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Summary of *Saturday's Women*

This thesis demonstrates that two plays about the LDS family culture, *Saturday's Warrior* and *Reunion*—contain Victorian images of women.

The study recounts the history of LDS literature. This literature was at first organic to the developing church, and consisted of scriptures, sermons, hymns, poetry, and journals. In the 1880's church authorities began to call for the deliberate creation of a Mormon literature. As a result, church members generated "Home Literature," works that promoted the Church and its dogma but were lacking in artistic merit—a trend that continues to this day. Fifty years later, in the 1930s, writers produced LDS works of more artistic caliber only outside of the mainstream church. Not until the 1960s did active church members produce works that faced real Mormon situations with both aesthetic skill and unfeigned belief in the LDS teachings.

These two literary trends—dogmatic and artistic—affect LDS theatre. This medium has also been promoted and influenced by church authority throughout its history. The Church used theatre as a means to achieve goals of community cohesiveness, pleasure, and moral instruction. The theatrical results of these two literary trends are the plays *Saturday's Warrior* and *Reunion.*
Before evaluating the images of women in these two plays, the study establishes the general concept of womanhood as found in authoritative LDS sermons and then shows how the authoritative voice has been influenced by the Victorian culture. Reaction to that influence has resulted in two different concepts of the LDS woman's nature and place, one doctrinally progressive and one culturally repressive.

The style of feminist literary criticism demonstrated in the book *The Madwoman in the Attic: the Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* is useful in pinpointing repressive, Victorian female imagery in written texts. Applying this style of literary criticism to the texts of the two plays and surveying for Victorian concepts of women as angels or monsters provides a valuable new reading of the texts.
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Introduction

Mormonism is the religion at the center of LDS culture, a culture animated by the Mormon religion. (Oman 10)

This quote, taken from a talk by Jan Shipps entitled "Are Mormons Christian?", succinctly sums up the dual tendencies of Utah’s dominant church. The members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints firmly testify that their church is based on true doctrine—and yet, at times, some of these same members firmly disagree on the nature of that doctrine. In Shipps’s analysis, this paradox "is possible because of the complex interrelationship between doctrinal claims on the one hand and religious culture on the other" (Oman 10).

Some of the confusion stems from occasions when cultural traditions are mistaken for actual dogma. This "dogma" may then merge with the Mormon religious experience both in its congregational meetings and its cultural arts.

As a member of the LDS church and a student of the theatre, I became curious about this subtle mingling of tradition and doctrine and its impact on LDS art. I was particularly interested in studying Mormon theatre, as I had participated in that art form since I was sixteen years old. My own concept of my religion and my culture had, in part, been shaped by my experiences with a variety of LDS musicals. I decided to ask a question of my own, a variation of Shipps’s: "Are Mormon plays Mormon?" Do the
plays that I grew up with express doctrinal values, cultural values, or a mixture of both?

I decided to narrow my study by tracing the treatment of women in LDS plays, and to compare my observations to both authoritative LDS discourse and literary cultural tradition. I chose two plays, *Saturday's Warrior*, and *Reunion*, both written in the 1970s by LDS men associated with Brigham Young University, the intellectual heart of Mormondom. These plays are comparable because they focus on the trials of LDS families and demonstrate cultural beliefs and attitudes concerning the role of women in LDS family life.

According to Jean Anne Waterstradt,

> Family relationships have provided the structure for dramatists from ancient Greece to modern America. The reason is simple, but fundamental: the family is the microcosm; within its bounds are fostered all basic human relationships. ("Making" 501)

In studying the Flinders and Robison families, I concluded that the women in the two LDS plays were basically defined by their relationship to men, and were not portrayed as individuals in their own right. The two plays demonstrate how the literary tradition of the past has mixed with and even replaced Mormon doctrine to mirror stereotypical cultural images of Mormon womanhood.
A Brief Survey of Mormon Literature

The Mormon church is a church that believes in the power of words. Not in words alone, but in words imbued with and aided by the power of the Holy Spirit. Such words effect a profound change in the lives of men and women. The Mormon church itself, as essayists are fond of pointing out, began with a sacred book, an ancient text preserved by heaven and given through angelic instruction to the prophet Joseph Smith. This Book of Mormon contains not only spiritual truths that sustain and harmonize with the Bible, but also includes fascinating historical and anthropological accounts, personal testimonies of ancient prophets and peoples. The Book of Mormon also contains elements of good literature. As the scrutiny of such scholars as Bruce Jorgensen, Dilworth Rust, Jack Welch, and Steve Sondrup has revealed, it contains mythic and poetic structure and rhetorical consistency (England, "Dawning" 145).

The early literature of the Church echoed The Book of Mormon and its companion scriptural volume the Doctrine and Covenants in its mixed practical and ecstatic style: personal testimonies of faith and accounts of daily happenings and revelations carefully recorded in hymns, sermons, letters, journals, and diaries. These writings, though set down by men and women usually unversed in cultured arts and letters, transcend their origins into a form of literary greatness through the power of internal
simplicity and deepest faith. Consider the following excerpt from Joseph Smith's personal history:

Why persecute me for telling the truth? I have actually seen a vision; and who am I that I can withstand God, or why does the world think to make me deny what I have actually seen? For I had seen a vision; I knew it, and I knew that God knew it, and I could not deny it, neither dared I do it; at least I knew that by so doing I would offend God, and come under condemnation. (Church, Pearl, JS-H 1:25)

This example contains plain terms of deep conviction positioned naturally in a rhythmic repetition that raises the account almost to the level of the most masterful prose.

Though much of the world doubts the doctrine thus presented, critics no longer deny that the early body of work has literary value. Its uniquely Mormon symbolism and concepts of salvation, its eyewitness accounts of dreadful hardships and unpretentious charity, and its stories of extraordinary self-sacrifice in a cause that appeared both impossible and gloriously inevitable--the building of the kingdom of God on earth--have definite literary value.

A few of the more outstanding works of this first period of Mormon literature, which lasted roughly the fifty years of 1830-1880, are found in the Autobiography of Parley Parker Pratt, the "King Follett Discourse," John Widstoe's compilation of the Discourses of Brigham Young, Eliza R. Snow, an Immortal: Selected Writings, and The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, edited by B.H. Roberts.
The next fifty year time period witnessed a falling off in the quality of Mormon literature (England, "Dawning" 141). It was during this period that the LDS people experienced the discouragement of the "Manifesto," which officially ended the practice of polygamy (see Church, D&C, p. 129), and the upheaval of official statehood (1896), with its accompanying influx of more mainstream American culture and values. It was during this period, in the year 1888, that Apostle Orson F. Whitney made his famous call for "home literature" (203-205), factual and fictional writings by and for the Mormon people, but also for the world at large. This literature was intended to "help take" Mormonism even to "the high and mighty" powers of the earth, "subservient to the building up of Zion" and written in humility and with the energy of the "sincere and earnest soul" (205). Whitney called for "polished thoughts" springing from intensive study of scripture, religious writings, "history, poetry, philosophy, art, science, languages, government--all truth, in fact, wherever found" (205). Whitney hoped for literature that was "original," not made in imitation of the past classics, though he termed the works of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, etc., "excellent" (206). This new form would be after "God’s own design." It was Whitney’s fervid and often quoted belief that

We will yet have Miltons and Shakespeares of our own. God’s ammunition is not exhausted. His brightest spirits are held in reserve for the latter times. In God’s name and by his help we will build up a literature whose top shall touch
the heaven, though its foundations may now be low in earth. (206)

Unfortunately, the writings of the Mormon people of that period fell far short of the mark. In trying to follow Whitney's counsel to "appeal to the heart" (205), writers seemed to forget that he also mentioned that literature appealed to the "head" and that writers should "choose between the unreal and the genuine" (206). Whitney's vision was not realized--the flood of "home literature" that was generated grew out of dogma, but was not rooted in experience. The writers did avoid imitating the classics but instead copied the popular, sentimental style of the day (Geary, "Poetics" 15), a pattern which Professor Edward Geary admits continues in a "slightly modified" form to this day. The style, explains Geary, is neither pure nor artistically powerful, as "in most cases its distinctive Mormon characteristics are only skin deep" (15). Eugene England gives this modern day example:

Think of the popular, entertaining, and 'edifying' Saturday's Warrior, with its slick sophistication, its misleading if not heretical theology, and its stereotyping toward bigotry in the social references--under the skin as foreign to the gospel as to real life. ("Dawning" 142)

The most famous work of this second literary period is Neph I Anderson's didactic Added Upon. Modern day examples include the works of Shirley Sealy and Jack Weyland, works sincere in their intents, but lacking in artistic merit.

The next phase of Mormon literature began in the 1930s, and peaked in the 1940s with the publication of the books
and short stories of Virginia Sorensen based on her childhood in Manti, Utah, and Maurine Whipple's *The Giant Joshua*, set in southern Utah.

England frankly considers *The Giant Joshua* one of the finest novels "yet produced by or about Mormons" ("Whipple" 1) because of its vital characterizations, its intense descriptions of the epic struggles between the Saints and the harsh, unforgiving land, and its handling of the human cost of that struggle and its ability to portray the uniqueness of the Mormon community. "The Giant Joshua [is] the most direct and perceptive avenue to deeper understanding of the Mormon experience [yet written]" (England, "Whipple" 3). Ultimately, however, Whipple's book is weakened because it vividly portrays early Mormon culture but does not accurately portray its faith, as Whipple herself was somewhat distanced from the Church.

Geary, in fact, calls the best works of this time period "expatriate novels," claiming that

they resemble the works of the so-called "lost generation" of the 1920s in their ambivalence towards a tradition which seems to have failed yet which still offers the only available spiritual anchor against a tide of meaninglessness. ("Mormondom" 92)

The authors of this "generation," though they were artistic and accurate in their view of Mormon surroundings and lifestyle, tended to find the deeper Mormon doctrine "naive" (England "Dawning" 144) and did not communicate the Mormon religious experience in any meaningful way.
Finally, beginning in the 1960s, Mormons began to develop an artistic tradition that mixed literary competence and sincere LDS faith with a love for the Mormon people, able to explore both the power and the problems of the Mormon experience, culturally and religiously. This tradition was founded by pioneering Clinton Larson, a man with a fortunate mixture of talent, training, and testimony. Larson is not only the founder of BYU Studies, a magazine that offered Mormon writers an outlet different from the official publications of the Church with their specific needs and limitations, but he is also

The first real Mormon poet, the ground-breaker...in achieving a uniquely Mormon poetic, and is still, by virtue of both quantity and quality of work, our foremost literary artist. (England "Dawning" 150-151)

Certainly, not all the works of the more literary daring of this current period are deeply moving, or even try to be. These writers, at times, produce work that is neither sentimental nor superficial. Rather, they attempt work that is challenging, not to the Church, but to the people who read in order to gain a deeper perspective of life. As Richard Cracroft wrote in the introduction to the anthology A Believing People:

So the best literature of the Latter-day Saints comes increasingly to consider the great questions that all mortals, Saints and gentiles alike, are forced to encounter; and the best writers come more and more to grapple with the profound problems of human existence, especially as that existence is worked out in the context of a universe revealing itself to man, a claim which in itself recognizes the open-endedness of Mormon theology and allows the ambiguities and questions from
which spring a thoughtful and profound literature. (5)

The best of these writers are making strides in reconciling the demands of both art and complex convictions, but they do not all follow the same style. Some authors aim toward portraying the Mormon cultural experience, to discover the universal within the peculiarities of the Mormon viewpoint, writing out of their Mormon roots. Authors of this style include Linda Sillitoe, Michael Fillerup, Donald Marshall, and Douglas Thayer. Other writers reach back towards the fervor and faith of the early Mormon literature, adding their own private context while creating personal essays. Prominent authors of this mode include Clifton Jolley, Mary Bradford, Hugh Nibley, and Eloise Bell. Still other writers research history from new angles (Leonard Arrington, Linda Wilcox), collect LDS folklore (William Wilson), or write truthful biographies (Edward Kimball, Robert E. Riggs). (For a selected Bibliography of Mormon Literature from 1830-1980 see England, "Dawning" 157-160. For more up-to-date work see publications of BYU Studies, Sunstone, Dialogue, and the offerings of such publishing houses as Signature, Covenant, Bookcraft, Deseret Book, etc.).

Many genres of Mormon writing are now available to the public, stretching from the experiences of the General Authorities to cook books and science fiction. There is even the danger that LDS theology and LDS theory will be confused or exchanged in the mind of the beholder. Readers
of any style of LDS literature would do well to ask the questions that Carson and Anderson have raised in reference to LDS oriented romance novels:

The greatest danger of books of this type is simply that of any ersatz: will they be mistaken for the real thing? real literature? real spirituality? will they further blur the line between Wasatch Front culture and the gospel of Jesus Christ? Will they persuade readers that having an emotional experience is the same as having a spiritual one? (30)

The dual literary trends of the Mormon people, the more dogmatic "home literature" and the more artistically challenging work, co-exist somewhat uneasily. Readers sometimes tend to divide almost into camps. Not all LDS readers are pleased with the newer, more artistic expressions, disliking either the genre, or the harder elements that they sometimes include. Other readers dismiss all of the more obviously devout works as immature. Reviewer Eugene England has advice for those who favor either style:

The dangers of mixing religion and art are clear and present--from both sides. Literature is not a substitute for religion and making it such is a sure road to hell; and just as surely religious authority is no substitute for honest literary perception and judgement--and didactic, apologetic, or sentimental writing, however "true" in some literal sense, is no substitute for real literature in its power to grasp and change....We must stop rewarding the "pious trash," as Flannery O'Connor called much Catholic literature--a phrase that well describes much of our own; and we must, on the other hand, also stop awarding prizes to those stories which, for instance, in reaching for unearned maturity, use sexual explicitness or sophomoric skepticism as faddish, but phony, symbols of intellectual and moral sophistication. (England, "Dawning" 155-156)
The best hope for a truly LDS literature that "touches the heaven" lies with writers who strive to combine the best faith and knowledge they have to offer with the best talent they have to offer, merging the best intentions of both trends into a powerful whole.
The History and the Hope of Mormon Theatre

And in the midst of the green, above the trees, one could see as he came out of a canyon mouth and across the eastern benchland, a white, oblong building. It was [the] playhouse. But beyond this building one could see a strange huge curve. This...was the just erected central arches of the Big New Tabernacle. Thus soon was a fact forced upon my notice, thus I was compelled...to see a peculiarity of thought and purpose in the erectors of those two buildings--the House of Pleasure and the House of Worship--the relationship between Church and Stage. (Lambourne 9-10)

Lambourne's 1860s impression of Salt Lake City buildings and enveloping trees neatly parallels the relationship between the dogma and the drama of the LDS church. For the roughly 150 years of the existence of church theatre, the church leaders have been trying to find a balance between three goals--pleasure, moral profit, and community spirit, a balance often at odds with artistic considerations.

The beginnings of LDS theatre theory and practice properly belong to Nauvoo, not Salt Lake City. While the remainder of the country shifted uneasily between the delights of theatres and the rigid Puritanical condemnation of such earthly distractions, the Mormons were being led by a Prophet who preached a distinctly un-Puritanical message: "Men are that they might have joy" (2 Nephi 2:25).

When the saints had built their homes in Nauvoo, the Prophet Joseph Smith organized a university and taught his people to study and learn. Almost simultaneously he organized musical groups and literary and dramatic associations...to promote the pleasure and refinement of society. (Metten 1)
Nor was lighter fare denied the Saints. "Circus acts, magic shows, and plays were staged in the Red [sic] brick store and in the Cultural Hall" (Anderson 111). While drawing up the Nauvoo City Charter, Joseph had secured the power to license theatrical productions (Manning 107-308) and was often in the audience at performance time (Robertson 40). Rex Skidmore explains:

The leaders of the Mormons introduced a new set of ideas which stressed the point that temporal and physical welfare were essential to spiritual welfare. Naturally relaxation and diversion were important features of such a philosophy. (quoted in Robertson 40)

Joseph influenced the choice of plays, and was "...foremost in encouraging the production of classical plays" (Pyper 24), as "He believed that the theatre had its mission, that drama could be made a medium of instruction" (E. Evans 21). In terms of dramatic content, what Roberta Asahina said of the Salt Lake theater is true of Nauvoo--"The Mormons did not create a theater to re-enact myths, dramatize religious themes, or depict stories in their history" (Asahina 7). The church members had not yet begun to develop their own dramatic material, and the "classics," well worn theatrical favorites of the day, were considered suitable for both welcome entertainment and moral teaching just as they were. Church leaders also endorsed a production of Kotzebue's popular classic Pizarro for its practical use of raising needed funds. This production was proudly billed as a "Grand Moral entertainment" presented "To aid in the discharge of a debt against President Joseph
Smith contracted through the odious persecution of Missouri, and vexatious law suits" (Stanley Kimball 51). The playbill continues: "His friends and the public will respond to so laudable a cause, in patronising [sic] the exertions of those who promise rational amusement with usefulness" (51). Joseph's friends were also in the amateur cast (including Brigham Young), which was under the direction of professional actor Thomas Lynn.

The production of Pizarro illustrates Joseph's success in his efforts to combine recreation, refinement, and community solidarity through the arts. Unfortunately, only two months after the performance, he was shot and killed by a mob. In mourning, Brigham Young canceled all "vain amusements," including theatre (Asahina 16).

As had occurred several times in their history, the Mormons were displaced from their homes by mob action. This time Brigham Young was their leader. He organized the despondent refugees into groups for the journey to the freedom of the open West. In accordance with divine commandment--"If thou art merry, praise the Lord with singing, with music, with dancing, and with a prayer of praise and thanksgiving" (D. & C. 136:28)--he encouraged the migrating people to lift the weariness of the day's exertions through song and dance (Spencer 162). Members of the Nauvoo Brass Band kept their talents in good order through providing nightly concerts (Hanson 9-12). This valiant group of musicians would eventually become the core
of the Musical and Dramatic Association, the first LDS cultural organization in the Salt Lake Basin (E. Evans 26).

Although the pioneers began arriving in the Salt Lake Valley in 1847, it was not until 1850 that the first theatrical entertainment occurred. This time lapse is amazingly short, seen in the light of the harsh desert wilderness conditions the new settlers faced. Drought, plagues of insects, and unseasonable weather all combined to put the very survival of the pioneers in jeopardy. Yet when Young and his people fled to the west they had merely changed location, not creed. Joseph Smith had set the example--the developing soul needed relaxation and cultural refinement.

Why the church's emphasis on the arts, especially in the early days, when every loaf of bread was the result of long, hard struggle with the soil, when every dollar was earned twice over by dawn to dusk attention to the building of the kingdom? How did they find the time? They found the time because arts were not considered to be "extras." (Walker and Quinn 81)

Brigham Young was certain of the usefulness of and need for a theatre: "If I were placed on a cannibal island and given the task of civilizing its people, I should straight way build a theatre for the purpose" (Spencer 110). In Utah, the first civilizing effort was devoted to the construction of a "Bowery"--a temporary building of lumber roofed with woven green boughs. This "building," raised on Temple Square, was used for vital worship services. It was the third such bowery, called "the Old Bowery" (Maughn 22), which became the first stage in the Intermountain West.
(Manning 310). Eventually Young built not one, but two theatres in Salt Lake City. The first, a Social Hall designed for a variety of entertainments including dancing and amateur theatricals, was opened in December of 1854. The second, the Salt Lake Theater, built to resemble Drury Lane, was opened in 1862 (L. Arrington, 288). The Salt Lake Theater eventually turned professional, although at first Brigham Young wanted only members in good standing to appear on that stage (E. Evans 101-102).

These theatres, though owned and operated by a religious institution, nevertheless continued to present nonreligious drama. Besides the dramatic elements used in sacred temple ordinances, Young did not call for original drama that preached LDS doctrine.

The Social Hall and the Salt Lake Theater were built strictly for play and the Tabernacle and the Temple were built strictly for religion. Thus Mormon theatres from the time of Brigham Young never presented plays of a religious nature and religious meetings never featured any theatrical trappings. (Asahina 21)

In fact, Brigham Young was quite outspoken that the LDS religion remain completely separated from theatrical productions:

I told them that dancing and theater performances were not part of our religion; we were merely permitted to occupy a portion of the time in those amusements, being very careful not to grieve the spirit of the Lord. More or less amusements of that kind suits our organization, but when we come to the things of God, I had rather not have them mixed up with amusements like a dish of succotash (JD, Vol. IX 194)
Despite this disclaimer, Brigham Young used the theatre at least to reinforce religious instruction. Sounding very much like Schiller, he taught:

> Upon the stage of a theatre can be represented in character evil and its consequences, good and its happy results and rewards, the weakness and the follies of man, the magnanimity of virtue and the greatness of truth....The stage can be made to aid the pulpit in impressing upon the minds of the community an enlightened sense of a virtuous life, also a proper horror of the enormity of sin and a just dread of its consequences. The path of sin and its thorns and pitfalls, its sins, and snares can be revealed and how to shun it. (Young Vol. IX, 242-243)

Young did not want his people ignorant of evil. He felt that viewing evil seen in conjunction with its inevitable consequences would impress the desirability of avoiding sin, and thus deter sinful experimentation. The drama of the world could teach truth to Mormons. But worldly drama or no, Brigham did not wish his people to be instructed to their detriment. The character of evil had to be represented carefully:

> The theatre in this city has been built for the sole purpose of furnishing recreation and amusement for the citizens....this theater was intended to be a place in every respect suitable for Saints to visit and where good thoughts would be inspired and where nothing would be seen and heard that could shock or wound the feelings of the most chaste and delicate men, women, or child—a place in fact where the Spirit of God would reign, and its influence be felt by every person who should enter it. (Deseret News 166)

Young felt satisfied with the quality of the same sort of dramatic choices that had served Nauvoo--Kotzebue’s plays were again featured. Young personally did not like melodrama style tragedy:
If I had my way I would never have a tragedy played on these boards. There is enough of tragedy in everyday life, and we ought to have amusement when we come here. (Pyper 168)

Nevertheless, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and other Shakespearian tragedies were favorites in Salt Lake. Lambourne recalls that from the beginning "all classes of plays were put on the boards—classical, romantic, domestic, melo-dramatic, tragical, farcical, and yet it was opened with prayer" (9-10).

Lambourne had good reason to remember the dedicatory prayer offered at the opening of the Salt Lake Theatre. Such a prayer might have been remarkable even for a church dedication. Daniel H. Wells of the First Presidency prayed that every separate part of the building be consecrated to the Lord for pure and holy purposes. Wells pled that if the theatre would fall under wicked influences that it should "utterly perish and crumble into atoms..." (Scanlon 7).

Young did his best to keep the theatre pure enough to last. He posted signs in the green room prohibiting swearing and other unseemly behavior, lectured visiting stars on proper conduct, installed his own daughters in parts on stage as examples to the community, and was not above threatening to close a show if death scenes became too realistic (Scanlon 19-20).

Brigham Young set the example, but he did not insist that theatre in the area be restricted to his theatres and his control. As early as 1850 he had lent his aid to a "Youth Theatrical Organization" which prided itself on being
based on "strictly moral principals and for intellectual improvement" (Asahina 39). He took his entire family to see Phil Margetts's Mechanic Dramatic Association in the basement of the Bowring home, which successful incident was a final encouragement to spur the building of the Salt Lake Theater (E. Evans 54-57). His example and love of the theatre lead to the dissemination of dramatic arts throughout Mormon territory. Until his death in 1877 the great leader managed to keep religious authority and theatrics independent, co-operative, and lively. Brigham Young "did more to elevate the drama and encourage the histrionic art, in his day, than perhaps any man in America" (Margetts quoted in Metten 11)--but he had "encouraged" it not primarily for the sake of art, but for the sake of achieving his goals of pleasure, profit, and community cohesion.

John Taylor, Young's successor to the Presidency, was not as involved in the theatre as the larger-than-life "American Moses" had been. Taylor, as head of the Church, "was quite content to let the theater go its cosmopolitan way as long as plays did not offend the morals of his sect" (E. Evans 231). Taylor had less control over the theater as it bowed more and more to economic trends. About recreational theatre as a whole, Taylor said:

Instead of forbidding the theatre and placing it under ban, it has been the aim of the Latter-day Saints to control it and keep it free from impure
influence, and to preserve it as a place where all could meet for healthful enjoyment (Metten 11).

By the time Lorenzo Snow became the fifth President, he had already copied Brigham Young's pattern in establishing drama in the town of Brigham City, Utah. Called by Young to help colonize this faltering community, he arrived in 1853 to find a destitute body of saints scratching out farms on semi-arid land, with only a dirt-floored, dirt-roofed, bug-infested meeting house for assembly. In that building Snow "preached the sermon of his life" (Romney 154) on the theme of consecration, and soon organized a voluntary redistribution of water and land. Within a year he had organized tax supported schooling and had a courthouse under construction. Community involvement was fostered when "he turned his home into an amusement hall and organized a dramatic association which served the Saints to high class plays during the winter of 1855-56" (Romney 155-156) even though his home was still unfinished.

He invited the citizens free of charge, but in shifts so all could be accommodated, to pass a pleasant winter evening viewing the efforts of the amateur dramatic company. Here the old and young, the grey headed and little Prattlers met and mingled--the people drawn together and a feeling of union was awakened. (Eliza R. Snow Smith quoted in Johnson 188)

Lorenzo Snow continued to nurture the theatre by gathering talented young people of the community (including members of his own family) into a dramatic group and hiring actor Henry Bowring from Salt Lake City "to instruct the group in the fundamentals of acting" (Johnson 138).
"President Snow always felt there was great value in the drama and encouraged the participation of Saints in recreation" (Metten 11). Certainly Snow was successful in fostering healthful recreation and community concord through theatre.

Although most documented Church theatre history of the late 19th and early 20th century focuses on the economically embattled Salt Lake Theatre, during this same period the scattered LDS community theatres which had begun such as Snow's came into their own. Though the beginnings of such theatre in America are hazy, "Personally, I should much rather start the little theatre movement with Brigham Young" (Macgowan quoted in Hansen 4). Young was not only involved in establishing theatre in Nauvoo and Salt Lake, he encouraged the leaders of other LDS colonies to establish theatrical activities.

In practice, interest in drama had never been confined to Salt Lake City. The outlying districts, towns, and wards developed their own dramatic associations, little theatre groups, and road companies. Support for the performing arts evolved into a Mormon tradition (Manning 318).

Mormons in many areas also supported community theatre. Touring actors record playing to enthusiastic crowds in such places as Farmington, Kaysville, Logan, Wellsville, Malad, and other small towns (Cosgrave 81). By the end of the 19th century the secular influence was becoming more pronounced in LDS entertainment. The overwhelming concerns of
establishing the rapidly growing Church distracted leaders from theatre.

As communities grew and people other than members of the Church settled among them, public recreation became questionable. In their struggles to establish themselves...many physical, economic, and religious matters were set up and established, and instruction given by the presiding brotherhood, but recreation was left pretty much to itself. (Robinson 1)

It would fall to the MIA to tug recreation back into church line--and beyond it to stricter standards.

Brigham Young himself had begun to address the problem of invasive non-LDS values. Perhaps harking back to the Youth Theatrical Society's self-improvement goals, in 1869 he organized the Retrenchment Society to better the behavior of his daughters in dress, manners, speech, and thought (Shields 31). This plan proved so successful that the next year it was extended to all the young ladies of the Church. In 1875 a parallel organization was instated for the young men. By 1893 the organizations had the combined name of MIA (Mutual Improvement Association), had a printed handbook (E. Evans 245) and had stated the goal of training youth in all that pertains to religious, moral, physical, and intellectual achievement (Shields 32). When Joseph F. Smith, who was particularly mindful of the youth, became President of the Church in 1901, he sent out notice that:

the character and variety of amusements have so much to do with the welfare and character of our young people that they should be guarded with utmost jealousy for the preservation of our youth. (Shields 32)
Thus, by 1903 the MIA handbook included literature courses in which Shakespeare and Ibsen were favorite authors (E. Evans 245). But as world theatre became increasingly materialistic, to further safeguard the youth the Church began to take more control over the content of LDS theatre. The autonomy of theatre began to fade:

Theater as a part of the MIA as it now exists, began in 1910 when Alice C. Tuddenham at June Conference suggested that young people in several wards who had produced plays that were not 'suitable' should rechannel this energy into worthy productions with church supervision ....'There are so many plays full of suggestion to evils that we want to keep our young folks from, as far as possible. If it is sentiment, we want them to have the highest sentiment.' (C. Arrington 50)

Soon theatrical activities were more closely supervised by ward bishops, and by 1922 the First Presidency assigned the exclusive responsibility for all recreation besides ward parties to the Primary and MIA (Robinson 12). W. O. Robinson was called by the Quorum of the Twelve to the position of Field Supervisor over recreation in the MIA, and thus, for the next quarter century, he was responsible for all church theatricals which included anyone of the age of twelve and up (Robinson 3-7).

Robinson worked closely with the MIA board, which included George A. Smith, who would become President of the Church in 1945. Robinson earnestly studied Brigham Young's opinions on recreation before setting out to his first MIA "convention" in Idaho and then to give three-day Recreation Institutes in each of the three stakes in western Canada.
He followed the same agenda in each Institute, dispensing both spiritual and practical advice pertaining to cultural development, music, dance, and theatre (Robinson 1-59). Robinson devoted each third night to drama; included in his teachings was a very clear statement of the slightly revised Church goals of pleasure and profit in a section titled

**Entertainment and Educational Values of Drama:**

It is evident that a play to an audience, and to a boy and girl acting in it, should be both a medium of entertainment and a source of development. To an audience, entertainment is of first importance. Secondly, the idea of the play with problems at least partially solved may be a source of help in life’s analysis. (Robinson 43-44)

The emphasis of the Church theatrical goals was thus put on the development of the personal talents and morals of participating youths, rather than on the display of painful life consequences to an audience participating in culturally stimulating recreation as it was in Brigham Young’s time. Theatre was expected not only to reinforce Church values, it was part of the Church.

The evidences show that under Robinson Church theatre became very popular. According to the Presiding Bishop’s Office, by 1940 there were 946 chapels in urban and rural communities, 510 of which were equipped with stages (E. Evans 262). The MIA sponsored large script writing contests, and a 1924 Granite Utah Stake road show became the model for the short, light, original, amateur playlet that is still "the most popular dramatic form in the Mormon culture" (Arrington 50).
With the best of intentions, the MIA influenced playwrights to observe the currently acceptable realistic, sentimental, message laden format of theatre that is so similar to the "Home Literature" style. Church amateur and commercial plays still generally conform to the guidelines established in a 1929 MIA pamphlet "Staging a Play," which states that "Drama Objectives are: To make Drama a means of a) Cultural development, b) Educational growth, c) Wholesome entertainment" (E. Evans 265). The pamphlet was redistributed as part of a "Bulletin on Play Production" in the 1930s (E. Evans 264). The bulletin contained this test of a good play:

1. A good play is determined by the number and kind of emotions it arouses and the character of the imagination it sets in motion.

2. The fundamental theme of a good play must be a dominant and underlying emotion that pervades the whole.

3. The play really great is the play which first of all stirs our emotions profoundly and then gives a meaning and direction to our feelings by the unity and truth of some underlying idea.

4. The author has put into the play his own ideas and feelings; the product of his art was his before it was ours. Our first duty is to analyze and discover the underlying meaning which motivates the play. We must understand and appreciate the message he has endeavored to convey if we are to put vitality and power into our interpretation of it. (E. Evans 265)

Forty years later, the authors and producers of Saturday's Warrior observed these standards extremely well. The play emphasizes emotions and sentiment to the exclusion of artistic ambitions. Its message, though doctrinally weak,
is strongly stated. *Warrior* also complies whole-heartedly with other standards of the earlier time, particularly that of the MIA Handbook. This booklet had advice that is often still followed in unofficial Mormon plays as well as in plays written expressly for the Church and its auxiliaries:

Great care should be exercised by officers that only clean wholesome plays be presented. All smoking, drinking of liquor, tea, and coffee, and particularly all profanity is to be eliminated. Where plays, otherwise acceptable, have these objectionable features, the passages where such features occur should be reconstructed. (E. Evans 264)

This advice sounds remarkably similar to the advice given in a *Deseret News* editorial written by George Q. Cannon after an incident where Brigham Young almost closed a too-graphic play (see Scanlon 20-24), with the addition of specific interdiction of the depiction of the use of substances banned in the Word of Wisdom. These rules have been traditional in Church theatricals since the mid-nineteenth century, but were built specifically into the Church recreation program in the 1930s.

Even if aesthetic or value judgments were left aside, issues of copyright infringement alone should prompt a review of these long ingrained standards. In addition, some critics are of the opinion that these rules ruin original works by LDS playwrights by preventing them from reaching the level of art by putting the emphasis on outward conformance to rules more suitable for the official drama of the Church:
The consequence of such an inhibiting program is that Mormon drama of the twentieth century is sectarian and amateur. It features plays which merely seek to trace types or stereotypes, and is marked by a propensity to express a greater degree of feeling than a specific situation warrants. Characteristically these plays fail to emphasize intellectual depth or imaginative development. Such plays may satisfy an audience which demands that the theater be a guide to life but strike a more sophisticated viewer as hollow. (Manning 320)

Outsider's criticism of artistic merit has not discouraged LDS participation in the theatre. Thousands of roadshows are produced yearly, stakes sponsor musicals, the Church annually stages the Hill Cumorah and other pageants (Arrington 50). These programs are lauded for their contribution to community relations and missionary work. These Church productions preach Church doctrine or, even in roadshow fantasy, adhere to a view of the world as Mormons would like the world to be. Almost without comment, the church tradition follows Robinson's 1924 remarks:

And remember, too, though we are striving to develop high standards in expression of the arts, it must carry the spirit of the gospel....It is the spirit and atmosphere we put into our work that counts. (Robinson 55-56)

Such a focus is understandable in the context of the goals of maintaining community harmony within the Church and providing uplifting developmental recreation. It is also consistent with the use of theatre as a proselyting tool. But great atmosphere does not equal great art. Manning explains that

the kind of insights which a literary critic would find satisfying and those which an ideologue would seek from the same material are not always different. But the emphasis and purpose of each
are distinctive: the critic seeks art and universality; the cultist, doctrine and exclusiveness. (Manning 320)

Manning believes that the purpose of Mormon theatre today is not to create art, but to serve as a place to strengthen Mormon values and traditions and to form a cohesive society. "Perceived as mass entertainment and designed to involve large numbers of participants, the conventions of Mormon theater are primarily social" (Manning 320-321). There is a proper time and place for such theatre, especially within the institutional church. Mormon artists working independently of the Church systems should be allowed to emphasize more artistic values.

However successful Mormon theatre may be in pulling Mormons together or teaching dogma, it seems true that most LDS drama is not considered high art. In his analysis of Mormon plays written between 1944 and 1969, Rowley concludes that

The general trend in the plays seems to be toward involvement of the individual rather than with the profundity of the idea with which the individual becomes involved. Although the official literature of the church pays lip service to dedicated intellectual drama, the search for an LDS play which might lay claim to profundity of idea or significant exploration of thought is difficult if not futile. (33)

Even some LDS essayists go so far as to condemn much of current church drama as morally dangerous. Although Alan F. Keele admits that "there should be room on the artistic spectrum for works of all types from Grand Ole Opry to Grand Opera," Mormon musicals are flawed because
They allow divine ideas—like unauthorized temple ceremonials held in a barn—to become trivialized by their setting. For when they are trivialized and clad in styles which make a mockery of their divinity, even divine [truths] cannot ring true for very long, and are likely to be rejected by any sensitive seeker for truth...the production of such works may in fact constitute aesthetic sin and perhaps even blasphemy. (Keele 47)

Marden Clark is also concerned with the welfare of those looking for truth. He warns of spiritual laziness in Mormondom causing the desire to seek "shortcuts to the sublime by way of the trivial" in theatre as well as life (46).

Is there any hope for the creation of Mormon drama which would meet the standards of both Church leadership and artistic critics? Spencer Kimball states in "The Gospel Vision of the Arts" that "if we strive for perfection—the best and greatest—and are never satisfied with mediocrity, we can excel" (5).

Such striving means that church members will have to grow beyond Saturday's Warrio and its companions, as "many of these works are clumsy and fumbling" though "they do represent a start" (Rowley 38). Other critics agree with Rowley's assessment. Bliss and Gump point out that "Elizabethan theatre did not begin with Shakespeare: audiences had to grow up on Box and Cox, Gammer Gurton's Needle, and other such pablum before they were ready for Hamlet...," counseling that "...if a giant should arise among the Mormon dramatists, it will be because the audience is ready. And not until" (63). Mormon artists and
audiences will need to leave road show material to road shows, to separate wholesome opportunities for development of youth talents from the professional playwriting which sometimes, in order to show "evil and its consequences" must bend or break the MIA rules. Mormons, in other words, must drop the "stultifying attitude" through which "drama is perceived less as an art form than a recreational activity for mass participation" (Manning 320). The theatre and the social hall should perhaps be farther apart.

If we are to have "Miltons and Shakespeares of our own" LDS audiences and leaders will have to overcome the feeling that "...serious and dedicated drama seems to pose a sort of threat to the orthodoxy of the participant. The serious theatre..." should not, as Rowley claims, "be looked on as a competing source of illumination" (Rowley 133). Strong, artistically mature theatre can actually help church members, addressing their real-life paradoxes in a way that purely dogmatic theatre cannot.

Even as the Church continues to use its own theatre as a means of mass recreation or proselytizing, its members should realize that a wider spectrum of acceptable styles and conflicts are, and must continue to be, available to talented playwrights outside of the official system.

Serious artistic theatre often uses serious, probing questions and conflicts that are frightening to audience members who equate investigations into the characters of Mormon people with attacks upon the Church itself. One play
that both unnerves and fascinates LDS audiences is Thomas Rogers's Reunion, which enthusiastically compresses within its action a quantity of LDS dilemmas, and allows characters to express realistic doubts. This play is not yet an expression of high art, yet it is a step in that direction. In its forthright look at actual life, it leads LDS theatre along the path that LDS literature has taken.

Other LDS playwrights have made progress expressing Mormon situations artistically or at least realistically. These playwrights have been inspired by the efforts of Clinton Larson, the same pioneer who break ground for Mormon literature. Larson's plays are poetic closet dramas, better read than produced, but they showed other playwrights that experimenting in LDS theatre is worthwhile. Playwrights who followed in Larson's path, among others, include Robert Elliot, Fires of the Mind; James Arrington, Farley Family Reunion; Susan Howe, Burdens of Earth, Tim Slover, Carol Lynn Pearson, Charles Whitman, and, of course, Thomas Rogers, Huebener, Fire in the Bones, Reunion (for other suggestions and a partial list, see Bliss and Gump 64-65).

None of these playwrights are widely known for their theatrical work. Arrington's work has gained a solid following in the Mormon community; it has not yet reached outside of that specific audience on any great scale. But these playwrights represent hope for the future.

Though some critics warn that trying to express Mormon values in dramatic form dooms Mormon theatre to "sectarian
plots and didactic goals--elements unlikely to be found in successful dramatic productions" (Manning 324)--President Spencer Kimball had no doubt about the potential of mixing Mormon religion with the arts:

We are proud of the artistic heritage that the church has brought to us from its earliest beginnings, but the full story of Mormonism has never yet been written or painted or spoken. It remains for faithful hearts and talented fingers to yet reveal themselves. They must be faithful, inspired, active Church members to give life and feeling and true perspective to a subject so worthy. Such masterpieces should run for months in every movie center, cover every part of the globe....(5)

Perhaps the best means of achieving artistic success combined with the spiritual feelings advocated by the MIA is found in Academy Award winner Kieth Merrill's suggestions that Mormon artists stop preaching specific Mormon concepts and instead reach for what is universal, "knowing that what we are, what we have been becoming, will inadvertently (sic) be reflected. We cannot remove ourselves from what we do" (33).

Whether LDS artists create new theatrical forms or simply rework their artistic standards, "the challenge comes...to produce theatre that is 'virtuous, lovely, or of good report'" Arrington 50). The "challenge" also comes to create theatre that is honest both to its intentions, and to LDS beliefs and trials.

As playwrights and church audience members continue to struggle with the problems of developing a valid theatrical tradition, they continue to deal with the problem that
Rowely identified—church members who persist in accepting Mormon theatre at face value as either attacking or supporting not only the cultural church, but the doctrine of the institutional Church. Some church members who feel threatened by plays that frankly address problems within the Church or of its members may have difficulty because they are unable to differentiate between the Church and its doctrine and church culture with its traditions and misconceptions. Some church members also, as Marden Clark warned, continue to fully accept sweet and reassuring facsimiles of doctrine as true teachings when they are presented in familiar and pleasing entertainment. These members then support the presented folklore, to the detriment of the truth. Church members should have knowledge and testimony of their own that does not depend on "borrowed light" from the playwright. Members who have been given the truth through the gospel are ultimately responsible for their own beliefs.

LDS students and critics of the theatre should use their learning for the benefit of those who do not have the skills to discriminate theatrical messages. These scholars may use their expertise to examine their own theatre, to evaluate both its merits and its failings, and to examine the messages that this theatre, in Kieth Merrill's words, "inadvertently reflect" about their own beliefs and attitudes.
In examining these plays, we examine ourselves, and run the risk of discovering things about ourselves that are unpleasant. Whether the things we discover please or disturb us, we are the better off by the examination.
On the Nature and Role of the Mormon Woman

One topic that has been addressed continually in the discourse of the Latter-day Saints, from the Restoration to the present, is the Latter-day Saint woman:

The Mormon woman's image--her stated nature and appropriate roles--has been repeatedly defined in both oral and printed sermons, books, general epistles, church magazines, and newspapers. (V. Evans 40)

Despite the plethora of available material, however, the LDS woman seeking for a final and absolute statement on her uniquely Mormon place in creation is left confused and uncertain. The definitions and messages she encounters are varied and often contradictory. The remarks of one LDS young woman are almost as applicable today as they were at the height of the so called "Women's Movement":

We are urged by some to get out and do something significant in the world. We are urged by others to stay home and feed the fires of heart and hearth. We are urged to have families and fulfill the measure of our creation. But if we do, still others say we aid and abet the population explosion. We are trained in schools the same as our brothers, and are then sent forth with subtle reminders not to compete with them and upset the scheme of things. We have been worshipped and exploited, applauded and forgotten. We have been the target of jokes, and the object of lust. All about us is dichotomy. (Church, Learn 175)

This statement was first printed in 1979, but it is not outdated. It was reprinted in the 1990 Relief Society Personal Study Guide, a manual that is to be reused on a rotating basis with three other study guides as part of a plan
initiated in 1989. The official texts of the Relief Society admit then that the community as a whole sends conflicting signals. Many individual members of the Relief Society believe that they have been given more concrete guidelines, but a comparison of their beliefs can show widely varying conclusions. Often even those members who profess to have the answer are less sure than they claim. For example, although one typical book, *Mormons & Women*, produced by and for LDS women, asserts that "Most Mormon mothers are secure in the understanding of their divinely ordained roles" (Terry 5), the book itself was written in an attempt to clarify those roles. The authors of the book continue in the same paragraph:

> They know clearly from the scriptures, from the prophets, and from their own experiences that true happiness is found only in obedience to the commandments of the Lord. (5)

These Mormon mothers may "know clearly" that "happiness" comes from "obedience," but they experience some difficulty discovering the "commandments" pertaining to their "roles." The scriptures themselves give some guidance, but "references [given specifically] to women are sparse in the scriptures acknowledged by Mormons" (Wilcox "Mormon Motherhood" 209). A larger body of instruction has been given by the "prophets," the spiritual and administrative authorities of the LDS church, yet even these instructions often vary in message or tone. As Vella Evans, a scholar who has carried out a comprehensive survey of the official discourse, concluded: "The authoritative definition
of the ideal Mormon women has fluctuated somewhat" (V. Evans 31).

Throughout its history, the Church has responded to cultural and economic trends, and has been affected by the personalities of individual Church leaders. As the Church has adjusted to these factors, the prevailing attitudes toward LDS women and their roles have varied as well. In "The Mormon Women: Defined in Authoritative Church Discourse 1830-1980," Evans illustrates:

For example, Brigham Young was a pragmatist and architect of a kingdom: and he viewed women as relatively complex and capable of multiple roles. On the other hand, Harold B. Lee frequently applied then-popular business principles to centralize authority and conserve resources; and he was president when the women's Relief Society offices were severely restricted. David O. McKay was noted for his vision of saintly women--sacrificing mothers in the home; and Spencer Kimball continually cited Old Testament values and promoted a female "helpmeet" role. (V. Evans 39)

Despite the differences in the views of church leaders, a survey of authoritative discourse originating from the church itself does reveal two consistent beliefs defining the Mormon woman:

1. A woman's nature is different from a man's.
2. The woman's role is to be a mother.

LDS Church Presidents, from the foundation of the Church to the present, have been consistent in their opinions that the nature of women is distinguishable from that of men. Evans documents the convictions of the current President and those whom he succeeded:
President Ezra Taft Benson articulates this belief in part when he told the sisters, "Your natural attributes, affections and personalities are entirely different from those of a man..."; women are "charitable and benevolent" while men are "striving and competitive." Most church presidents have sided with President Benson. Joseph Smith claimed that women were "spontaneously...humane and philanthropic." Brigham Young said that women were naturally pious and "submissive." Young also said women had a "finer nature" and "stronger moral inclinations" than had men. (V. Evans 32)

Presidents Joseph F. Smith, David O. McKay, and Spencer W. Kimball made comparable statements (32).

These pronouncements function as part of the LDS doctrine on the nature of humankind. The book Mormons & Women describes this teaching as "a basic doctrine of the Mormon church: that the male and the female were designed as component parts of one entity; that entity being man" (3-4). This unofficial book adds a continuation of this doctrine that is sometimes less easy to accept at face value: "Latter-day Saints believe that, as is true elsewhere in the animal kingdom, a biological division of labor was built into the creation of each gender of the species" (4). The book proceeds to compare men and women with Mallard ducks, which have a color differentiation that allows the female duck to remain still and camouflaged on the eggs while the brighter, active male attracts danger away from the nest.

There is risk in making blanket comparisons to the animal kingdom because for any biological rule there are notable biological exceptions. In this case the continuation of the argument is weak in its assertions about
humans. Though it is true that "a much greater proportion of her body is designed for reproductive purposes [than that of the male]" (5), it is not necessarily true that "the male is physically strong, by nature more aggressive and bold" (5), or even that immediately after birth "her emotions surface and her instinctive desire to nurture the child is kindled" (6). Certainly there are women who are strong, or more aggressive or less nurturing than some men, and to pretend otherwise is discourteous to the numerous exceptions in either gender. The only certainty is that with humans, biologically, only males can father children and only females can bear children. Still, women in the Church are encouraged to fulfill a different role in life than their husbands, as the Church teaches that their nature is to some extent as predetermined as their gender.

The other belief consistently expressed by authorities of the Church is based on the differentiation of man from woman, leaving women a role that no man can fulfill. That belief is that woman is automatically equated with her role as mother. As Patricia Holland, drawing from scriptural precedents, explains:

> Eve was given the identity of "the Mother of all living"—years, decades, perhaps centuries before she ever bore a child. It would appear that motherhood preceded her maternity." (Church, Come 119; emphasis original)

Joseph F. Smith, speaking to women on their "high position and destiny as 'Mothers in Israel,'" explained that
actual motherhood may even begin after death, a comfort to those who are unable to have children in this lifetime:

To be a mother in Israel in the full gospel sense is the highest reward that can come into the life of a woman. This designation has a deep and significant meaning, one that is far more than marrying and bearing children in this life, great and important as that course is. In fact, in the full and true sense of the word, the blessing of being mothers in Israel shall come in due course to some who, through no fault of their own are denied the opportunity to marry and to bear children in this life. (Church, Come 119)

The details of this belief in the motherhood of all women is open to some interpretation, for the definition of the role of mother has changed over the years from prophet to prophet. One example is the changing relationship of the female roles of wage earner to mother. As Evans notes: "Since 1830, female members of the Church have provided or supplemented the family income; and such work has variously been taken for granted, praised or condemned" (V. Evans 33). In her article "Mormon Motherhood: Official Images," Linda Wilcox relates that Brigham Young not only acknowledged that many mothers worked outside the home, but "emphasized the importance of mothers' self-sufficiency" (211). Young not only expected mothers to work, but called upon them to teach their daughters useful occupations so that women could support themselves when husbands and fathers were called, as they often were, on missions or to other church duties. In the Mormon culture of his time, the activities that we consider "mothering" were not regarded as the only priority in a woman's life:
Rather it was one of many responsibilities, all of them necessary and important. With so much other work to do, devoting most of one’s time, energy, or thought to mother work was an unrealistic luxury. (211)

In the mid nineteenth century, Brigham Young encouraged women to be involved in "building the kingdom" not only by bearing children but through building the community by way of professional nursing, bookkeeping, printing, retail selling, operating telegraph offices, etc. (V. Evans 34). In doing so, they would "but answer the design of their creation" (V. Evans 34). In this time the role of mother, rather than being restricted to the home, was extended to the community at large, including economically benefitting the "kingdom." In a sense the whole kingdom was her home, a Kingdom of God on earth. Motherhood built that kingdom in many productive ways; motherhood, however, has been redefined since then.

Evans summarizes the time of change:

The most expansive definitions of Mormon women occurred in the nineteenth century, after which a rather gradual constriction took place over the next forty years. From World War II to 1980, however, the orthodox image was identified almost exclusively by domestic and ecclesiastical assignments. (37)

By the 1970s, the top leadership of the Church viewed the idea of mothers working outside the home as an unhappy necessity, allowed only to the most unfortunate of sisters. Wage earning was now considered an inherently male ability:

[President] Kimball...observed that God had created man to "till the ground"; and they "should be men indeed" and earn the living. N. Eldon Tanner claimed that woman’s domestic role was
complete in every way and obviated any move "outside the home"; while Ezra Taft Benson advised women to avoid commercial employment because, among other liabilities, it diminished their godly attributes. (V. Evans 36)

This dramatic change in attitude can at least partially be ascribed to a change in the Church's cultural situation. The Church lost its isolation as the West became more developed. The era of expansion drew to an end as more and more non-members moved into the area. The members of the church became exposed to outside ideas. Some of these ideas were rejected, and the church took a defensive posture towards the world, which included drawing women back into the safety of the home. Other ideas harmonized with church members' convictions and were adopted. Brigham Young's comments that women were naturally pious, submissive, and morally strong were perhaps influenced by the even earlier traditions that the Victorians hardened into rigid rules; these ideas helped establish a basis in the church for the Victorian model of the submissive, angelic wife. Despite Young's somewhat more expansive view of womanhood, after his death, church members followed English and American cultural trends. Wilcox explains:

The Victorian image, which reached Utah about the turn of the century, provided a detailed model for motherhood which was adopted practically wholesale by the Mormon culture and remained the primary image of motherhood during the next thirty or forty years. ("Mormon Motherhood" 211)

Major themes from the Victorian style of motherhood that especially resonated in Church teachings are "a strong emphasis on the power and influence of mothers and a
romantic idealization of mother’s self-sacrifice, love, and divine purity..." (211). These themes were particularly important to David O. McKay, who, in 1944, recapitulated what had been taught for almost half a decade, calling motherhood "the noblest office or calling in the world," "the greatest of all professions," and "the greatest potential influence for good or ill in human life" (quoted in Wilcox 212). Apostle Melvin J. Ballard echoed an earlier statement by David O. McKay when he said "Those who sacrifice most and serve best love most. That is why a mother’s love is the greatest love in the world" (212-213).

Wilcox points out that Ballard "saw suffering as the only source of a mother’s love," and further quoted Ballard as saying that "If her suffering and pain were not the price she pays—that marvelous thing, a mother’s love, would die" (213). The theological support for such a statement is weak. The roots of such sentiment lie clearly in Victorian thought, which celebrated woman’s "natural" submissiveness, delicacy, need for protection, and an immense capacity for self-sacrifice completely out of proportion for such a supposedly weak creature:

Mothers have been honored from time immemorial,...But the mother adored for her self-abnegation, her 'altruistic surrender,' even for her self-immolation, was a nineteenth century Victorian creation. (quoted in Wilcox 212)

It was during this time period, according to Wilcox, that "Sacrifice became motherhood’s supreme virtue" (212) in the church.
Fortunately for all LDS women, that particular image of motherhood has softened somewhat over the years. Wilcox explains that "the ecstasy of self-abnegation of the early twentieth century has been replaced by such qualities as those Marion D. Hanks of the Presidency of the First Quorum of the Seventy outlined in a 1978 Mother’s Day pamphlet":

they "make homes happy," are "resourceful," "courageous and fun"; they impart wisdom, teach valuable lessons, and (still) [sic] "have special capacity for sacrifice." (217)

Progress is being made in moderating other excessive Victorian views. Though women are still held up as the great influence for good in the lives of their husbands and children, they are not expected to be a "moral shelter" merely by the virtue of their femininity, or even to be the only influence for good in the home. One Relief Society lesson counsels women to pray sincerely so that they will be able to

let the weight of your innocence be felt as you lovingly motivate others to good works. With your mind so attuned to the Lord and his power, your influence for good becomes immeasurably great. And in this world of sin and temptation, the power of prayer will protect you and be a shield for your loved ones. (Church, Come 106)

This lesson teaches that innocence, good works, and protection all come from the Lord, not from a woman’s nature. Likewise, the woman is dependent on the Lord for protection, not wholly on her husband; indeed, she gains that protection through active personal attention to prayer and faith, not a passive dependence on others that fosters feminine helplessness.
Other Victorian images are harder to excise. One position that is particularly tenacious is the notion that "mother" and "woman" are actually the same term. Linda Wilcox postulates that this image took its deepest root in the 1950s when "Motherhood became the central factor in the identity ascribed the Mormon woman" (215). During this era, motherhood took on a connotation beyond bearing and raising children. The role expanded again, but not to include professional employment as it had in Brigham Young's day. Rather it expanded to include "any activity deemed suitable for a woman." Wilcox elucidates:

For example, a Deseret News Mother's Day editorial listed the multitudinous roles of mothers: the Cook, the Clothes Washer, Ironer, Interior Decorator, Do-It-Yourself Expert, and Gardener. What is missing from this list? Only the relationship of the mother with her child. There is in the entire editorial no mention of a child at all, no reference to a mother as a mother. Instead, the mother role here is identified totally with housework--work that could as well be done by a childless woman, a man, or even a child. (216)

Change is slow coming on this issue. Another example of the persistence of this idea is the book, Mormons & Women, written by three LDS women to help their sisters through the time of the women's movement. The book "explored" the subject of Mormon women and the ERA "with honesty and sensitivity" (back cover), yet this same book answered its own question "What Is a Mormon Woman?" with three chapters on the subject of how to deal with the frustrations of motherhood and homemaking.
Adjustments are being made in official discourse, however. Efforts have been made to address the needs and concerns of single and widowed sisters in the Relief Society lessons; for example Elder Russel M. Nelson’s November 1987 conference address "Lessons from Eve," quoted in the 1989 Relief Society manual, addresses "childless sisters and those without companions" (Church, Come 104). This same address discusses the meaning of "sacrifice," teaching that "We are still commanded to sacrifice, but not by shedding of blood of animals" (106). An implication is that we are not to sacrifice ourselves into cultural self-destruction but rather to follow God’s "laws of obedience and sacrifice." In obeying commandments such as tithing, the Word of Wisdom, and keeping the Sabbath day holy "our highest sense of sacrifice is achieved as we become more sacred or holy...like our Lord" (106). The commandments Nelson cites apply to both men and women equally and are not exclusive to a woman’s "role."

There is much hope to be found in recent encouragements to expand not the woman’s role, but the man’s. Quoted at length in another current Relief Society lesson is a talk of Elder Boyd K. Packer:

It was not meant that the woman alone accommodate herself to the priesthood duties of her husband or her sons. She is of course to sustain and support and encourage them....Holders of the priesthood, in turn, must accommodate themselves to the needs and responsibilities of the wife and mother. Her physical and emotional and intellectual and cultural well-being and her spiritual development must stand first among his priesthood duties....There is no task, however menial,
connected with the care of babies, the nurturing of children, or with the maintenance of the home that is not his equal obligation. (Church, Learn 99)

Packer’s teachings are an antidote to the old Victorian vision of authority which is, in many ways, a secular mockery of the priesthood of the LDS church. In Packer’s view, a man serves a woman just as much as a woman serves a man. This supports the scriptural teaching that "Neither is one without the other." Least there be any confusion, the lesson, "Sustaining the Priesthood," also clarifies the term priesthood for the sisters, using excerpts from a 1987 Ensign article. According to this article there are three points to remember regarding the term priesthood. The first, appropriately enough, is that women should not "casually refer to an entire group of men as ‘the priesthood’ as if the items men and priesthood mean the same thing" (Church, Learn 98). Women should not expect all men to have priesthood authority; neither should women believe that they are subject to the priesthood of all men the way that they are subject to the priesthood authority of their husband. Women are not subject to all men. Secondly, women are called to "sustain" all their "appointed priesthood leaders," including her husband who is priesthood leader of the family unit, by giving support and loyalty to those who hold office. Her husband must give the same support to the leaders called to preside over him. Thirdly, the term priesthood means "the power and authority of God; the source of all our spiritual and temporal blessings...every worthy
member of the Church has access to the blessings of the priesthood" (98).

Even as Church authorities try to build a more sound understanding of the relationship of men and women, other church members habitually rely on older, more restrictive concepts of the role of women, concepts that are too often perpetuated through cultural activities such as theatre. Saturday's Warrior seems to take seriously the folk-religion concept that

Women are doormats and have been
The years those mats applaud,—
They keep their men from going in
With muddy feet to God.

This little "poem," quoted by Rodney Turner in a 1966 talk entitled "Women and the Priesthood," which he delivered at a Six-Stake Fireside at Brigham Young University, sums up the misconception that women exist only for the convenience of and use of men. According to this idea, women are to be simultaneously subordinate to men (passive "doormat") and responsible for men's behavior as the Mother (active nurturer) to both the man and his children. "Speaking directly to the women in his audience" ("Rodney" 10), Turner continued:

I am afraid that it is only too true. A man needs that kind of support so that he can go back home without muddy feet. A helpmeet to God, fulfilling the procreative power that you have; a sustainer of your husband; a homemaker; a rearer of children; a husband prodder....(Turner 12)

There is an implication in this speech that women are either too good to need such help, already having an angelic
relationship to God, or that they do not go to God at all. There is no mention of a Mother for the Mother. Such a view of women is the direct descendent of the Victorian outlook which saw women as either perfect conformers to men's needs or as unholy independent monsters.

This particular talk was offered more than a decade before the woman's movement reached its peak, focusing attention on women's issues. Despite attempts of the church to modify such attitudes, the Victorian ideas persist. As late as 1982 Turner, still a Professor of Religion at BiU, delivered a lecture entitled "Eve's Daughters and the Second Temptation" wherein he implied that women should not become educated. After stating that the "radical feminist movement is using a line-upon-line program to deceive women" into eliminating motherhood, the speaker asserted that "Getting an education may be...used to support career advocacy" (Blake 2). In justifying the fact that many women do attend college, Turner said that "The purpose of education is to make better wives and mothers" (2), suggesting that women should avoid "training for status professions," such as law or medicine, that might tempt them to delay marriage. Again there is the connotation that a woman exists only in relationship to men or children. Turner does not even admit to the possibility that a woman might need to support herself except in cases of "emergency," stating that "women should give no excuse for their husband not to support
them." In this lecture, even "working out of need" is part of the radical feminist design.

Teachings such as this persist, in part, through repetition in books and in the cultural arts. The Victorian ideas Turner and others espouse are repeated in both Saturday's Warrior and Reunion, the first supporting them and the second showing some of their consequences. LDS doctrine does not agree with Victorian ideas of women but rather shows women as coequal with men and inheritors of the highest degree of eternal potential. The images of women presented in these two plays are based on Victorian concepts, not on LDS doctrine. These images have, however been adopted in large part as a standard of LDS culture, as demonstrated by the two plays Saturday's Warrior and Reunion.
Feminist Literary Criticism--Stalking the Angel/Monster

Saturday's Warrior and Reunion, written in more modern times, nevertheless bear traces of repressive Victorian attitudes toward women and their role in life. Using the lens of feminist literary criticism, it is possible to identify and classify these traces, and also possible to identify some of the unhappy consequences of adhering to Victorian axioms. When the style of critical analysis demonstrated by Gilbert and Gubar is applied to these two plays, evidences of the Victorian influence upon them are clearly revealed.

Sandra M. Gilbert, a professor of English at Princeton University, and Susan Gubar, a professor of English at Indiana University at Bloomington, are widely recognized as leaders in feminist literary criticism. In addition to their individual books and articles, they have co-authored or co-edited a number of books on the subject of feminist scholarship, including The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women, The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination, the two volume No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century, Shakespeare's Sisters: Feminist Essays on Women Poets, and The Female Imagination and the Modernist Aesthetic (the first volume in the series Studies in Gender and Culture). According to Wendy Martin, author of the
preface to the series *Studies in Gender and Culture*, for the last two decades "gender studies has been one of the most intellectually challenging areas of investigation in contemporary intellectual life" (vii). As scholars of literary gender studies, Gilbert and Gubar attempt to place "female literary tradition in the larger literary context and the interconnection of social and sexual identity with historic and economic events" (Martin vii).

Since the late 1970s, Gilbert and Gubar have been particularly well known for their efforts in analyzing the work of female authors. Their work has focused on the definition of a distinctly female literary tradition that used the traditional literary constructs of the male-dominated society in which these writers existed, but which tended to emphasize "images of escape and enclosure ...physical discomfort...and obsessive depictions of disease" (Gilbert, *Madwoman*, xi). Gilbert and Gubar base their work on an extensive knowledge of literary history and tradition as a whole, including the conventional, restrictive view of women perpetuated by the texts. Gilbert and Gubar explain their approach:

That literary texts are coercive (or at least compelling and persuasive) has been one of our major observations, for just as women have been repeatedly defined by male authors, they seem in reaction to have found it necessary to act out male metaphors in their own texts, as if trying to understand their implications. Our literary methodology has therefore been based on the Bloomian premise that literary history consists of strong action and inevitable reaction. Moreover, like such phenomenological critics as Gaston Bachelard, Simone de Beauvoir, and J. Hillis
Miller, we have sought to describe both the experience that generates metaphor and the metaphor that creates experience. (Madwoman xii-xiii)

Gilbert and Gubar clearly demonstrate the male-generated metaphors that define women as angels or monsters, according to their relation to men. Throughout literary history these metaphors have been used to portray and to influence women, encouraging women to angelically subordinate themselves to the endorsed pattern, or warning them that if they did not do so, then they would be shunned as monsters. In turn, the men and women reading these textual admonitions were persuaded by the views, and tended to adopt the patterns presented. As a rule these literary patterns were then overtly accepted and perpetuated by authors of both genders. These same metaphors continue to be used in literature to this day, manifesting themselves in the works of the heirs of the literary traditions. These works of these heirs include Saturday's Warrior and Reunion.

In their well documented work A Mad Woman in the Attic, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar illuminate in impressive historical detail the antecedents of the long tradition of Angel/Monster figures in Western literature which seem to haunt the LDS outlook. They begin by documenting the ingrained belief of the Medieval, Romantic, and Victorian eras in the actual "sonship" of the written text. According to that belief, an author literally fathered, with his female muse, a posterity of "brain children"—his characters. The power to create was thus exclusively male,
and women attempting to write were considered presumptuous, freakish, unnatural, and subject to various health problems (6-8). In consequence of this social outlook, the female images that we inherit from the literary traditions of these eras were created by men. Social pressure prevented women, particularly Victorian women, from writing, effectively preventing them from creating their own images of themselves. Those women brave enough to write were for the most part shamed into publishing pseudonymously. They, and women authors who published under their own names, repeated the male styles and forms of writing, and thus reinforced the male stereotype of subordinate female characters. Lynne Agress, author of *The Feminine Irony*, concurs with this conclusion:

> Although women writers were often discriminated against by male readers and critics, the women, with few exceptions, did little or nothing to challenge this discrimination. Ironically, they reinforced the passive, inferior, feminine stereotype in their writings as well as in their public statements. (16)

Most women of the day merely opted for the "silent" writing of diaries and letters and did not publish alternative feminine models (64).

With both male and female writers advising women to adhere to certain standards of behavior, the roles ascribed by authors became prescriptions for general comportment, particularly among members of the middle and upper classes. Books of conduct such as Thomas Gisborne’s *An Inquiry into the Duties of the Female Sex* became guides for living. This
particular text, first issued in 1796, proved so popular that it was reissued seven times in ten years. In it Gisborne defined the role of the woman:

First, [she must] contribute daily and hourly to the comfort of husband, of parents, of brothers and sisters, and of other relations, connections, and friends, in the intercourse of domestic life, under every vicissitude of sickness and health, of joy and affliction.

Secondly, [she must] form and improve the general manners, disposition, and conduct of the other sex, by society and example.

Thirdly, [she must] model the human mind during the stages of its growth and fix..., while it is still ductile, its growing principles of action. (quoted in Agress 34)

Thus, women were considered responsible for the health of the extended family, the conduct of the men, and the minds and morals of the children. She was to perform these duties within the nuclear household, and not concern herself with wider affairs of politics, law, art, etc.

By the mid nineteenth century, these rules of conduct had hardened into rigid role expectations. Steven Mintz explain in A Prison of Expectations that a woman was expected to maintain a "walled garden" (10) of a home, a place where her husband could find refuge and be purified from his encounters with the harsh realities of his ruthless business world, and a place where the innocence of her children could be protected. "Scholars have demonstrated that the Victorian idealization of the middle-class home...[was that it be]...essentially a private place, a shelter against the turbulent seas of social change..." (Mintz 13-14). A wife was thought able to maintain this
refuge because of her special virtues of femininity—"Women, by their very natures, were intended to purify the sphere of family and home" (Boswell 33).

The special feminine traits attributed to women and extolled in literature included a capacity for cheerful self-sacrifice, docility, sentiment, delicacy of thought, goodness, unselfishness, joy in serving others, and tact, all springing from a woman's instinctive moral superiority (Boswell 21). Part of the feminine moral superiority was the self-sacrifice of her own sexuality—"indeed, the idolized wife of the period was portrayed as asexual, void of desire herself and loved for her virtue, not her flesh" (Boswell 23). Her only passions were to be love of children and home and domestic duties.

In order for a woman to preserve this "moral superiority," she had to be kept in her place. In his book Victorian People and Ideas, Richard Altick concludes:

Putting aside woman's lack of sexual passion, which...was universally accepted as a biological fact because to assume otherwise was indecent, there was the wider implication that woman was inferior to man in all ways except the unique one that counted most (to man): her femininity. Her place was in the home, on a veritable pedestal it one could be afforded, and emphatically not in the world of affairs. (54)

Wives, in fact, were "protected" by law from the manly affairs of economics and politics, spheres thought too harsh for women:

The practice of not allowing women to maintain any individual right to chattel, real estate, inheritances, annuities, etc., after their
marriage was directly related to their perceived unique and angelic natures. (Boswell 33)

"Angelic" was indeed the term of the day, as reflected and reinforced by Coventry Patmore's immensely successful poem "Angel in the House." Published in 1854, this poem "describes the bliss that comes from marrying the pure, self-sacrificing Victorian maiden...and describes the bride-to-be in 'other worldly' terms":

A rapture of submission lifts
Her life into celestial rest...
And round her happy footsteps blow
The authentic airs of Paradise. (Boswell 22)

Patmore was by no means alone in comparing the Victorian wife and mother with angels. Poems, books, and plays of the day used the term and description freely, depicting heroines that "codified the womanly ideal...[as they] conform to the idealized stereotype of self-effacing, self-sacrificing 'helpmeets'" (Boswell 22). And, in opposition to these heroines, were "wicked-step mothers," or other monster women—the independent and unfeminine characters who suggest, as Thackeray implied in Vanity Fair, that "every angel in the house—'proper, agreeable, and decorous,' 'coaxing and cajoling' hapless men—is really, perhaps a monster, 'diabolically hideous and slimy.'" (Gilbert and Gubar 29)

The women in these literary works are portrayed as perfect, or wicked, or, strangely enough, a combination of the two, but never as human. In The Madwoman in the Attic, Gilbert and Gubar explore the contradictory images of women
that were common to the literature of the period, focusing on the reflections and representations of angels and monsters.

The types of male-created female characters most prevalent in the literature of Victorian times were the seemingly extreme opposites that Gilbert and Gubar illustrate symbolically through the story of silent Snow White and the mad, self-destructive Queen, both seeking in their own way to please the King, locked in the strife of the Queen’s quest to be the most beautiful woman reflected in the magic, patriarchal mirror (36-44).

Snow White is representative of the eternal, unchanging woman, never aging, always beautiful, brought to life only at and for the desire of her Prince. Snow White began life as the darling of her Father, but when her domestic Queen mother died and was replaced by the seductive Mad Queen, her own life was threatened. She trustingly went to the woods with the Huntsman, who, charmed by her angelic innocence, spared her. She then preserved her life by domesticity, serving her group of dwarves (or imperfect men). Succumbing to the disguised Queen’s temptations to don the feminine comb and to bite the two-sided poisoned apple of desire, she is punished or “killed.” But her innocence again triumphs: she exists in living death displayed in her glass coffin, forever abiding the whim of her Prince. The message is clear—female survival depends on naivete, beauty, domestic arts, and silent obedience to the man.
Extending the story line still further, the Prince must inevitably come one day and release Snow White from the coffin. He then takes her off to his kingdom and marries her. She, then, is expected to take the position of the original domestic Queen, running the castle and raising the children. Therein lies a danger for the Prince. His angel, like all Victorian "angels in the house," is expected not only to have power to run the house but the power to use her suppressed sexuality to give birth, which denotes power over the next Prince. As Gilbert and Gubar explain, the angel of life is also an angel of death—she may deny life or give death. The angel may be a much repressed demon who wants out of the coffin (25-28). Thus, submissive Snow White's alter ego is the aggressive, assertive, fiendish Mad Queen who embodies male fear of the inconsistency of women, of the sexual power that women hold over men (both the power of attraction and reproduction), of the male inability to completely suppress the creative and independent impulses of women:

Because, as Dorothy Dinnerstein has proposed, male anxieties about female autonomy probably go as deep as everyone's mother-dominated infancy, patriarchal texts have traditionally suggested that every angelically selfless Snow White must be hunted, if not haunted, by a wickedly assertive Stepmother; for every glowing portrait of submissive women enshrined in domesticity, there exists an equally important negative image that embodies the sacrilegious fiendishness of what William Blake called the "Female Will." (Gilbert and Gubar 28)

As many men unconsciously both love and fear women, the fictional characters they "father" are often an ambiguous
combination of the two extremes of angel and monster, such as Goddess Mother, Angel Mother, Castrating Mother, Fallen Angel, etc. The masks fastened over genuine female features are myriad; the roles assigned, as anthropologist Sherry Ortner explains, "can appear from certain points of view to stand both under and over (but really simply outside of) the sphere of culture's hegemony" (quoted in Gilbert and Gubar 19). In the texts, women can be angels or monsters, or somehow simultaneously both, but are not allowed to function as humans in society.

The perfect angel woman figures, as depicted by male authors of the Victorian times, indeed were models of selflessness and purity of heart, displaying all the virtues espoused by the early conduct books. A list of these virtues sounds familiar: "modesty, gracefulness, purity, complacency, reticence, chastity, affability, politeness", all contributing to angelic innocence, making her pleasing to her protecting male (Gilbert 23). The Otherness of the feminine is made safely subject to the rules of the masculine. Her story is no story at all, as she exists only in the context of male approval:

At times, however, in the severity of her selflessness, as well as in the extremity of her alienation from ordinary fleshly life, this nineteenth-century angel-woman becomes not just a memento of otherness but actually...an angel of death. (24)

Even in the perfection of these women there is a lurking threat, that of indecency, disease and death.
A survey of the literature of the period will reveal examples of this death angel. Even period advertisements, like today's pictures in fashion magazines, illustrate the ideal of Victorian beauty—slim, delicate, tiny waisted, white skinned. In the literature is a fascination with the natural consequences of the attempt to achieve such a look—female passivity, weakness, illness.

In more modern times, a survey of the play *Saturday's Warrior* reveals several death angels: the Matron, Mrs. Flinders, and especially the spiritual Pam, who passively wastes away from some unidentifiable illness. Like the dead yet alive Snow White in her coffin, these women all "in some curious way simultaneously [inhabit] both this world and the next" (Gilbert and Gubar 24).

*Warrior* also portrays a woman who "in some curious way simultaneously" manages to be angel and monster. Julie Flinders sways between angelic passivity and monstrous independence—changing as circumstances vary in her attempts to be an angel. Confusing as her situation sounds, it is not without extensive literary representation. Shakespeare neatly summons up the picture of the Angel/Monster woman:

But to the girdle do the Gods inherit,/ Beneath is all the fiends (King Lear IV.vi)

Like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the opposite aspects reside in every woman, an angelic facade over the lurking corruption. Men have used these literary images to face and conquer their own fears about themselves:
In all these incarnations—from [Spenser’s] Error to Dullness, from [Shakespeare’s] Goneril and Regan to [Swift’s] Chloe and Caelia—the female monster is a striking illustration of Simone de Beauvoir’s thesis that woman has been made to represent all of man’s ambivalent feelings about his own inability to control his own physical existence, his own birth and death. As the other, woman comes to represent the contingency of life, life that is made to be destroyed. (Gilbert and Gubar 34)

In other words, though a model angelic woman is supposed to help man overcome his own impurities through the example of her innate purity, she actually betrays man by existing in her own innate carnality, a physical reality so like the carnality of man. In a sort of circular logic, then, man must control the woman so as to control himself. The monster must be forced to behave as an angel for the good of mankind—and women, no matter how angelic, are not to be trusted.

Julie, and her sisters Chris and Mildred in Reunion, deal with the consequences of these male fears in trying to fit themselves into the authoritative roles prescribed by their culture. These women vacillate between the extremes of angel and monster, and are never quite allowed to be human.
CAST OF CHARACTERS *Saturday’s Warrior*

MR. FLINDERS - a father
MRS. FLINDERS - his wife

JIMMY, 19
PAM, 19
JULIE, 18
BENJY, 16 - their children
ALICE, 13
ERNIE, 11
SHELLY, 9
EMILY, 7

TOD - a seeker of truth

WALLY KESTLER, 19 - a fiery gungho missionary
HAROLD GREENE, 19 - his timid companion

MATRON, 40ish - a kindly pre-existence worker

MACK, 19 - a free thinker

FIRST BOY
SECOND BOY - his friends
FIRST GIRL
SECOND GIRL

THREE GIRLFRIENDS
THREE MISSIONARIES
PETER (Julie’s boyfriend)
BUSINESS MAN
HOUSEWIFE
HIPPIES
OLD TIMER
KID (seven-year-old)
MISCELLANEOUS PEOPLE IN PARK
ASTROLOGIST
GURU
PROSTITUTE
WORLDLY TEMPTERS

TELEVISION ANNOUNCER - to be recorded
FEMALE ANNOUNCER -to be recorded

CHORUS
Saturday's Warrior: Women and Warriors

Saturday's Warrior, first produced in Provo, Utah, in 1974, clearly reflects the Wasatch-Front Mormon Utah community in which it was created. Doug Stewart, immersed in the combined Western American and religiously oriented culture of the area, presents an image of that culture as a positive, Heaven-approved refuge from the harsher influences of the world, a place where a man can be "free." However, a closer look at the image, using the lens of feminist criticism, reveals the repressive Victorian underpinnings of the folk culture of the area as well as Stewart's attitude toward women. Specifically, the play portrays all its female characters as trapped in the Victorian roles of angel and monster.

Warrior is the logical climax to the Mormon homegrown style of cultural activities. This full scale, episodic musical deals with the battle of good (family values) against evil (birth control) in a manner reminiscent of the early Saints' "Us against Them" survival attitude. Its plot is a string of emotion-invoking scenes, featuring events dear to the LDS heart: smiling brothers and sisters pledging eternal unity; romantic lovers promising eternal fidelity; the wisdom of a dying girl; the joy of birth; the sorrow of parents soul-searching after the defection of a son; the subsequent redemption of the prodigal. The play is lightened by TV sit-com-style humor and set to Lex
deAzavedo's lush soft-rock music, backed up by a large pit chorus. Staged in full auditoriums throughout the West with all the trappings of a New York production, it was, in Clifton Jolley's words, "probably the most professional Road Show you're likely to see" (19).

The influence of *Saturday's Warrior*, however, went far beyond the small local road show productions that were its literary roots. It has been termed a "watershed" play for its triumph in being the first commercially successful play script that based its sales on an almost wholly LDS audience. It coaxed "hundreds of thousands of people into theaters in Utah Valley, Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. Most of them had never been to a live [commercial] play before," and their attendance proved that "there is a paying audience for strictly Mormon entertainment" (Bliss and Gump 58). Other shows, both Church sponsored, such as *Threads of Glory*, and independent, such as *The Order is Love*, were successful on the touring production circuit in part by following *Warrior*'s footsteps.

Nonetheless, the show was not without its critics. Clifton Jolley felt that it "expected our devotion and sentiment to fill in for its lack of artistry" (19), and complained that

The makers of *Warrior* have too gladly indulged and not at all challenged the "popular mind," much less the educated or questing soul. In so doing, their inclination to emotional and intellectual generalizations, to sentimentality, is enormous. (19)
Alan Keele protested roundly that the play trivialized divine truth in such a manner that the truth would be rejected by those who were sincerely seeking it, claiming that "the production of such works may in fact constitute aesthetic sin and perhaps even blasphemy" (44). Those who commented unfavorably were themselves criticized for disparaging a play that dealt with Mormon beliefs. Jolley had an answer for "those who feel I am being too critical of an honest effort:

The problem with Warrior is that the art is not equal to the "statement,"...[though] the makers, I think, are sincere. But truth and sincerity do not necessarily give birth to beauty any more than beauty insists on sincerity and truth as parents....The matter of art, as it relates to the gospel of Jesus Christ,...whether popular or legitimate in discipline, is a serious subject and needs to be seriously considered. (19)

The form and message of Warrior necessitated serious review, if for no other reason than that the message of the play was taken quite seriously. The folk culture the play extolled was often mistaken for gospel truth, as evidenced by the popularity of Warrior firesides and the many times the play was quoted over the pulpit.

Warrior is patently full of LDS folk theory, as distinguished from LDS theology. The play never mentions the word "Mormon" at all. Its tie to LDS canon is described as "preachment," didactic moral messages that are only "peripherally correct" (Jolley 19). These theatrical lessons are based in part on what Orson Scott Card describes as the "rather shaky folk doctrine that premortal spirits
choose to come to earth as families, and birth control thwarts premortal covenants" (Bliss 58). Though the script contains recognizably LDS elements such as a pre-mortal life waiting area, and young missionaries in church service for two years, even the play program itself printed a disclaimer:

*Saturday's Warrior* romanticizes the Mormon belief in a preexistence, the promises that are made there, and the resulting mixups that occur in earth life. It should be understood that the play's representation of premortal life reflects the feelings of the author combined with artistic license, and should not be interpreted as Church doctrine. (Lundstrom 10)

Yet both the standard grapevines and the *Church News* reported the revitalized faith of church members and the conversions of their guests. Typical is the report of one stake president that the local production had prompted eight baptisms and had given some cast members "a whole new perspective on what their membership in the Church means..." (Musical 10).

Another newspaper article carried the testimonial of one young woman who gave up a school tour in order to participate in a stake-sponsored Illinois production in the role of Julie: "I'm so glad I didn't go to California. This has been the sweetest spiritual experience of my life" (Musical 10).

This "Julie" and others who uncritically accept *Warrior's* folk culture stereotypes as authentic LDS gospel run the risk of subjecting themselves to the slanted versions of truth that are unintentionally preached in this...
play. One of the most serious corruptions of doctrine presented in the play is represented by the very role of Julie. Instead of portraying women as real people as well as equal partners with men, the stage show depicts stereotyped roles of female subordination.

The characters in *Saturday's Warrior*, male and female, all seem to be exaggerated cliches, due, in part, to the shallow nature of the play's humor, and even more to the writing style which gave more time to evolving the episodic plot than developing characterization. The scripts of musicals are usually thinner than dramas in characterization; actors have the responsibility of fleshing out their roles in performance of the songs. It is, however, possible to analyze a musical to discover the intent of the author. In *Saturday's Warrior*, the author settled for stereotypes of both people and situations that plainly show the influence of the earlier Victorian culture. While the male characters are depicted as leading lives of action, the female characters have passive lives. The men are shown questing, proselyting, sinning and repenting, and "sailing on" (26), "free" (87). The women in the play are put in the orbital positions of Snow White and Mad Queen, revolving as various manifestations of angels (Turner's "Helpmeet to God") and monsters (Turner's "Prodder" in its fiercest expression) around the active sphere of men.

The plot of the play focuses on the actions of male protagonist Jimmy Flinders, a leader of his siblings in the
premortal world, who in mortality forgets his prior promises and rejects what he feels to be the confinement of his family and its beliefs. Eventually, after the death of his twin sister Pam, Jimmy returns to his family and fulfills his promises, uniting his family by helping his final sister come to Earth. Subplots of the play include the exertions of two rather silly missionaries, one of whom is engaged to Jimmy's sister Julie, and the internal struggles of Tod, an artist searching for meaning in his life, who is converted by the missionaries and marries Julie as he promised he would in the pre-mortal world. As is the norm with most Mormon theatre, the plot resolves neatly and happily, with bright hope for the future.

But is it really that happy an ending? Mormon audiences enjoy the affirmation of traditional family values which occurs at the close of the play. Another look, however, reveals that the traditional family so affirmed is created in a Victorian, not a gospel, pattern, to the detriment of the female members.

The play opens with a "Female Soloist" singing the title song, "Saturday's Warrior" (11-12), a song about glorious children reserved to be born in the "last days of the world." These children are seen as coming down from the premortal world of light to learn their life's purpose—which is to march forth as strong, mighty warriors in sun-bright armor to win the battle for the hearts of men. To be more accurate, the soloist sings alone only during the first
four line verse dealing with the children "coming down like gentle rain," a verse that she repeats alone at the end of song. For the next partial verse, describing how the young ones grow like trees, she is joined by the higher voices in the chorus. Once the strength and battle images are mentioned in the song, the deeper voices join in. Delicately, from the very start, a point is made—women may bear and rear children and even sing praises to the Warriors, but only men are to fight the battles. Though the point may seem extremely subtle at the start, it is made repeatedly throughout the play. This interpretation is verified most strikingly in Reprise #1 of "Paper Dream" (58), which Julie and Tod sing together. The words of this reprise describe the people they would "like to be" (printed just as it appears in the script):

JULIE          TOD
A girl with courage  A man with courage
in her brow,
in his brow,
Who's licked her doubts  Who's licked his doubts
And fears somehow...  And fears somehow,
(she stops)           A warrior of great nobility!

Tod is destined to be a warrior, Julie is not. Even though the battle is purely spiritual, there is no female equivalent for Julie to pattern herself after. All she can do is trail hesitantly off into silence.
In addition to containing a message portraying men as stronger than women, the first verse of "Saturday's Warrior" exposes some traces of males' dislike of the birth process over which they have no control. The description of "children coming down, coming down" (11) from heaven is a description of birth. The premortal world is therefore a place where women have power; indeed, in this portrayal it has a Matron for a director. It is a waiting place where a man is trapped until, through the woman's ability to create a mortal body for waiting spirits, he can progress on his journey in mortality. Thus, he is damned until his angel mother releases him.

In the opening scene Tod and Julie, the romantic leads, are preparing for Tod's imminent departure to mortality. Tod Richards is all man (note that he even has two masculine names) and anxious to get on with life, while Julie is all "frustration" (13). The scene is humorous, the humor focusing on the contrast between Tod's awe and excitement in the opportunities before him, and Julie's fears that Tod will forget her. Tod's first words are a complaint about all the waiting he has to endure while his mother is giving birth to his body--protesting the power his mother has in obstructing his ability for immediate action. He attempts to speed things along by demanding that someone (calling off stage) tell him what is delaying his progress. Obviously it is important to him to get out of this premortal womb place where women hold the key to the door.
"Suspicious" Julie, on the other hand, "her frustration mounting," is not so excited about Tod's departure. Even in her angelic premortal state she shows signs of becoming a jealous monster, breaking into tears and accusing Tod of lust—"All you can think about is getting down to those physical bodies!" (13)—and disloyalty—"Well then, go on then. Have your wild fling on earth! Just so long as you're happy!" (14). The crux of Julie's anger is that she doubts the dependability of heavenly vows in a fleshly world: "What good are promises in a world where all will be forgotten?"

Her question is a good one, yet Tod gives her a "melodramatic" answer:

I'll find you. And as for not recognizing each other...why that's like saying...(building with melodrama)...that suns and moons and stars will never recognize their glory...that truth and beauty and virtue will never recognize their own....(14)

Tod doesn't see the problem. Julie, on the other hand, is certain that Tod will be born handsome, therefore attractive to many women; she is afraid to the point of tears that she will be born "plain" (14). Even here in the incorporeal world Julie recognizes the need to be an art-object/angel to hold her man. Tod has loved her "forever" as she was, eternal and unchanging in pre-mortality, but she feels that he may not love her as she becomes less than perfect and decays in mortality. Life itself will force inconsistency upon her. Gilbert and Gubar explain:
The "killing" of oneself into an art object—the pruning and preening, the mirror madness, and concern with odors and aging, with hair which is invariably too curly or too lank, with bodies too thin or too thick—all this testifies to the efforts women have expended not just trying to be angels but trying not to become monsters. (34)

Julie can do nothing about her future body but struggle with her fears and try not to behave like a monster. Secure Tod, after admitting that it might be hard to recognize each other in the world, nevertheless tries to comfort her with "If you were the ugliest girl in the world, I'd still love you." His comfort is cold, focusing on his superior capacity to love despite her possibly unattractive appearance.

Tod and Julie now break into an indistinctly poetic love song that claims that as certainly as the sun rises and sets, and in all warm and tender things breathed by lips, their love will continue forever and ever (16). During the song Julie, in answer to Tod's promise to (actively) search the world over for her, promises to (passively) wait for him. "Forever."

Our first view of mortal Julie is in another farewell scene (29). This time she is at the airport to see her fiance', the new Elder Wally Kestler, off on his mission. Again she is depicted as silly and overly emotional—her first words are "Oh Wally...I think I'm going to cry." When Kestler chides her, she "breaks down" and "sinks to the floor, sobbing" saying "But...how can I go on living without you?" As Wally pulls her up off the floor he demands "Is
this the girl who swore to unconquerable fortitude and pioneer zeal?"

This scene is exaggerated for comic effect, of course; we laugh at the ridiculous, weeping female and the over-eager, missionary. But beneath the comedy in the rest of the scene is a more serious message, a message that will be overtly stated several times during the play: no matter how innocent they seem, women are not to be trusted.

Kestler, reversing Julie and Tod's farewell scene, tries to remind Julie of her promises by quoting from a document that he has made Julie sign:

Whatever hardships I am called to endure...what ever pain I am called to suffer...yet I will be a woman of courage and true strength...until that glorious day when Elder Kestler returns in triumph! (29)

Kestler is in a bind. He recognizes at some level the paradox that if he wants to keep inconstant Julie angelically waiting for him, she must become a woman of strength, a whole being rather than the delicate angel girlfriend that he enjoys. An angel cannot endure the absence of the man within whose relationship she exists. As the impulsive monster within Julie is too strong to allow this angel to safely wait in living death, she will of necessity find another man to relate to. In order to keep Julie from becoming the possession of a new man Wally, has to allow her be a true mortal woman for two years--but he has put in an escape clause at the end of the contract. She
need only be strong until he returns to take over the strong role again himself.

But Kestler really can't have it both ways. He confides a few lines later, "And all I ask in return for being the world's greatest missionary is to know that my girl will be waiting for me when I return in glory" (30). Kestler wants an angel girl as a reward, not a woman. Even though Julie had sworn an oath to "unconquerable fortitude" six weeks previously, she obviously, by her weak behavior in throwing herself at his feet, had not been asked to be strong as a person but strong in adoring. How can she possibly remain strong for, as Julie moans, "two years!" Kestler tries to overcome the paradox by having Julie swear yet another oath of fidelity, this time on her honor, asking if she will wait for him.

"Will I wait for you?" Julie coyly repeats, echoed by a chorus of suddenly appearing girlfriends singing to their miss onaries.

Julie proceeds to prod Kestler as a Mother, "...you ought to be ashamed of yourself" (31). She complains that she has sacrificed the best years of her life for him, "and now you're questioning my integrity?" What more could she have done to prove her fidelity? She and the other girlfriends evade making more promises by performing a "campy" (stage directions 30) song and dance on the theme of waiting. "Will I Wait For You" (30), expresses Julie's quandary. She would like to wait, but knows her inability
to do so. She would like to tell him, but is not so much of
a monster to hurt him by baldly admitting such disloyalty.

The song is filled with allusions to Julie's
angel/monster dilemma, listing different types of waiting.
There are pictures of female waiting: Mother waiting for
bread to rise or a chicken waiting for an egg to hatch.
There are domestic, powerless images: a burger waits for an
order of fries to complete it; a helpless baby waits for a
diaper change. There are active, malevolent, male images:
"Like the big bad wolf for Red Riding Hood" and "Like
Captain Hook did for Peter Pan." In this oblique way Julie
describes her three choices: angel/mother passively waiting;
waiting as an incomplete part, lacking fulfillment or power;
and waiting as a masculinized monster, lurking in the hopes
of destroying the fairy tale boy hero or innocent girl—she
has a choice of the three roles of the Snow White story:
Snow White, Queen, and Mad Queen. One line, "Like a cowboy
waits to be home on the range" is male but not monstrous,
thrown in to rhyme with "diaper change"; yet it is still
oddly passive—what keeps the cowboy from going to the
range?

The balance of the lines are riddle clues—the
"morning" does not wait "for the sun to rise"; either the
morning is defined by the sun, not existing otherwise, or it
is defined by the clock. Two a.m. is morning even without
the sun; morning is inevitable. Likewise, birthdays do not
wait for big surprises; birthdays are another function of
relentless time and will occur, surprise or not. Alice did not wait for Wonderland, she fell into it just as Julie will fall into love with someone else. Julie's answer to Wally is as clear as she can make it. She can not perform angelic, immortal waiting in a mortal world, as she is no longer a strictly spiritual premortal woman. She has been surrounded by monstrous, corrupt fleshiness, and so must find another man if the first leaves her. Though she vehemently declares her loyalty in victim terms--"If they should torture me with ants and leave me to dry in the sun, I will still be true"--Kestler's reassurance is as much a fantasy as Wonderland or Peter Pan. Julie is powerless before time and her male-determined role of Angel/Monster.

Julie's relationship to Wally begins its transformation from angel to monster almost immediately after Wally's departure. The scene begins with Julie "primping before an imaginary mirror" (49) under the watchful eyes of all her younger siblings and one stuffed monkey. As Julie puts on her makeup (assuming a false outward appearance while trying to be angelically beautiful for Peter) brothers Benjy and Ernie tease her, pointing out her inconsistency in going out on a "hot" date just two weeks after parting with Wally. Julie rationalizes that "Peter is just a friend. My love for Wally is eternal." Before anyone can argue with the logic of that statement, she asks the boys to leave so that she can finish her preparations which, as Shelly taunts, "are for girls only." Only initiates sympathetic to female
deception are allowed to stay to complete the mysterious rites. As Benjy, the ever perceptive young male, exits the room, he passes along the lesson: "Ernie, I know you are a little young, but let me give you some advice. Never...never trust a girl!" (50). It seems that one is never really too young to learn that behind the angelic pretense, females are really monsters.

Even romantically minded Alice seems to have some doubts about the appropriateness of Julie’s actions, but, as a young student already partially trained in female wiles, is capable of understanding her older sister’s behavior. When the girls are left alone she remarks:

\[
\text{Boys are so insensitive, aren’t they Julie? The hand of a lonely person reaches out to you for understanding and they expect you to turn him away. (50)}
\]

In the apprentice angel’s opinion Julie is not behaving monstrously by being unfaithful to Wally, but comporting herself with angelic charity toward another needy soul. Younger Shelly, not quite initiated into womanly values, doubtfully asks: "Wally would understand, wouldn’t he?"

Faced with the straightforward question from her sister, Julie is forced to admit: "Well, I did pledge my heart to him, didn’t I?" (50). She continues with a rebellious "But that doesn’t mean I have to put myself in cold storage for two years." Julie’s monster half is coming to ascendancy. Not only does she refuse the glass coffin, but, as she coyly divulges in "He’s Just a Friend" (50-51),
she wishes to satisfy her own needs for comfort. "After all..." (50):

Friends are like eggs and roses, you know,
They come in dozens, too.
And when the boy you love is gone,
A friend can comfort you.

The song, however, is not a positive declaration of her own independence. Rather, it is a song of duplicity, set in terms of protecting herself from the harshness of life and the "bitter winds of sorrow." (50):

He's just a friend
Like those I count in dozens,
A kind unselfish boy
Who understands my pain.
He's just a friend to fend
The bitter wind of sorrow,
And after all, a girl can always use a friend.

(50)
The delicate angel is a vampire in disguise, calmly able to "use a friend" for her own benefit.

The song becomes a mild parody of the "girl in every port" male philandering—Julie is not only happily going out behind her missionary's back, but she is diabolically cheerful about the possibility of "dozens" of friends. This Snow White seems determined to eat the whole of both sides of the Queen's apple.

As "underscoring continues," indicating the passage of time, "the lights come up on Wally Kestler on opposite side of stage" (s.d. 51). The device of letters sent back and
forth between Wally and Julie succinctly illustrates Julie's metamorphosis from angel to monster (as she simultaneously becomes Peter's angel). Wally writes the first letter, telling Julie that he has not yet been successful in baptizing anyone, hinting that the problem is with his senior companion. He then asks "Do you still love me?"

Julie, though she has been dating Peter for weeks now, replies "I love you so very, very much and will for eternity." She is working hard to appear to be the eternal angel Wally wants her to be. Her next line is a clue Wally also wants her to be a prodder. "Work harder." Apparently she is successful in being a powerful prodder, as Wally's next letter begins "You are my inspiration." He has worked so absurdly hard that he has had to hospitalize his companion, though he still has not had any baptisms. Julie has been just as unsuccessful in convincing him of her loyal angelhood, for he asks again "Do you still love me?" Julie, who does not feel the need to remain waiting as the prize for an unsuccessful warrior, simply replies "What a silly question. Work harder." It is cold comfort and an unreasonable prod. Julie has given up her pretense of being an angel to Wally.

At this point, the stage directions read "Enter ELDER GREENE who kneels at KESTLER'S feet shining his shoes" (51). As the long suffering Wally writes his next letter, he skips the description of his labors and instead lists the virtues of his new companion, who, in contrast to his lazy former
senior companion, is "terrific" (51). He doesn’t complain, does everything Kestler asks, has a good sense of humor, and even remembers him from the pre-existence. In other words, Kestler informs Julie that he has found an eternal companion with all the desirable qualities which Julie herself now monstrosely lacks. And, "Our motto is work! Work! Work!" Kestler doesn’t even need Julie as a monstrous prodder—Greene is a perfectly satisfactory Angel/Mother who can simultaneously sit at his feet adoringly, take care of his clothes, and inspire him to new heights. It seems a man can have all his needs taken care of by another man better than by a woman, particularly since the provider is part of the man’s sphere. Elder Greene understands the pressures and problems of mission life far better than can Julie. Kestler’s righteousness in leaving women and going on a manly mission (there is no hint in the play that missions are possible for women) has earned him freedom. Kestler is now able to flaunt his independence from women. But there is still one thing that, in approved LDS or Victorian culture, only a woman can provide Wally. So he once again asks "Do you still love me?"

The full depth of Julie’s disloyalty to Wally is now revealed in her slip at the beginning of her answer. "Dear John...I mean Wally. Work harder!" Julie gives one last prod out of habit, but she can no longer hide the fact that she has no further need for Wally. There can, in the angel/monster scenario, be only one explanation—she has
found another relationship. The letters stop as the "FEMALE CHORUS" repeats the most significant two verses of "He's Just A Friend" while Julie and Peter "cuddle" (52).

He's just a friend
Like those she counts in dozens
A kind, unselfish boy
Who understands her pain.
He's just a friend to fend
The bitter winds of sorrow
And after all, a girl can always
Use a friend.

As the underscoring still continues, Kestler receives news of a final betrayal--Julie has been engaged for two months! Kestler "cries out in agony." His new companion, however, tells him "Maybe it's for the best." It is Greene who will "throw his shoulders back," march over to despondent, rejected Kestler and order him to go "out there and show that two-timing woman the kind of man she's losing" (53). Greene is capable of prodding Kestler to, as the saying goes, "take it like a man" (53). He may not, as Kestler accuses him, know much about love for a woman, but he knows the active, self-validating male rites of dealing with pain.

True pain it was, according to Kestler. "And to think I trusted her!" (52). The pain of being fooled adds a whole new dimension to the song, entitled "Dear John." Now "JULIE & GIRLS" heartlessly sing about "Dear, dear old John" (53) as "KESTLER & MEN" groan that girls are less trustworthy than a "broken leg":

A girl, like a toothache
Only gives you sorrow
And that is why
I'll never trust a girl again. (53)

The missionaries view women as an extension of themselves, something they should have control over, a part that turns out to be unreliable. They sing the next verse, appropriately without the women in duet.

Fickle women, what a menace!
Look at what you’ve done unto us!

They have been victimized by the inconsistency of women. Unfortunately, they cannot rid themselves of the painful part without becoming less than whole. The real problem, as the missionaries admit in the next line, is that these dreadful women are not waiting for their Elders to come home to them to exercise their sexuality, a sort of Mormon reversal of the infamous double standard:

While you’re kissing, we’re alone
Can you blame us if we moan--
(crying out) Oh, Pain!

The young men’s simultaneous love/hate bond to their angel/monster girls is once again highlighted and mourned.

The song finishes with the girls mockingly repeating "He’s just a friend....and after all / a girl can always use a friend," and the men wailing "Dear John..." (53). The missionaries now understand that in trusting in women they are victimized--"use[d]."

The missionaries proceed to work out their disappointment in women by vigorous proselytizing, somehow just passing by Tod, who is in the park searching for truth. Tod seems to be trying to artistically make himself over in his own image as he sings "Paper Dream" (56). He discloses
in the song that he aspires to be "A brave and noble, fiery youth/ Who's not afraid to die for truth."

As the music fades, a pool of light reveals Julie, again with an audience of siblings. Julie, like Tod, is attempting to fashion herself on paper, though she uses the Victorian approved form of the silent diary, not the public art form that Tod has chosen. She tells "rapt" Alice that Peter has taught her "the meaning of love" and given her "everything I've ever wanted" (57). Then walking "off into a world of her own" (s.d. 57) she angelically records in her diary that she wants to be "the best wife in the world for him..." (57). At first she seems to be deliberately trying for a balanced life, in that as a wife she desires to be "gracious, yet strong...gentle, yet firm." She soon turns, however, from traits to romanticized roles of "perfect housekeeper...a wonderful cook..."(57). Even in her diary she pens herself into culturally endorsed fictions of perfection. We, along with Ernie and Alice, are encouraged to laugh at Julie's fervent dreams of excellence as she continues "And now...it's up to me...to make myself worthy of you...My Prince" (58). The Snow White line is silly, but even sillier coming from fickle Julie. Yet, as she begins to sing Reprise #1, "Paper Dream," we are shown that she sincerely is trying to "describe the girl I really want to be" (58). Immediately she is joined in the song by distant Tod, and, as shown before, Julie trails off into silence while Tod describes himself as a noble warrior. Suddenly,
Julie feels "homesick," presumably for the perfect relationship she enjoyed with Tod. Tod will be rewarded with the truly angelic Julie when he succeeds in his quest for truth and joins the Church. Julie’s quest to be a perfect angel is ordained by forces beyond her control. Her destiny is to be a perfect wife; and as the Chorus now reprises "Circle of our Love," her role is "In God’s eternal plan...forever" (59).

The next scene exhibits an immediate change in Julie’s attitude. Reminded intuitively of her destiny, she changes from a monster style to a domestic waiting style, another option listed in "Will I Wait for You?" Now she harnesses her energies to the Homemaker role, mothering her brothers and lecturing on the role of a family with scarcely a mention of her fiance’ (59-70). She seems more human in these scenes, as, for the first time since the pre-existence, she has seen past her own self-absorption to what others in the family are doing. She does not, however, become any more realistic about her domestic abilities, believing that the shirt she has sewn for Jimmy’s birthday gift proves she is ready to tackle sewing her own wedding gown (the stage directions describe the shirt as "the most outlandish looking man’s shirt imaginable, with proportions all out of whack" 66). The birthday shirt is symbolic in another way. To give the gift, she wears the shirt under full wrapping complete with bow, literally giving herself to Jimmy, the male of focus. Of course, she plans to make
another one just like it for Peter, giving herself from one household to the next.

Because these family scenes present Julie at her most human, they also show her at her real strength. She displays a homemaking ability while taking over the more active part of the mother role that her own mother cannot fill. She is the one who leads the defense when Jimmy attacks their angelic mother, challenging Jimmy's right to condemn Mrs. Flinders for her pregnancy and daring him to find any better love outside of the family. The daughter says the words that her mother should be able to say but cannot in her proscribed silent role as Angel/Mother to the family. Julie defends her own future role, the role that will probably silence her as well.

Despite having assumed a more domestic role, Julie appears to be monstrous one last time in the play. She startles her parents by announcing that she cannot marry Peter even though the wedding is only three days away. In answer to her father's question about little doubts, she replies "It's not just doubts...Please try to understand. It's so much deeper" (88). Even Julie doesn't understand, but the underscored to "Feelings of Forever" soon clue us in. Tod has just been converted by the Elders. He has, in accordance to Pam's formula for freedom (74), discovered who he is, and now everything else must straighten itself out. Julie is his angel, and must rid herself of all entanglements. Tod's self-confidence grows as he discovers
the reasons for his feeling and his eternal purpose. Julie's strength diminishes, and she asks Heaven "What are these feelings?" Tod has succeeded in his quest, but Julie is yet misplaced as the reward, and so feels lost and uncertain.

The two lovers-to-be now stand in separate pools of light and sing another romantic duet alluding to their previous existence, titled "Feelings of Forever". Tod describes Julie (as if she were an angel) arising "shining like a star". Julie describes Tod as if she were a nostalgic mother, remembering "the tender child in your eyes." Julie is now ready to take her rightful place as eternal Angel/Mother as they "Finally come again back to the start, / Where we began!" Tod, like the bespelled Toad prince, is restored to himself and, at the airport, will be reunited with Julie, his Jewel bride and reward, to fall in love at first sight and live happily "Forever...and ever".

Tod and Julie will appear one last time with the whole family to celebrate Emily's birth, ready to take their place as the head of just such a family of their own. Everything works out as it should, and Julie is safely set into an idealized Victorian setting of active males and their adoring women. Forever.

The rest of the LDS female characters in the play, especially the "Death Angel" Pam, are similarly placed outside the sphere of the spiritual battle, left either to
wait in domesticity or passively waste away to save their men. Throughout the play women are encouraged to cheer the real warriors while waiting for valiant Princes to bring them to life. Though the women may use charm and pleading to reunite Jimmy with the family, at no time are they allowed to use their will in their own behalf.

Sisters and Mothers

Julie is not alone in following her culturally prescribed role. Her younger sisters Alice, Shelly, and Emily seem eager to follow in Julie's footsteps.

In following Julie's example the Flinders girls aspire to become what Julie is becoming—a mother. Julie's own role model is her own mother, Mrs. Flinders, who is herself created in the image of the idealized woman as defined by long literary convention.

Mrs. Flinders's model, the idealized Victorian angel in the house, is a direct descendent of the medieval madonna descended from heaven into the house through the writings of Dante, Milton, Goethe, and Patmore (Gilbert and Gubar 21-22). As with Goethe's Eternal Feminine, Mrs. Flinders has no story, no past, no future, no character. The only words she speaks in the play are to or about her children; her only function is motherhood.

Mrs. Flinders role in life is neither Snow White, as she is married, nor is it Mad Queen, as she is not independent. Her role is rather a sanitized combination of
the two: Snow White’s Mother, whose sexuality is wholly contained in giving life to her child, leaving no life for herself. In the fairy tale the original Queen desires a child, gives birth, and dies soon afterward. This doomed Queen is literally a death angel, dead to her own desires as she soon will be to life, and bringing death to her child. Gilbert and Gubar explain:

...as death angel, a woman suggests a providentially selfless mother, delivering the male soul from one realm to another[;] the same woman’s maternal power implies, too, the fearful bondage of mortality into which every mother delivers her children. (26)

Mrs. Flinders matches this description precisely, releasing Jimmy from his pre-mortal womb and allowing him to progress on his way, and also bringing Julie out of her state of eternal perfection to decay monstrously in life. There is, however, one more aspect usually attributed to the Death Angel, one which Mrs. Flinders does not mimic as exactly.

Finally, the fact that the angel woman manipulates her domestic/mystical sphere in order to ensure the well-being of those entrusted to her care reveals that she can manipulate. (Gilbert and Gubar 26)

Mrs. Flinders does manage her home to some extent. She mentions giving one sewing lesson to Julie, and she is the one who will try to talk Julie out of sewing her own wedding gown (Warrior 66-67). Mrs. Flinders may have baked the birthday cake that she carries to Jimmy’s party (63). On the whole, though, she does very little manipulating, leaving Pam charge of twin Jimmy’s redemption, and the
family discipline to her authoritative husband. A truer maternal manipulative power is given in the preexistence to the Matron--Mrs. Flinders's partner at the other end of the birthing conduit.

The Matron is a Mormon recasting of the Victorian death angel (who has the duty of attending birth, sick and death beds); she ministers not to the mortally dying, but the soon to be born. She is the director of the premortal realm, a literal mother in heaven who personally rushes spirits out of immortal waiting into the spiritual death of mortal life.

The Matron of *Saturday's Warrior* is not the only Mother in Heaven. Jimmy remarks to Pam that in leaving their pre-mortal home they are leaving "Heavenly Father and Mother" (26). Yet Matron has some qualities similar to those that are attributed to Heavenly Mother by the Latter-day Saints.

In her article "The Mormon Concept of a Mother in Heaven," Linda P. Wilcox explains that the idea of a Heavenly Mother "is a shadowy and elusive one floating around the edges of Mormon consciousness" (64). The LDS idea of a Heavenly Mother is thought to have been first received around 1839 when prophet Joseph Smith shared the concept with a woman grieving the death of her mother (65). The concept is best stated and most widely known as an element in Eliza R. Snow's poem, "O My Father" (originally titled "Invocation, or the Eternal Father and Mother"), first published in 1845 (Wilcox, "Mormon" 65), and later set to music as part of the LDS hymn book.
In Mormon theology, the role definitions of this Mother are as elusive as her origins. Various Church leaders, such as Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball, have expounded the principle that, since Heavenly Father creates by natural means, it follows that there must be an equal Heavenly Mother. At the turn of the century this idea was adopted and used by those who aimed at raising the status of women in and out of the Church (Wilcox, "Mormon" 66-69). Another view traceable in both Mormon and American thought of the same period was:

...the yearning for a female divinity...[who] embodied all the maternal qualities which men had experienced as so warm and soul fulfilling in their own mothers...and which were generally absent in a male god that perhaps reflected a stern and rigid image of Victorian manhood. (Wilcox, "Mormon" 69)

Later Church leaders, such as John A. Widstoe and Melvin J. Ballard, underscored the concept of Eternal Motherhood itself as ennobling, stressing the "feminine deity's role as producer of spirit children" as a model for earthly women. Thus, the mortal mother's "calling" is to provide "tabernacles" for waiting spirits. The role of a Heavenly Mother (or Mothers, in a polygamous style) is to create the spirits children (Wilcox, "Mormon" 69-71).

The Matron in Saturday's Warrior is a heavenly mother, a supplier, not a creator of spirit children. Though she is titled Matron, which in LDS terminology signals a partnership with her temple president husband, this Matron has no authority attributed to deity, having only limited
control even over her responsibilities. For example, at one point she rushes her charges to their pre-mortal departure place, advising them to "hurry along, boys. Your mothers are due any second" (24). Soon, however, she brings one of the "boys" back, informing him that "It's called a false alarm...It happens all the time" (27). Matron does not even have the ability to tell real from false labor, let alone see into the future to the boy's real birthtime.

The Matron is herself part of the eternal, timeless frame, yet is very concerned with time, constantly scolding her premortal children to hurry and prepare for birth as "This is one time that just won't wait" (24), and "These things come on suddenly, you know" (25). She has no story of her own in Heaven, and can only give advice and cheer to disappointed Emily, not help (71-72). She has no foreknowledge of earth happenings, and is therefore surprised by Jimmy's actions (94). She has only a restricted influence on earthly events; though she may conspire with mortal nurses to correct a mix-up (25), her power is clearly limited to assisting spirit children from one stage of their life to the next. In this play Heavenly Father gives all blessings (28), and the mother figure is clearly a subordinate "Helpmeet."

At one point in the play, Matron calls Emily "my child" (94). This Matron in Heaven does have one daughter who is more truly hers than her mortal mother's: Pam, whom Emily is sent to replace on Earth, always has at least one foot in
the eternal world, and thus never really leaves the Matron's home.

**PAM**

"Templum aedificatum super clocam" "a temple built upon a sewer"--Tertullian's observation on the duality of women. (qtd. in Miller 23)

Down from the waist they are Centaurs, Though women all above; But to the girdle do the God's inherit, Beneath is all the fiends. (King Lear IV.vi. lines 124-127)

Julie spends the play vacillating between her dual angel/monster aspects. Her older sister Pam, however, is presented as the ideal Mormon woman, one with "eternal optimism" who "never complains," is "always cheerful," and "is too good for this rotten world" (46-47). In short, she is all angel in attitude as plainly as she is all angel in body.

Pam, in the preexistence, is as much an angelic object as Julie. She is introduced in the play, along with the rest of her brothers and sisters, as they gather in a small family assembly in honor of Pam and her younger twin Jimmy, who are about to leave for their turn in mortality. The difference between the twins is shown immediately. Jimmy believes that this gathering is a "farewell party" (18), and like Tod, he is happy to be leaving the premortal
world. Pam has a slightly different view of their upcoming change in status. Her first line is "After all the waiting, and finally our family is ready to begin!" (18). Her excitement is not for her own personal progress, but of the inception of the family unit. This view graciously includes her siblings in the event, causing them to "laugh and cheer" (S.D. 18). Pam's angelic selflessness is typical of her attitude throughout the play; her entire function is to serve her family.

Pam herself colludes with the other children in establishing her identity as someone to be used by those around her. Her siblings stage an imaginary reception to welcome the two new arrivals to Earth, complete with orchestra and television coverage. Pam's brother Benjy playfully announces her forthcoming birth: "Fellow citizens of the planet Earth...the historical event you have all been waiting for! Just arriving in all her birthday glory--the incomparable Pam Flinders!" (18). According to the stage directions, "The CHILDREN cheer and applaud as PAM moves gracefully into the SPOTLIGHT where she strikes a dramatic pose, covering her private parts" (18). Pam's pose instantly calls attention to the nudity of her forthcoming physical body. She stands like a nymph in a renaissance painting, both innocent and passively on display, ready to be used by any viewer--literally an art object. Her twin brother Jimmy, however, merely "takes his place next to PAM" (s.d. 18).
The interview continues as Benjy uses an "imaginary microphone" to interview first Jimmy, then Pam. He asks them "...before coming to this cold, hard, world...what was it you feared most about earth life?" (19). Jimmy jests that he fears in mortality he will be "so physically attractive" and "dashing" that no one will notice his "sweet spirit" (19). Though "The CHILDREN boo!" (s.d. 19) Jimmy's egotistical joke of over-abundant charms, still it is certain that a good appearance is merely an expected bonus to Jimmy; as with Tod, good looks are presupposed. On the other hand, Pam jokes "Well, of course, being a girl...my number one fear was that I would have nothing but a sweet spirit to notice" (19), a humble attitude which the children cheer. While Jimmy pretends to worry about too much in the way of good looks, Pam worries about having an inadequate supply—a definite problem for a dependent art object. Good looks are possibly a burden to a man; "of course," to a woman they are a necessity.

Neither twin worries about his or her spiritual qualifications in the mock interview. Their confidence proves well founded as the play progresses. Jimmy, as a warrior, will hazard himself in a quest for truth but be redeemed through his sister's unvarying, angelic spirituality. Pam, as his mortal guardian angel, will be incapable of monstrous misbehavior on earth. As she continues the interview, Pam "gracefully dances across the stage" (s.d. 19-20), stating that her desire is "with beaut;
or without...[to] dance my way through life" (20). Her fears will be realized, not her hopes for joining the dance of life. Pam, in mortality, is literally cut off from her monster parts and entombed in a wheelchair—a half-dead angel so pure that her feet never touch the ground.

In one sense Pam's reduction to cripple plays on the audience's capacity for sentimental pity. We see Pam in the wheelchair and admire her all the more for her stalwart and uncomplaining attitude in the face of her afflictions. Yet in another sense she is the embodiment of the tendencies of "patriarchal socialization" (Gilbert and Gubar 53) which presses women to be silent, to suppress their own creativity and will. Women have been told that to exercise self-assertion made a woman into a monster, a monster destined to self-destruction. Like the Mad Queen of the Snow White story who, in her envy of Snow White’s beauty, ends up dancing over a cliff to her doom, the woman who tries to determine her own life insanely creates the dance of her own death, or, at least, the destruction of her capacity for life. This rule is so ingrained in patriarchal literature that many nineteenth and even twentieth century female authors express in images of both confinement and disfigurement their fear of the fate they face for daring to be creative. Gilbert and Gubar refer to a passage from Margaret Atwood's 1976 Lady Oracle which defines one conflict between the urge to be creative and the demand to assume the image of the feminine ideal:
Significantly, the protagonist of Atwood's novel is a writer of the sort of fiction that has recently been called "female gothic," and even more significantly she too projects her anxieties of authorship into the fairy-tale metaphor of the red shoes. Stepping in glass, she sees blood on her feet, and suddenly feels that she has discovered "The real red shoes, the feet punished for dancing. You could dance, or you could have the love of a good man. But you were afraid to dance, because you had this unnatural fear that they'd cut your feet off so you wouldn't be able to dance....Finally you overcame your fear and danced, and they cut your feet off. The good man went away too, because you wanted to dance."

Whether she is a passive angel or an active monster, in other words, the woman writer feels herself literally or figuratively crippled by the debilitating alternatives her culture offers her, and the crippling effects of her conditioning sometimes seemed to "breed" like sentences of death in the bloody shoes she inherits from her literary foremothers. (57)

When Pam declares that she wants to dance through life, she is making her only personal assertion of the play. She makes the statement while she is safe in the pre-mortal realm, where she has followed the heavenly plan in choosing
to come to earth. Technically, therefore, it is not sinful for an angel to aspire to the dance of an active life, to hope for happiness in living out her own dreams and personal ambitions. Pam does not desire to be crippled. She does not knowingly choose the wheelchair and the role of sacrificial virgin; she is pushed into the part, culturally cut down to size because of her small impulse towards autonomy. Jimmy needs an angel, and Pam is elected by heavenly powers, regardless of her own wishes. She must not be allowed a dance which would destroy her ability to angelically succor her male twin. Even her moment of dance in the pre-mortal world is symbolically threatening to the ordained order.

Pam's angelic willingness to serve does save her from the symbolic and self-destructive dance; in the pre-mortal realm she is stopped after a few steps by a crying Emily's need for comfort (20). On earth she is stilled by her mortal internment in a wheelchair, preserved from offensive action.

What little dancing is performed in the play is almost all executed by monsters. Julie and the missionaries' girlfriends do a few "campy" steps to express their monstrous inconsistency. The play's real monsters, Mack's girlfriends, dance to express evil values and temptations. The only exception to the rule is the few steps performed by the whole family in the song "Daddy's Nose" (32), wherein they dance to Daddy's tune. Pam does not perform these few
steps in mortality; instead she is punished for desiring independent action, struck down and crippled. True to form, "The good man went away too, because you wanted to dance" (quoted Gilbert and Gubar 57). Though Julie dates in the play, and both Shelly and Alice observe her feminine behavior in preparation for their own dating, on stage Pam not only never meets any males besides her own relatives, she is never even in the room when dating relationships are discussed. Even her twin eventually leaves her, forcing her to self-destruct to save him.

Twin Jimmy is himself capable of angelic, though more active, sympathy. When Emily is discovered at the pre-mortal "farewell party" crying over fears of being unwanted and left out of the family, Jimmy offers to "see to it personally" that she is "not forgotten" (21). Echoing Julie and Tod, Emily makes Jimmy "promise" because, as he admits, "It's a pretty risky life we are going to" (21). Pam feels he is understating the point, declaring that "we'll have more problems, fears, and weaknesses than we ever imagined" (21). Pam will actually have more problems than Jimmy, as she will be called upon to bear the burden of his "risks."

Jimmy reassures Emily that he will get her born to the family: "you just leave that part of it to your big brother" (21). It is a kindly but presumptuous promise. Jimmy not only offers his manly protection, but usurps power over the birth process of his own sister. The play grants him that power; in the end he "Pester[s] his parents into having
another baby" (94), an event even the Matron has not imagined happening.

Though Pam is the oldest child, Jimmy is clearly the dominant sibling. As oldest son, he is "interviewed" first before his older twin, and he also takes the lead in organizing his family. Following his example, all the children sing an optimistic song entitled "Pullin' Together" (21) which explains how a family of "father and mother,/ Sister and brother" can work together to overcome all of life’s problems. At this point they can only guess that it is Jimmy’s "journey" that will be "rough" and Pam who will offer the "courage" that she admonishes the others to "take" (21-22). Pam is as yet in no position to offer anyone courage, and soon, despite her confident demeanor during the song, turns to her brother for the same manly reassurance that he gave Emily.

After Emily has fallen asleep and the other children have gone, Pam reveals to Jimmy her sadness at leaving her pre-mortal home (25). Jimmy elaborates on her theme, reminding her that they are leaving their first home, their Heavenly Parents, their friends, and memories. He marvels that "in a moment all will be gone...erased and forgotten" (26). Though this thought does not appear to distress Jimmy, "PAM begins to cry" (s.d. 26). She is thus the third female angel in thirteen pages to break into tears. When Jimmy asks her why she is crying, she replies "I don’t know...suddenly I’m so afraid" (26). Pam, like Emily and
Julie before her, doubts the efficacy of Heavenly promises she fears that will be forgotten. Although angelically hesitant to admit it, she seems to have little faith that the family, particularly Jimmy, will pull together. She tries for reassurance: "Promise me, Jimmy...no matter what happens, we'll always be close. No matter what happens" (26). Just like her sisters, Pam has to be content with a personal but off-hand promise from the man on whom she is dependent. Jimmy does promise, but brushes off her girlish fears: "Hey, now, this is no time for tears. We're on our way!" (26).

Jimmy proceeds to "(Tenderly)" describe to Pam his vision of progress: "And in a moment, two little strangers will lie in their mother's arms...gazing up into her eyes...wondering and feeling...but not quite knowing" (26). The twins will soon be strangers, not only to their new mother, but to each other. Jimmy honestly cannot keep a promise that he cannot possibly recall. Pam, as a passive woman, must inevitably be left behind. Jimmy makes this conclusion plain in his solo "Sailing On" (26-27) with its chorus, "I'm sailing on, I'm not a stranger." Jimmy knows himself, and knows he will journey alone. He and his "faith will ride through wind/ and tide and stormy sea." Pam must angelically function as the "distant lamp/ that lights the way for me." As a lighthouse that guides seafaring ships, she will passively wait and glow with faith for her brother-
"I hope they hold it high so I can see." Jimmy's role is to sail on, not pull together.

A contrast to active Jimmy, Pam is created after the image of perfect womanhood as defined by long literary tradition. She is the sister of Makarie, a female character extolled by Hans Eichner when he translated the concluding vision of Goethe's *Faust* into English (Gilbert and Gubar 21). In this final portion, entitled "The Eternal Feminine," Eichner refers to Makarie (originally found in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Travels*) as an example of Goethe's "noblest femininity." According to Gilbert and Gubar, "His description of her usefully summarizes the philosophical background of the angel in the house" (22), or as she could be named in Jimmy's song, "the angel in the harbor":

She...leads a life of almost pure contemplation....a life without external events—a life whose story cannot be told as there is no story. Her existence is not useless. On the contrary...she shines like a beacon in a dark world, like a motionless lighthouse by which others, the travellers whose lives do have a story, can set their course. When those involved in feeling and action turn to her in their need, they are never dismissed without advice and consolation. She is an ideal, a model of
selflessness and of purity of heart. (quoted in Gilbert and Gubar 22)

In Goethe's opinion, "the 'ideal of contemplative purity' is always feminine while 'the ideal of significant action is masculine'" (Gilbert and Gubar 21). Through Goethe's influence, the image of this contemplative woman, characteristically lacking her own story but ready to listen, advise, console, and sympathize with others, influenced Western literature:

Such characteristics show that Makarie is not only the descendant of Western culture's cloistered virgins but also the direct ancestress of Coventry Patmore's angel in the house, the eponymous heroine of what may have been the middle nineteenth century's most popular book of poems. (Gilbert and Gubar 22)

Pam's character shows her ancestry as plainly as a child wears an inherited facial feature. In the pre-mortal world, Pam is suggestive of Makarie. In mortality she is her mirror image.

Pam first appears in mortality much as Ben)\_\_ imagined, complete with "FANFARE AND TIMPANI ROLL" (s.d. 32) and television coverage. She is once again introduced with the rest of her family, this time at the start of the song "Daddy's Nose" (a song so redolent of Freudian symbolism that one is tempted to think it was written to tweak the feminist nose). It is immediately apparent that this young
woman is not "growing tall, growing strong" (28), as "She sits in a wheelchair, holding a hand mirror in front of her face" (s.d. 32).

This visual image of Pam and her mirror is a graphic reminder of Pam's angel position in the Victorian version of the patriarchal household, "Riverdale's family of the year" (32). All we can see of her is her disabled body; she appears faceless as her features are hidden behind the hand mirror. She sees, as women see in much of literary tradition, the reflection of her father's face superimposed over her own, for, as she lower's the mirror, she "exposes" a "gigantic red nose" (33). The other family members also sport this "trade mark" (33)—"Mom's even got it" (34)—but it is Pam whose image is most affected by the male created format. Faceless (powerless) and crippled, she indeed has "nothing but a sweet spirit to notice" (19).

Pam opens the song with a solo part:

All my friends told me:/ take advantage of your face!
Other people so endowed/ Have really gone someplace!
So I dreamed of Hollywood/ Till it occurred to me...
Someone beat me to the punch/ Named...Jimmy Durante! (33)

Pam may "dream" of "Hollywood," a place where women are made into successful stereotypes and the stereotypes are in
turn imposed on women, but how can she "take advantage" of
the face with which she has been "endowed" when it is still
her father's? She has been "beaten to the punch" by the men
who are able to pass on their own image of themselves and of
women. All the family members assume the pattern. In
donning the noses they "plainly show" that they acquiesce,
at least outwardly, to the "rosiest" family pattern, a
pattern based on absolute obedience to the authority of a
dictatorial father. "Everybody knows" (33) their duty,
their place in the design, as the model is automatically
reproduced. "A nose is a nose, like a rose is a rose,"--
call it by any other name, this cultural pattern is passed
down to a family without need of any overt indoctrination.
One does not even have to approve of the feature to inherit
it, for, as the family sings "it wouldn't be so bad/ If it
had stayed with ol' Dad!/ But we've all got Daddy's nose"
(33).

After Pam, Alice has the next longest verse in this
song. She sings:

    Once I baked a strudel for the county fair!
    Duncan Hines and Betty Crocker both were there!
    After the judging they picked to my surprise--
    Not my strudel, but my noodle!
    For the winning prize. (33)

Her father's "endowment" takes the prize even in feminine
competition. This system works for the father, as the nose
is his tool--Mr. Flinders sings "it's a rack for your
clothes/ a plow when it snows" (33), but the rest of the family is hidden behind his visage. In the tradition of Hamlet's "Mousetrap," this little show within a show "reveals" and "exposes" almost too clearly the power structure and basic philosophy of this family.

No one in the family is allowed to question the system. When Mr. Flinders is faced with Jimmy's incipient rebellion he berates him for "all this free thinking...these radical ideas!" (43), and orders Jimmy to tell his friends that "you've been taught differently and you can think for yourself." In other words, Jimmy is allowed to think what his father thinks. Jimmy is too active to obey such strictures; he immediately asserts his independence by demanding that his father recognize that he is "not your little boy anymore" (43) as he "turns and rushes off" (s.d. 43).

Pam, however, cannot escape so easily. She sees herself reflected in male tradition as angel in the house, and has no capacity for monstrous, independent action. Even though she is immersed in mortality and the decay which releases Julie's monster sexual side. Pam herself literally cannot follow even in her sister's footsteps. Her monster half is dead.

Gilbert and Gubar show much evidence that in a long respected tradition, many of the literary texts of the past are "inhabited" (29) by women who "use their arts of deception to entrap and destroy men, and the secret,
shameful ugliness of [them] is closely associated with their hidden genitals—that is, with their femaleness" (30). From the works of Tertullian and Milton and Swift and even Shakespeare, these simultaneously half-angel/half-monster women first entice men into the house, then destroy them through assertiveness and manipulation (30). But in Warrior, Pam is forced to be all angel, held up as an example of righteousness. Gilbert and Gubar explain:

While male writers traditionally praise the simplicity of the dove, they invariably castigate the cunning of the serpent—at least when that cunning is exercised in her own behalf. Similarly, assertiveness, aggressiveness—all characteristics of a male life of 'significant action'—are 'monstrous' in women precisely because 'unfeminine' and therefore unsuited to a gentle life of 'contemplative purity.'" (28)

In a new twist on an old tradition, Pam is castigated, cut off from the side of herself that wants to dance, and remade as a purely Snow White woman. She therefore has a special capacity to "coax and cajole" (Gilbert and Gubar 29) without turning into a "diabolical, slimy monster" (30) of literary fame who manipulates for her own ends. Her gentle stratagems in her father's home are only for the good of the inhabitants, not herself. She is willing to serve forever; this angel can invite others in, but cannot walk out of the house.
Pam's role as an angel in the house has some other particular modifications. Though Pam serves all the members of the household, she is particularly Jimmy's angel as she was promised to him in the pre-mortal realms. Also, her home already has a resident angel, her Angel/Mother, who takes precedence in the family order. Pam is therefore pushed out, becoming more "angel" than "in the house." Pam spends much of the play separated from the action of her family's more active life.

Pam's particular position as angel is especially evident in the first scene set in the Flinders' home (37-49). The stage directions describe the family members involved in rather gender stereotyped tasks:

MR. FLINDERS reads the newspaper. ALICE holds a skein of yarn as MRS. FLINDERS winds it into a ball. BENJY and ERNIE are on the floor with a game. SHELLY plays with a stuffed monkey, and JULIE writes a letter. Outside PAM sits in her wheelchair, embroidering. JIMMY enters family setting. (37)

Pam is both part of the homely activities (embroidering) and removed from the scene of activity (outside), angelically separated and other-worldly. The head angel in the house, the mother, considers Pam as present, "Every child [is] home and accounted for" (37). Yet the family behaves as if Pam were absent, discussing her freely.
This discussion of Pam is based on one sibling's question: "Mama, do you and Daddy love all us kids the same?" (38). Shelly elaborates "Well, in school our teacher read us a story about a mommy and daddy who had to give away one of their children. And I wondered which one of us you'd pick" (38). The various family members discuss the problem and tease each other by "volunteering" one another, until Mr. Flinders finally suggests "What about Pam?" (40).

Her siblings' serious reactions to this suggestion are proof of Pam's angelic service. Shelly is "shocked" and "emotional" (s.d. 40), wondering how "Daddy...could even think such a thing" (40). She is moved enough to make a "strong declaration" (s.d. 40) that "If you pick Pam, I'm going too!" (40). Ernie and Alice are worried about losing Pam's services, asking "who'd help me with my math?" and "what about my piano lessons?" (40). Benjy offers monetary aid: "Look, if it's the medical expenses ya can't hack...I'll take on two extra jobs to keep that girl around!" (41). Even Mrs. Flinders adds what for her is an emphatic opinion, commenting "Well, dear, I think you've just been outvoted" (41). Throughout this commentary Pam remains passively aloof, not because she cannot hear the family (she tells Jimmy that she "overheard you talking with Mom and Dad" 45), but because she is unable to use her influence in her own behalf. She must remain modestly silent regarding her own fate.
Pam, as angel, is able to use her pure influence to help others. The angels in literary tradition are allowed to break their silence to serve, particularly as talk without action is, in this tradition, considered specifically female, while talk with action is masculine (Gilbert and Gubar 654). As Jimmy’s guardian angel, Pam has a responsibility to influence her twin for good, a responsibility she tries to fulfill at the end of the long family quarrel which included the discussion of her fate.

Jimmy leaves his father in anger (42-43), frustrated by failing in a struggle to gain power over his mother and her power to give birth (he had tried to get his mother to promise not to have another child). "JIMMY crosses to area of stage where PAM gazes into the night sky" (s.d. 45), going to his angel for advice and consolation.

Pam’s angel status is unmistakable. Though we have been told that she is embroidering, we find she is sitting in the "clear night" (45). Instead of stitching, she is contemplating, thinking of God, staring up into the Milky Way and feeling "smaller and smaller" (45). This little woman, like Louisa May Alcott’s fading Beth March, is weak in body but strong in spirit. In the full power of her ability to manipulate for good, she is ready to guide her brother as a "lamp" to his "stormy sea."

She begins her unselfish manipulation of her brother by distracting his attention, asking him if the universe ever makes him feel small, focusing first on his feelings and
working around to helping him discuss his problems. Throughout this scene Pam remains calm, non-judgmental, and focused on Jimmy.

Jimmy himself is not so calm. He openly questions Pam's quasi-Mormon beliefs about family and children, and reacts with disbelief when she gently patronizes him: "You're just trying to find yourself, Jimmy... and you will" (46). Perhaps the word should not be "patronizes" but "matronizes," for she mothers him gently with a sort of angelic detachment but definite skill, mediating between Jimmy and the father about whom he complains. By deftly and unexpectedly changing the focus of the conversation to Jimmy's acting talent, she sweetly tries to transform him from a "mixed up radical teenager" to "Sir Galahad" (46), complete with a quest, in just a few sentences. Jimmy is unsure, but plays along enough to reveal his fondest wish-- "Freedom to explore new and different ideas without being put down" (47). It is a wish that many who live in an overprotected or sternly authoritarian environment share.

Jimmy's seriousness makes him impatient with Pam's game, and, as she tries to continue the fantasy, he rejects being made into a mythic being and walks off in disgust. Pam, however, is still powerful in her selfless cajoling, and proves her angelic power over him by stopping him with his own name (47). She offers one last charming little joke "you forgot your sword" (47).
"Jimmy returns, half laughing" (s.d. 47), caught by her persistence. He recognizes that she is the fantasy figure:

"You're unreal, Pam. You're too good for this rotten world... You and your perfect faith. You never complain... always cheerful... the only one who even tries to understand me" (47).

Jimmy is correct in his assessment of her character. Certainly she is "too good" in that the play has given no proof of her behavior except the character witnesses of her family, no acceptable basis for her amazing "goodness" except our faith in the validity of her subordinate role. She is a cardboard character. Pam states her own belief:

"that's what comes of being your twin" (47). Actually, she is not his twin so much as his better half, for, as she tells Jimmy, "I believe we knew each other a long time before [we were together in our mother's womb]... a long time" (47). Having her feet in the eternal world, Pam is perhaps able to remember part of their former life and their pact to each other. Jimmy is fully active and mortal, so is much less positive, asking "But how can you know? How can anybody really know. And I don't mean just that... I mean anything spiritual. You talk about freedom and truth and God... Like it was part of you" (48). In her calling as angel, handmaid to God, it is part of her. Pam will not talk about herself, but answers his question after once more referring to him as Sir Galahad looking for the Holy Grail
(48). She finally bears a testimony, a testimony based on doctrine, not fantasy or cultural and opinion.

In the song "Line upon Line" (48-49), Pam presents a scripturally supported concept that "Line upon line, precept on precept" God gives his earthly children knowledge and guidance. Yet she presents the doctrine in a passive way, claiming that "If we are patient we will see/ how the pieces fit together in harmony" (48). She does not mention searching or repenting, but simply being "patient," implying that if we receive the "wisdom" as the earth receives a "summer shower," all will be well, "and...we'll live with Him forever!" (48). Though she encourages "warrior" Jimmy to look at the heavens for himself and not to throw away a "whole universe of opportunity," she repeats for herself her own personal creed that "until it happens" we should be patient.

After Pam and Jimmy sing the final lines of "Line Upon Line" together, the music fades away. At that tender moment Pam takes her brother's hand, exclaiming "Oh Jimmy,...I feel so close to you" (49). Pam has come as close as she can to fulfilling her purpose for existence as Jimmy's own angel on earth, sharing her vision while maintaining both her passivity and his active manner. She has reached the climax of her Snow White tale, the moment when the Prince has lifted the lid of the glass coffin, allowing her a modicum of life as he briefly shares her world. But, lest the message be too positive, the play switches scenes
immediately to Julie's preparations for her "Hot One" with Peter (49). It only takes a few moments to remind us to "Never... never trust a girl" (50).

For all her feelings of closeness to her brother, Pam and her wisdom have failed to change Jimmy in any significant way. In the next family scene Jimmy enters "cuffing BENJY!" (s.d. 59). "At the same time ERNIE enters from a different area, pushing PAM in wheelchair" (s.d. 59). While Jimmy is actively belligerent, verbally and physically wrestling with Benjy, Pam seems paralyzed by being "pushed" into the scene of strife. Only Julie is outspoken enough to attempt, though fruitlessly, to intervene. Pam perhaps joins in when "CHILDREN (ad lib) 'No you guys... stop! Stop! You're gonna hurt each other... Please...’" (60), but she is not listed as specifically speaking until she calls Jimmy's name when he "rushes off" (s.d. 61). But here in the world of discord Pam has less angelic power over Jimmy, and he ignores her. Brother Benjy recommends that she be silent: "Save your breath Pam! He doesn't care about you any more than he cares about anyone in this family. Don't forget, he's the one pushing zero population! If he could, he'd get rid of every last one of us! (61). Jimmy has chosen monstrous behavior outside of Pam's sphere of influence; she cannot affect him any longer.

Sister Julie, being half monster, is not so weakened. She reminds her siblings that Jimmy is part of the family and "we can't just sit back and let him run away from
home..." (61). Pam, "choked with emotion" (s.d. 61), concurs. "Please, you guys...Julie's right. Who else does Jimmy have but us. And if we fail...but we can't. Don't you see, we can't" (61). Physically, all Pam can do is sit back. Yet she knows that failure to do something to bring Jimmy back will result in consequences too terrible to speak--Jimmy's damnation and the corresponding loss of her own angel existence, for Snow White cannot exist without her prince. Benjy asks the pertinent question, "So whatta we do?" (61). To which Pam, the passive angel can only reply helplessly, "We love him, Benjy...that's all. (pause). We just love him" (62).

Love is not necessarily helpless, however, and Pam still can employ her angelic manipulation, and she concocts a plan to enchant Jimmy into staying in the family circle. As Jimmy "is left alone" (s.d. 63) after a visit from Mack and friends, the rest of the Flinders family enters, prepared for a surprise birthday party. The festivities will be "MC'd" by Mr. Flinders, but all indications point toward Pam's guidance in the preparations.

The first evidence of Pam's hand is the costumes that all the siblings wear. Pam previously tried to coax Jimmy into symbolically assuming the stereotypical accoutrements of a knight, including a sword. Now the brothers and sisters are dressed in gender stereotyped costumes representing the service each has performed or will perform to show their love for Jimmy.
The actions of the family show more evidence of Pam's handiwork. Pam had previously entertained Jimmy as a visitor to her world, but he refused to stay there, choosing to question instead of to quest. This time Pam enlists the whole family to carry her romanticized world view to Jimmy. Moving as she cannot, the more active family members "circle Jimmy, singing" (63), bringing him back into her world. On the prior occasion Jimmy had protested "Oh, come on Pam....when will you ever see I'm not this great and good person you keep talking about?" (46). Now the whole family sings "For he's a jolly good fellow! That, nobody can deny!" (63).

Jimmy is suspicious of this stratagem, refusing his father's extended hand and birthday greetings. He contends with unknown irony (unaware of Pam's planning), "Oh, come on...what is this? It's Pam's birthday just as much as mine" (64). Twin Pam quickly effaces herself, saying "Just never mind, Jimmy. It's about time you had your own special one-person surprise birthday party" (64). Julie and Alice promptly add "Please note...with gift wrapping!" and "Are you surprised, Jimmy?" (64), diverting pressure from Pam while adding their own coaxing.

Jimmy still is skeptical of these feminine tactics, and, after a pause, challenges them with "Look, whatever it is you're trying to do...it's not going to work!" His statement "shocks" Pam, who is not able to cope with outright opposition. Jimmy ignores her, again challenging
his father, who, as the head of the home, is his real rival for power. "(Looking toward Mr. Flinders)" (s.d. 64), he asks "You think I don't know what's coming off?" (64).

Between Mr. Flinders's forcefulness and Pam's pleading, Jimmy is convinced to stay as the family members "show" (65) their love for him. Pam has angelically managed to get the whole family, including her parents, to "pull together," drawing reluctant Jimmy into her safe, unquestioning world for at least "five minutes" (65).

One by one Jimmy's costumed siblings come forward to give their "gifts" to their older brother. "Organ Grinder" Shelly, pressured by her mother, sacrifices her "best friend," a stuffed monkey which is "the most special thing" she "ever had" (65). "Shoe shine boy" Ernie gives "a spit shine a week for a whole year" (65). "French Maid" Alice gives notice that "I can't take all the credit for my present 'cause Daddy's paying for it...Breakfast in bed for a week....featuring cuisine from seven different countries, including Texas" (65-66), a gift that points up her role as future dependent homemaker. Benjy, dressed in greasy overalls, gives what he describes as not "such a great gift" (66). This offering, which he has been working on for weeks, is a newly repaired car. Benjy has fixed "that old junky Ford of yours that's been sittin' out in the garage for three months" (66). In what amounts to an apology for their earlier fight, Benjy hands keys to his "apostate" (60) brother, essentially gifting him with the freedom to
"explore" the world. As Benjy says, "Ya got wheels now, brother...and it runs great" (66). The masculine gift of wheels is the exact opposite of Pam's confining wheelchair. Benjy alone is capable of giving Jimmy what neither passive Pam nor authoritative Mr. Flinders can give him—the option to "run."

Gift wrapped Julie does not wait for Mr. Flinders to present her as he has the others, guessing that "now is the exciting moment" to present "the world's most exciting fashion creation, designed especially for you" (66). Julie herself is the family's most exciting creation, and, as "she rips off the wrapping paper, revealing" the shirt with the "J" sewn over the heart in which she is dressed (66), she highlights her status as an art object to be used. Her posing strongly implies the worldly link between a man's power over a car and the women he (according to commercial images) collects with the car. Julie herself acknowledges her position as a man's reward by her action of volunteering her "gift" at the moment she chose.

"Well, I guess that takes us to you, Pam," or, as Shelly reminds Mr. Flinders, "Your Royal Highness!" (67). The aim of the party is indeed to "take" Jimmy to Pam. This moment is Pam's triumph, the moment when she is acknowledged as "Queen." Through her successful plotting, Pam has brought Jimmy back to the family fold, thus, for the evening she is indeed the queen angel in the house. The whole family has served her in her gentle scheming that ends with
Jimmy being asked to "kneel before the Queen," as the children say, "just for fun" (67). Pam, however, is serious about her imaginary realm and the importance of keeping Jimmy in the kingdom. Though she uses a "painted, cardboard sword" instead of a real implement of male power to "knight thee, Jimmy Flinders...Valiant! Noble! And Courageous Warrior of the First Rank" (67), she is not kidding when she tells Jimmy, "You should have known I’d never be satisfied until you were officially knighted! Or have you forgotten your quest?" (67). Pam has succeeded for the moment in getting Jimmy to passively submit to her imaginary power, as she originally attempted sitting with him under the heavens. He is now "knighted" or brought into her angel’s realm of "night" (back in Heaven), where he can quest for the truth without risk, and fulfill the promise he has "forgotten."

Pam continues: "Here’s your sword. And now, Brave Warrior arise! The world is yours!" (67). Pam willingly relinquishes the power to the "Valiant Prince" (68). Jimmy is "overcome" (68)—he accepts her cardboard armor and weapons, and is almost convinced to escort her, as her Prince, "to see Camelot" (67).

The little "show" draws to a happy ending, and all parties prepare to feast on the birthday cake, when a sudden plot complication occurs. Shelly, the young extra, has not yet been adequately incorporated into the plot, and consequently adds some unwelcome lines. "But Daddy...you and Mama haven’t given Jimmy your present. Remember the
surprise?" (68). As so often happens when a performance suddenly goes awry, "There's a sudden uneasy silence" (s.d. 68). Mr. Flinders fumbles, trying to find his lines "Well...I...guess now's as good a time as any to tell Jimmy the good news" (68).

Shelly tries to blurt out the "news," but Alice, more trained in her role, "stops her from saying any more" (69). Mrs. Flinders is left alone to take a long pause before telling Jimmy "I'm going to have a baby" (69).

The show is over. Jimmy's real-life Oedipal struggle with his father has ruined the fantasy world. Camelot again falls because it has been betrayed by the monstrous, unfaithful queen. Jimmy's "frustration" (69) brings, as it were, the house down, and he, "choked with emotion...rushes off" (70).

As "the CHILDREN look at each other with shocked realization" (s.d. 70), Benjy states "I think we blew it, Pam. I think we really blew it" (70). Pam's attempt to bring Jimmy into her world has failed, and Benjy's gift of the car has backfired. Jimmy and his friends will explore far more of the real world than either of them intended.

For all her angelic attempts to manipulate Jimmy into being righteous, Pam is unsuccessful on earth. When Jimmy runs off to "experience the bitter debaucheries of life" (79), she is separated from her Prince, and, not being able to follow him into hell, she must of necessity retreat to heaven, essentially sacrificing herself to save him. It is
her death of unknown causes, not her doctrinally sound yet passive advice, that finally motivates her lost, lonely brother Jimmy to begin his journey back to his family.

Pam informs Jimmy through a letter that she is in the hospital, where she is enduring "the same old thing--tests and more tests" (74). The cause of her distress is not medically obvious: "not even the doctors know what's wrong" (74). The actual medical cause is irrelevant; a lingering illness is an identifying characteristic of the Death Angel (Gilbert and Gubar 24-25). Pam is not alone in her mysterious illness; she has many sisters similarly enfeebled:

The nineteenth century cult of such death-angels as Harriet Beecher Stowe's little Eva or Dickens's little Nell resulted in a veritable 'domestication of death,' producing both a conventionalized ichnography and a stylized hagiography of dying women and children. Like Dickens' dead-alive Florence Dombey, for instance, Louisa May Alcott's dying Beth March is a household saint, and the deathbed at which she surrenders herself to heaven is the ultimate shrine of the angel-woman's mysteries. (Gilbert and Gubar 25)

Rather than "killing herself into art" as Julie does and her little understudies Alice and Shelley imitate, Pam takes her angelhood to its ultimate conclusion--residence in the eternal realms. Her death should be a warning to all
those who take the Victorian ideal of womanhood too seriously:

Whether she becomes an objet d'art or a saint, however, it is the surrender of her self—of her personal comfort, her personal desires, or both—that is the beautiful angel woman’s key act, while it is precisely this sacrifice which dooms her both to death and to heaven. For to be selfless is not only to be noble, it is to be dead. A life that has no story...is really a life of death, a death-in-life. The ideal of ‘contemplative purity’ evokes, finally, both heaven and the grave. (Gilbert and Gubar 25)

To coin a phrase, Pam’s unknown disease is just "the same old thing—tests and more [literary] tests" (74). It is nothing but the common doom of the storybook angel.

All through her short mortal life Pam has glided without touching the floor. Now she sits in her hospital room, writing, in good Victorian-approved fashion, a letter which is her own selfless epitaph.

Pam’s letter speaks more of doings of her family than of her fate. She paints a happy picture of all the lively idiosyncracies of her individual siblings. Only with that business conducted can she speak of herself, asking Jimmy not to worry, as "Lately I’ve felt a closeness to God and a freedom I’ve never felt before" (74). Pam is obviously dying, gaining, as part of her "closeness," more light to
hold up to guide Jimmy. Pam’s new understanding is that "Freedom is knowing who you are. And once you know that...the rest can straighten out itself...if you really, really know who you are" (74).

This rather ambiguous message is automatically replaced in the Mormon mind with the phrase "I am a child of God." But that is not what the play teaches about Pam; rather it teaches that she is an angel, and she knows it so strongly that it burns in her heart (74). She will seal her testimony of it with her death. Once more she reminds her Sir Galahad to look for "one star at a time," one last time she sings an angelic reminder of "Line upon line," and signs off "Love Pam" (74).

Jimmy reads her letter to Tod, who is thus prepared to meet the missionaries—Pam’s wisdom does help Tod find his true self. Jimmy instead takes both Julie’s and Tod’s advice to "find out" for himself about the world. Because of this he encounters the totally monsterized version of Pam, "The ASTROLOGIST" who "wears a cape covered with signs of the Zodiac (s.d. 79). Though "JIMMY backs away from her evil smile" he immediately runs into the Guru, prostitute, and "OTHER WORLDLY TEMPTERS...symbolically [experiencing] the bitter debaucherries of life" (s.d. 79). Despite Jimmy’s experimentation with worldly values, it is only after he receives the telegram informing him of Pam’s death that Jimmy finally "looks like a broken man" (84) and begins to regret leaving his family. Meanwhile, Pam joins her
miscarried sister Emily in some Mormon Limbo for those who died before they really lived. "They move together and embrace," as we hear Reprise #3: "Saturday's Warrior" (81). The whole female chorus, not a soloist, sings just the first section of the song:

Who are these children coming down, coming down,
Like gentle rain through darkened skies,
With glory trailing from their feet as they go,
And endless promise in their eyes.

These two angel children never reached the earth to "grow" and "fight alone," but rather fell "like a summer shower"—God's handmaiden helping "give his wisdom."

Heaven itself shaped these angel women to "have no story of their own" but only the heavenly word.

Pam was not foreordained but predestined to die for Jimmy. She is in actuality the third to do so. Emily promised in the pre-mortal world that if Jimmy ever lost his way, "If it would help I'd even die for you, Jimmy" (22), and has fulfilled her promise by being the sacrificial baby miscarried because of Jimmy's bid to control his mother. Mrs. Flinders, who divulged that "I think I'd die before I could give any of my children away" (39), has had to die to her own desires for another child, to die in her life-identity as a mortal mother of waiting spirits, sacrificing Emily because of Jimmy's command, "I don't want you [to have another baby]" (42), refusing to try again because she was "afraid that having another child right now will only create
more problems" (72). Jimmy succeeded in gaining power over his mother's power of life, forcing her to become a monster and deny life in order to try to save him. But only Jimmy's loss of his heaven-promised Snow White angel moves him to question his own actions.

Jimmy sings in "Brace Me Up" (82-85) that he is "discouraged" and wishes he was "someone really loved." His doubts and fears keep comin' faster," so he prays for "Heaven" to "help me up above." It is his own actions in going to the hell of the world that have caused him to be alone and unhappy, but he is always forgiven. Pam and Emily help answer his prayers by shouting advice to him, trying to give him wisdom to counteract the solicitations of Mack and his friends. Pam insists, "Don't listen to them; you belong with your family" (83), repeating the words of her father which so angered Jimmy--fathers are never wrong. She reminds Jimmy that "It was your idea...to pull together (83). Emily urges Jimmy to "Remember your promise" (83). These angels have no advice to offer but the advice they have heard from their men.

Jimmy insists that he needs something more tangible than advice. "All" he really wants is a "hand to spare...someone who will take me as I am" (84). During a musical shouting match between the three factions of the family, the angels, and Mack's group, Jimmy hears what he prayed to hear: "Jimmy, we love you, that's all we have to offer/ Jimmy we need you, please don't turn us away" (85).
"JIMMY melts into his FATHER'S arms. The rest of the FAMILY surround him" (s.d. directions 85). Jimmy returns to his family after they offer to be a substitute Pam, passively loving and needing him. He then proceeds to resolve his power struggle with his parents by "pestering his parents into having another baby" (94). He thus manages to both retain control over his mother's birth process and bring self-sacrificing Emily down to earth to be an actual substitute for Pam and fulfill her promise (22) to "stay by" and "pray" for him.

But will Emily be content to remain Jimmy's angel? In uniting the family to save Jimmy in the Mormon fashion, having both the living and the dead pulling together for the family unit, Emily has seen during "Brace Me Up" that in order to be truly united it is necessary to have both men and women sacrifice and work together equally. Though that point is immediately submerged under a scene of Julie and Tod acting out their stylized Victorian courtship, Emily has glimpsed a middle ground between the angel and monster roles—that of spiritual equality. In that light, Emily may read the Matron's parting advice, "So be courageous, Emily...and above all else, find out who you are just as soon as possible! Do you understand?" (94), not as advice to remain an angel but as a "slant wise" encouragement to discover her real self. If this second interpretation is the one that Emily chooses, then the final thunderclap sound effect that signals Emily's birth could also signal change.
During the final reprise of "Saturday's Warrior" that ends the play, the female soloist sings the first portion, but then is joined at last by all the men and women as the whole chorus sings in full harmony "who are these young ones growing tall, growing strong?"

The combining of high and low voices was probably written to add strength and substance to the final rendition in order to carry it over the applause of the curtain call. Those of us who wish to see it otherwise, however, could interpret the vocal change as an encouragement for social change leading to a future when men and women "sing" more equally. In such a future, "Pams" will not have to remain in the "Background" (s.d. 95) of their family groupings, and will not be urged to die to create fantasy happy endings.

Most viewers, nevertheless, will probably see in the repetition of this folklore an endorsement of the Active Man and Passive Woman lifestyle that encourages not wholeness but division of the relationships into rigid and less rewarding roles. "Forever."
CAST OF REUNION

(in order of their appearance)

Wayne Robison
Mildred Robison
Billy Robison
Arthur Robison
Chris (Christine, Christina) Robison
Jerold Robison
Brother McManus (home teacher)
Phil Spenser (home teacher and former suitor of Chris)

Other people who are important to the story:

Robert Thornley (well-to-do real-estate developer)
Robert Siegel (Chris’s "fiancé," a stock-broker)
Arnie Spenser (Phil’s brother, Wayne’s former best friend)
Larry Robison (oldest Robison son, killed in Vietnam)
Julie Robison (Wayne’s seven-year-old daughter)
Beverly Robison (Wayne’s wife)
Jerry (Jay) Jr. (Jerold’s teenage son)
George Knox (former seminary teacher who sold bogus stock)
Fred Robison (Arthur’s brother, who committed suicide)
Esther Robison (Fred’s wife)
Arch Collins (seminary teacher who encouraged Larry to go to Vietnam)
Reunion: in Father's House

While Saturday's Warrior is a play that portrays Mormons as many LDS church members believe that Mormons should be, Thomas F. Roger's Reunion is a play that attempts to portray Mormons as they really are. Rogers studied his own surroundings in order to recreate the voice of his own culture accurately and in a relevant fashion. He asserts in the preface of the play that "I can personally document practically every line of the play in terms of who of my acquaintances first said what and when" (Rogers x).

This emphasis on a closer adherence to reality has resulted in a less comfortable play than Saturday's Warrior. In contrast to Warrior's sweetly emotional content, Reunion, with its sifting of bitter feelings, and its strained family relationships, "is likely to be very unsettling for Mormons" (Lloyd 29).

Unlike the widely-known Warrior, very few Mormons have actually seen Reunion. Among connoisseurs of LDS letters, Rogers "has earned a solid reputation as a playwright dealing in significant Mormon problems, values, and possibilities" (Waterstradt 1), but his plays have not been widely produced. Reunion itself was performed at Brigham Young University and in the Provo-Orem area by the Fireside Player's in Reader's Theatre style during late 1979 through early 1980. It has since been more fully staged for only two performances in a combined effort of a community theatre
and an LDS ward in Logan, Utah in 1982 (Perry). Yet the play earned enough of a reputation that it was well covered by theatrical reviewers associated with both local newspapers and several small magazines.

The reviewers who witnessed the readings were in agreement that this play was a change from the more gentle faith-promoting style of LDS plays that Mormons had grown to expect. According to one critic,

LDS literature and drama is replete with celebrations of the joy, which comes supposedly as a direct result of attending one's meetings, paying tithing, filling assignments at the stake welfare farm. Seldom is there a hint that the performance of these outward rituals may not always result in unmarred bliss or the rearing of perfect children. Thomas F. Rogers, chairman of the Department of Asian and Slavic Languages at BYU[,] has dared to suggest that the success formula may not be as simple as that. (Lloyd 29)

Said another, "Rogers' new play, 'Reunion', is not at all tame or usual; it is a challenging, vivid, unsettling, ultimately compassionate and helpful and memorable look at contemporary Mormon family life" (England, Herald)

England, in fact, felt that this play was notable in "looking squarely" at Mormon life, stating emphatically:

Be assured that this is not traditional Mormon drama, with a clear, pleasant, and easily forgettable (because obvious) moral;. . .It is something nearly unique, a good, skillfully wrought play about real Mormons with real conflicts who make mistakes, suffer, struggle with each other, learn, grow love, forgive and partially resolve their conflicts. (England, Herald)

Saturday's Warrior uses similar elements of conflict, forgiveness, and resolution, but in a sentimental, almost
melodramatic fashion. **Warrior** is a good example of what Legler defines as the "slick Mormon musicals that play like advertisements for smug Mormon security, separate from the rest of the saddening world" (67). **Reunion**, on the other hand, is more "believable," due to its "complexity and convincing dramatic tension..." (England, **Herald**). "Here," said Legler, "is honest talk--not probing but at least exploratory" (67).

Critics were also fairly unanimous in their opinions of the weaknesses of the plays. Deborah Legler judged that:

Rogers has not written something lyrical here, and the Robison family will not linger, in conception or interpretation, as immortal additions to the theatre...the play is...too obviously a microcosm of Mormon society--a liberal, an intellectual, a bigot, and an as-yet-untarnished zealot...(66-67)

This microcosm is overfilled, as an ambitious author "tries to crowd too many 'realities' into one play" (England, **Herald**). Though Lloyd felt that "Rogers is to be congratulated for capturing the foibles which plague contemporary Mormon culture," he also pointed out that:

The play's one drawback may be that the characters possess too many of these foibles to be credible. Even though 'Reunion' is, in the author's own words, a 'patchwork play' made up of actual events and circumstances, we are prompted to say that no family could be **that** frustrated. (29)

**Reunion** is like an exercise in Mormon frustrations. Though it adheres to the neo-classical three unities of time, place, and action, its style is not classical in that the "action" is fairly static, consisting mostly of conversations about the past rather than struggle toward a
single point of crisis. This action becomes an "ordeal of bickering and resurrection of unpleasant memories" (Lloyd 29), "a marathon unburdening to rival the most tortuous group therapy" (Legler 66). Christopher Sharp explains:

The play's major flaw is that the characters have wound themselves so tightly into their roles and images that their main actions is simply winding down, which they do during long winded attempts to justify themselves. Their inertia might be linked to an old and unfortunate literary habit of Mormon writers to leave out everything in life that is not church related. The result is that we know this is a family of Mormons better than we understand they are--most importantly--human beings. (Sharp 41)

Reunion's aim toward great literature is somewhat shy of the mark; still the play is far beyond "Home Literature" in its clarity of vision. Though both Saturday's Warrior and Reunion inspired in their audiences what Eugene England describes as "largely positive, deeply felt reactions" (Herald), of the two, only Reunion "may do much to spark some healthy introspection among the saints" (Lloyd 29). Rogers accomplished what he set out to do. As he said in a telephone interview, he feels that it is the aim of the artist not to preach, but "to raise questions."

Rogers may not preach, but he does teach by example. Reunion is memorable in that it braves the exploration of universal paradoxes, conflicts of conformity and personal accountability, discernment and judgment, in their Mormon manifestations. In surveying a collection of four of Rogers plays, Sharp discovered a central message:

These plays argue against the seductive notion that so long as we are obedient to authority, we
will not be judged for our mistakes. Rogers would submit that we cannot ask the Nazis, the Supreme Soviet, the corporate empire of a Howard Hughes, or any man-made authoritarian organization to save us from moral responsibility. His most heroic characters begin their spiritual ascent when they understand that only God can save them, that they can have no other god before him. (41)

An analysis of the play *Reunion* raises some questions of its own. One such question is stated in the play, inspired by Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*, "Why [does] the man [end] up alright, and the woman doesn’t?" (*Reunion* 26). An examination of the play using the lens of feminist criticism reveals that its female character, though more well-rounded than those of *Saturday’s Warrior*, still are subject to the false image of the gospel imposed by Victorian custom on the Mormon culture. In the play, Mildred, in trying to be an Angel/Mother, is deprecated as a Death Angel. Christina, a fallen angel, deliberately pushes herself towards full monsterhood. It is in trying to be obedient to a falsified notion of male "authority" that these women make their mistakes.

The plot of this "Mormon soap opera," as Rogers jokingly calls *Reunion*, is not as easy to sum up as it is to describe. Roger’s own synopsis is as follows:

The setting is the living room of a middle class LDS home in Salt Lake City on General Conference weekend. The three oldest children, now living away from home, have come together to celebrate the missionary farewell of their youngest brother Billy. They are also concerned about their father Arthur who, they discover, is dying of cancer. Despite their desire for an agreeable reunion, the older children’s misfortunes, grievances and mutual antagonisms soon rise to the surface: Chris, an airline stewardess, maintains a
clandestine liaison with her pretended fiancé, a married man. Wayne, a school teacher, who did not complete his mission, is sour about people in the Church and ready to abandon his career and family. Jerold, a prosperous broker and active churchman, resents the others' "liberality" but has alienated his own teenage son, who recently left home. While fretting over the many surface manifestations that all is not right in their children's lives, Arthur's wife Mildred tries to put a pleasant face on things. In his turn Arthur maintains a stoic and tolerant facade.

Wayne and Jerold finally square off with a classic debate that touches upon practically every area of controversy that was ever argued between Mormons. This triggers Arthur's reminiscence about his earlier days as a seminary teacher, an oil stock fraud, his brother Fred's consequent suicide, and even his first son Larry's death in Vietnam—all somehow related. Disillusioned by the cumulative spirit of contention and incrimination, Billy shocks the others, in the presence of the home teachers, by threatening not to go on his mission. The family's feelings of alienation and despair reach a turning point only after Arthur breaks down at the announcement that the man he has all along blamed for his own misfortune is a newly appointed General Authority. As Arthur admits that he is vulnerable because he is unforgiving and that he has all along tried to manipulate his children, they feel freer to recognize their shortcomings and to become reconciled. Arthur's remorse prompts Billy to forget his own bitterness and to console his father. Arthur then asks his sons to bless him, and, as they do so, Mildred and Chris looking on, all are truly reunited. None of their problems are fully resolved. Billy is still unsure that he will embark on a mission. But the atmosphere is one of peace and mutual compassion, of budding faith. And there is hope. (Reunion, unnumbered preface)

Mildred

In his preface to the book God's Fools, a collection of four of his plays, Rogers asserts that the characters and situations of Reunion spring from real life:

The circumstances of Reunion are... fairly universal. At least the audiences who
participated in the discussions following its first performances seemed to think so ...(X)

Rogers, as playwright, attempted to recreate life on the stage, to compile his characters from the examples of people around him, to report actual conversation in his dialogue. In doing so he unconsciously recreated "patterns," patterns that he identified only after the fact: "I did not perceive the recurring thematic patterns in these plays before they were written and performed" (X). In Rogers's belief, the fact that he was unaware of the trends in his work "...makes their genesis all the more legitimate, all the less contrived. The circumstances...are not imagined" (X). In Reunion, the circumstances that Rogers recreates show evidence that they are influenced by the Victorian model that has been integrated into the LDS culture. This influence has particularly affected the female characters in the play.

Rogers admits that he himself may have been influenced by a cultural bias. "I should add that...[the women] too fit a certain pattern or stereotype--a fairly traditional but very noble one" (XII). According to Rogers, the wives, mothers, and sisters in his plays have an intuitive ability to mediate the conflicts between men and to inspire reconciliation. "Perhaps this reflects a seeming predilection of mine for Maryolatry--a bone of contention to both orthodox Mormons and some feminists" (Rogers XII). He seems to feel that this "Maryolatry" is justified by the true nature of women: "Still[,] I think that women were
always less in need of serving missions to become converted to Christ" (XII). Rogers completes his assessment of women, explaining that his prejudice is actually veneration: "If that is discrimination it is all in women's favor" (XII).

Jean A. Waterstradt, a former professor at BYU, seriously disagrees with her colleague's conclusion.

Although he apparently sees women as handmaidens, Rogers clearly believes that his picture of Mormon women is complimentary and sensitive. According to his reasoning, then, the women in Reunion, though stereotyped, belong to a "very noble" tradition, and we should see in them exemplars of Mormon womanhood. What Rogers portrays in the play, however, belies what he says in the preface. ("The Women of Reunion" 2)

In spite of Rogers's rather Victorian assertions on the stereotypical nobility of women, in Reunion he has generated women who are struggling with the stereotypical role of death angel, a less-than-noble role assigned by the very culture in which Rogers was raised. Like many men raised in this culture, he appears innocent in his intents—he honestly does not realize the implications of such stereotyping. Yet his more subconscious poetic abilities more accurately record the unpleasant results of culturally pressuring women to assume the ill-fitting, subservient Victorian roles. Whether the role is designated as noble or ignoble, the cultural model still defines women as passively and angelically existing only for the benefit of men and their needs, or defines them as monstrous if they attempt action for their own benefit.
Waterstradt points out one such result. After noting that the husband character, Arthur, usually replaces Mildred's name with the title "Mother," she asks:

Is it the Mormon pattern to relegate women to roles, to refuse or to fail to see them first as individuals? While it is true that Mormon women, indeed all women, have certain, but varying, roles throughout life, others, particularly husbands, should see them first as human beings. The attitude that makes "Mother" of "Mildred" diminishes the woman's self-concept and her own ability to see herself first and always as an individual; she can then attend to her various roles as necessity arises. ("Women" 8)

Mildred, as evidenced by her husband's habitual naming, is not treated as an individual by her family. Instead she is treated as a failed angel in the house: a fallen angel or demon, or as Gilbert and Gubar name her, Mad Queen.

Mildred tries hard to fulfill the Mormon version of her Victorian roles. She seems to believe that it is her duty to be an angel in her home, to follow the prescription laid out by Turner in his 1966 BYU address, including the roles of helpmeet to God, homemaker, rearer of children, sustainer of her husband, and husband prodder

Helpmeet to God
(fulfilling the procreative power)
Your greatest calling, sisters, is motherhood, and in motherhood you are fulfilling a peculiar relationship to God. He brought us forth spiritually, and you bring us forth naturally. (Turner 11)

Mildred has followed the counsel to bear children, and has five children to her credit. She believes that she has "brought them forth" in the peculiarly husbandless way affirmed by Turner, a way that suggests the role of Mary.
bringing forth Jesus (note also that there is no spiritual mother in Turner’s equation). However Mildred does not believe that her task was as appreciated as Mary’s. In her one truly outspoken moment in the play she lectures Arthur: "Let me remind you that I’m the one who had to bear each one of them...while you stood by" (61). In this family, childbearing is part of a woman’s sphere, not a man’s, in some contradiction to the spirit of Spencer W. Kimball’s pronouncement that mothers "are partners with God, as well as with their own husbands, first in giving birth to the Lord’s spirit children, then in rearing those children so they will serve the Lord..." (Learn of Me 112). Turner’s attitude is a descendent of the Victorian duality that although childbirth was monstrous, animalistic and beneath the dignity of men to even observe, motherhood was angelically glorious, ennobling and out of man’s domain. As a result, a mother was held responsible for all the burdens of child care; the father was under no obligation to assist her in her womanly role.

Rearer of Children
The vital responsibility pertaining to the actual rearing of children must be borne by the mother, not, ordinarily, by the father. The father sustains the mother, backs her up; but most of those critical moments in a child’s life are in terms of his relationship to his mother. It is always the mother they talk about, look for, and weep over. (Turner 12)

The assumption in the play is that Mildred has always tried to fulfill this angelic role, though the only evidence of past mothering is in her claim that she has tried never
to argue "since the children came" (61), to which Arthur is forced to reply, "and you’ve done very well, dear" (61). She is still trying to mother, asking (not accusing) her family about the open window (38), trying to protect Billy from Wayne’s bitterness (2), reacting tolerantly to Wayne’s rudeness to her (2-4). She turns down the volume on the stereo so that it won’t disturb sleeping Chris, because she has noticed that "she got in so late again" (1). She is concerned for flight attendant Chris’s welfare, "The hours they make those poor girls keep....all the crashes you read about—and meeting so many footloose strangers..." (1), but she does not try to force Chris to change jobs, merely remarking to Wayne "I do hope she’ll get tired of that stewardess job before another year goes by" (1). She keeps informed of the accomplishments of her sons, even if they don’t tell her about them (5), and praises them for their accomplishments several times during the play (5, 36).

Mildred gets little respect for her efforts, however. Chris considers her a "sneak" and an eavesdropper (19), and Wayne baits her about her incorrect habits of speech (4). Her efforts to coax Wayne into listening to conference are treated with resentment (1-2) and finally ignored (18). Her children seem to regard her as a meddler, particularly in Chris’s love life—"It’s too bad you interfered there, Mom" (44)—even though they know it was Arthur who drove that particular boyfriend away (86). Mildred, in fact, is a meddler more than a mother now, as her children are fairly
independent. But, having only regarded them in the role of a subservient mother, she cannot now adjust her role to that of friend. Following her husband's lead, her children see her as "Mother," and have little sympathy for her needs. When she tries to openly discuss her fears about Arthur's illness with the most frank of her children, Wayne, she is told: "Don't borrow trouble. Don't worry needlessly" (17). Wayne does not wish his mother to change from her reassuring mother attitude of "Well, with all our faith and prayers, Dad's [cancer] will [go away for good]," even though Wayne himself disagrees (4). In this play, the sons and daughter wrestle with their emotions and reactions to their father, not their mother. No one touches or says "I love you" to her (though Chris states that she tells that to everyone 83), yet Wayne, Jerold and Chris worry about having their father's approval and plan how to convey that they love him. Additionally, Chris and Billy embrace him after he admits his weaknesses (95, 100). Mildred, as mother, is taken for granted or viewed suspiciously as a monster; Arthur is accepted as a human with weaknesses. However little the family respects their mother, they expect her to carry on in her next role, that of homemaker.

Homemaker
That is a great calling day by day. There isn't any career in this world so great as that—to be a homemaker. Remember, sisters, they do not have career girls in the celestial kingdom. All they have there are mothers and sisters. If you will do the humble and demanding tasks the Lord has appointed for you in "time," you will be "added upon" in the "eternities" beyond your wildest dreams. A celestial "career" is the only career
worthy of your ultimate concern and desire.
(Turner 12)

Part of the reason that Mildred is taken for granted by her children is that they see her position as a "humble" one. She is very much the homemaker, the domestic queen, using her manipulative powers to serve the family. Her first words in the play, a rhetorical announcement, "Well, the roast's on" (1), immediately identifies her position. She is the one who manages the finances (12), and is, as Wayne testifies, the "...one who runs the house" (17).

Mildred receives little help in her role of homemaker. When she scurries to prepare potatoes for the oven so that she will be punctual driving Arthur to his doctor's appointment, for example, neither Arthur, Wayne, nor Billy offer to assist. Instead, Arthur calls after her (s.d. 12), "Don't get your blood pressure up, dear" (12), and does not even apologize that she is behind schedule because she stopped to help him find his lost tie-tack. He simply ignores her and joins in conversation with Wayne. Billy laconically announces "I'll be in the car" and leaves (12). When the potatoes are prepared, Mildred directs Wayne, not to put the potatoes in the oven himself, but to: "Tell Christine to put them in the oven exactly one hour from now" (16). Only the daughter should actually work in the kitchen. Son Wayne pays so little attention to his mother's bid for even this small assistance that he cannot remember what time Chris was "supposed to put the potatoes in the oven" (35).
Mildred likewise receives little praise for her efforts. After dinner, she solicits some applause by remarking "Well, that was a delicious meal, if I do say so myself," whereupon her sons respond dutifully, "It was super Mom!" and "It was great!" On the one occasion in the play that Mildred really demands recognition for her service, she is treated as a mad queen (61). When Mildred reacts to being told "with sudden, bitter anger" (s.d. 61), to "shut up," she does not attack Arthur, only defends her own worth:

I'm the one who's kept the bills all this time and worried every month if we'd make it or not, if the groceries would hold out. That's one reality I've tended to and, whenever I have, you've come back to three times a day. You men discuss so many fancy notions--what you, Dad, and Wayne read about. How others make you feel, old friends. And whether you should have joined the Church or married this or that woman. But I've always been too busy worrying about your reality, keeping you in one piece, keeping your bodies and souls together. (61)

Arthur replies resentfully, "I know Mother" (61). That both spouses call each other by their role titles indicates that their "spheres" are separate, and the spheres separate Arthur and Mildred at this point in time. Though they live in the same house, they live in different worlds.

Mildred is to run the house. Arthur and his sons are to be educated and philosophical. Women need not be educated to fulfill their function. As Turner stated, "Remember, sisters, they do not have career girls in the celestial kingdom. All they have there are mothers and sisters" (12). The insinuation is that "career girls" are banned from celestial glory. Of course, Turner's statement
begs the questions "Will there be career boys in the celestial kingdom?" and "If all they have in heaven are mothers and sisters, where are the fathers and brothers?"

Weak logic aside, however, the statement does sum up an attitude of antipathy towards the education of women. Subservient women need not be smart; education is only optional for women. Said Turner to a BYU audience in 1982:

> An MRS degree will still be in demand when this university and its degrees have been consumed in the fires of celestial glory. I can assure you when you stand at the gates of heaven, God will not ask you if you have a PhD in physics. ("Rodney" 10)

Such an attitude, taken as church teaching, at best constrains women to feel guilty about taking time to gain an education and, at worst gives impetus to those who claim that educating women deprives men of their rightful place and resources in the university. As a result "too many women view themselves and their potential very narrowly" (Come Unto Me, 239). The Relief Society lesson "Being Personally Prepared" reminds women that

> The roles of wife and mother are still the most important roles for every married woman and remain so even if she is employed outside of the home. Nevertheless all Church members, male or female, should make career development a part of their personal preparedness plan....Despite these cultural patterns each woman should take steps to acquire the training she may need. (Church, Come 239-240)

Although the lesson acknowledges that "it may be difficult for the married woman to continue her education" it also maintains that "...many women have gradually completed
courses of study or advanced degrees while raising their families (Church, *Come* 240).

Even if the LDS woman does not pursue formal education or a career, it is still her opportunity to learn, and even her responsibility to do so.

Individuals have a responsibility to be continually learning and to use knowledge in order to benefit themselves and others. Every woman who nurtures a creative, inquiring mind and develops herself intellectually can be a stimulating influence in the lives of others. She can influence others to learn in the many situations which she shares her council and wisdom. (Church, *Come* 237)

Both LDS men and women are commanded scripturally to "Study and learn and become acquainted with all good books, and with languages, tongues, and people (Doctrine and Covenants 90:15).

Mildred, however, is in no way inclined towards intellectual pursuits. She, in fact, dismisses them with disdain as impractical "fancy notions" (61). Like the good woman of the Bible who toils so that her husband is known among the Elders at the gate, she is willing to deal with the everyday tasks that make up the home, but she has no inclination towards independent learning, as evidenced by her complete lack of interest in her son’s Tolstoy novel. She even speaks in an uneducated manner—"Mildred is the only character who uses modifiers incorrectly, substituting the adjective ‘real’ for the adverbial ‘very’ in the phrases ‘real good,’ ‘real comfortable,’ and ‘real well’" (Waterstradt "Women" 4). Actually, Arthur also occasionally
substitutes a "real" for a "very" (14), but he does not do so on such a regular basis. Waterstradt is more accurate in her comment that: "Mildred Robison emerges as a woman of limited understanding and limited intelligence. Ultimately she is pathetic, scarcely representative of a 'very noble' pattern." ("Women" 2)

Her husband, on the other hand, values worldly and spiritual education. Arthur has been both a seminary and a Sunday School teacher. When he resigned from teaching in support of a dismissed fellow teacher, and was released from his church calling under suspicion of being "too liberal," he took a mindless job as a shoe salesman as "a kind of penance" (62). Although he has not taught a Sunday School class in twenty years (63), he has not given up his interest in education. In a complete reversal of the father/son relationship of Saturday's Warrior, Arthur strategically uses his discussions about Freud, Marx, and Darwin, and other "great minds" of the world to form a bond with his son Wayne (83). Arthur is forced to admit that his plan has backfired, that he is worried by Wayne's loose ties with the Church and his family, caused by Wayne's inability to accept dogma at face value (84). But he is far more worried about his successful son Jerold, who he claims has "'Made it.' In every way." (14). Arthur ticks off Jerold's successes:

Been in a bishopric, and now on a high council. Has a devoted wife--and a new kid every year...(chuckling) or every other year. Earns real well--vice president in his firm...But I still worry for him. Why is that? (14)
Wayne later answers his father's question: "Jerry's the most worldly one among us" (85). Arthur's confessed strategy to use his assumed "unorthodox" behavior to help Jerold has also backfired. "That [behavior] gave you something to rebel against, but it kept you in the fold. You've never stopped rebelling--against me...I didn't mean it to go that far" (85). What Arthur does not state is that in rebelling against his father, Jerold has turned to his mother, adopting Mildred's worldly and reward-oriented standards of success. Jerold has also picked up his mother's disdain for academics--though he enjoys boasting that son "Jay's math scores are still pretty impressive--especially for a high school freshman" (38). He later admits his son has recently run away, in part because "I could never talk to him about anything. He was never interested in sports--or in business. Just math...and music" (73). Jerold elaborates that he and his son "just never spoke the same language. I've tried. But he won't. He never tried to fit in..." (74). Jerold has tried to deal with an "exceptional" (74) son by communicating in the stereotypical male language of sports and business. Like his mother, he has spurned less practical and less gender specific activities, and, as a consequence, has lost his son. Ultimately, he is less successful in his parenting than his "liberal" father. Arthur is realistically worried about Wayne, but at least he and his son are communicating. Jerold, on the other hand, sighs "I doubt we'll ever see him
[Jay] again" (74). In imitating his mother's example, he is failing as a father. In adhering to the strict limitations of her Victorian role regarding intellect, Mildred has been ineffective as a mother to Jerold. She is also ineffective in her next role, that of husband-sustainer, as she does not understand her husband's mind.

Sustainer of Her Husband

The role of a woman is to sustain her husband, to support him and to honor him and to be an example to her children, and not, as some women do, to ridicule him because he is not making enough money, or because he is not the brightest person in the world, or because she wishes she had married "George" instead. You must support your husband before your children. "Be an example of the believers" in your husband if you want your children to believe in him. (Turner 11-12)

Mildred has tried to angelically sustain her husband. As noted earlier, she has refrained from arguing, and has tended to her husband's "reality" without help. "His mind was always somewhere else. He's always been impractical. I'm so used to that and to looking after him..."(17). In fact, she is so dedicated to caring for Arthur that she wonders, should he die, "What would I do?" (17). Wayne tempts her to complain--"...Dad gets on your nerves a lot, doesn't he? Now that he's so forgetful?" (17) --but she refuses the bait, replying "But I'd still miss him."

Indeed, she tries to "support" her husband in front of Wayne, explaining that Arthur did not miss a mission because he was unrighteous, but because he was too old--and that he made up for the lack by teaching seminary.
But, being human, Mildred has a difficult time maintaining a perfect angel demeanor. Arthur does get on her nerves at times. For example, she mutters about the "silly tie clip" that she must find before Arthur will proceed to his doctor appointment (12). But there are signs that she is suppressing much stronger reactions. As Wayne immediately comments to his father, "Mom worries as much as ever, doesn't she? Still have her migraines?" Mildred is only hiding her monster nature behind an angelic, though slipping, mask. She would like to speak out more forcefully about her confining situation, but, in pretending to be an angel, she cannot, to her own distress. Her distress is manifested through her headaches. Gilber and Gubar explain:

If we return to Goethe's Makarie, the "good" woman of Wilhelm Meister's Travels whom Hans Eichner has described as incarnating her author's ideal of "contemplative purity," we find that this "model of selflessness and of purity of heart...suffers from migraine headaches." Implying ruthless self-suppression....[this illness marks] the despair of a life like Makarie's, a life that has "no story." At the same time, however, the despair of the monster-woman is also real, undeniable, and infectious. The Queen's mad tarantella is plainly unhealthy....(Gilbert and Gubar 55)

Mildred is under such stress trying to sustain her angelic role that she ends up acting like a monster, a mad queen. As Wayne continues to discuss his mother with his father he asks, "And [does she] still nag you?" (12). Arthur answers:

There's no changing that. Besides[,] she indulged me plenty in her younger years. She stood up for me when I left the seminary--in public, anyway. And if she feels deprived, if there's been any resentment, she's always tried to smother it. (13)
Wayne answers his father, "That's why she picks on you, Dad" (13).

Strangely, Arthur sees Mildred's monstrous nagging as a kind of "support." He replies to Wayne "I know. But I brought it on. I deserve it." He is again choosing a penance for his sins, driving his wife to flagellate him with her nagging. Instead of working with his wife to relieve her despair, he encourages it, "indulge[s]" it. As Arthur says, "Why shouldn't I? She's my wife" (13).

Part of Mildred's problem is that she wants to support her husband as she angelically supported her own father. She seems to have great respect for her father as a male role model, praising him for his tenure as bishop, and his ability to provide for his family. She does not seem as capable of valuing the spirituality of the man Arthur calls "the saintly spud farmer" (58), but tells her sons, "I expect you'll all be bishops some day too--though probably not as long as he was. Twenty-one years" (3). She exults that her family is together as a reward for her father's service:

Here we are today, reunited--just such a happy family....How pleased he'd be if he could see you all....Your grandfather Riggs. It would reward him for all those years he was a bishop. (40)

Mildred does not seem to comprehend the spiritual worth of being a bishop, just its outward prestige and rewards. In the Victorian value system women are not trained in spirituality, they are to be spiritual, and support their husbands' true spiritual power. As Turner suggested in
1982, a woman is to live to "merit the support of her husband, developing talents within the boundaries the Lord has set, magnifying opportunities made possible by the first judgment..." (Blake 2). The first judgment, according to Turner's 1966 talk, laid a "curse" on Eve, wherein her husband would rule over her. "Her stewardship is to be a wife and mother. It is not to preside" (Turner 5). He continues, "...it is the calling of a woman...to be the one who is responsible for making a heaven of her home, the one who creates the spiritual aura that should exist in the home" (5). She must create this "aura" while the priesthood holding husband is the "spiritual force" who should "guide and direct all that is done" (5).

In other words, it is not Mildred's duty to lead in spirituality; it is her duty to support her husband by casting an "aura" of spirituality, perhaps even a facade. The less spiritual the family is in truth, the harder it becomes for Mildred to maintain that facade; although as angel in the house, she tries to maintain such a facade. She sets the example for her children, turning on conference several times, although she never actually watches it. She creates a facade of happiness that fools her youngest son Billy (40), twisting each member's life into a "mission,"--claiming that grandfather Rigg's grandchildren will each in turn have served a mission--in his or her own way. Yes, I include Larry. And you too, Christine, with your fiance, Mr. Siegel...Yes, here we are, such a blessed and happy family. (40)
Mildred, at this point is entirely ignorant of the fact that Larry went to Vietnam "on a special mission" and "gave his all" because "he didn't want to go on a mission" (99). She is also unaware that Mr. Siegel is already married. She will remain ignorant of both facts, as the family members reveal them only when she is not present, and vow to keep silent on those points. She is not unaware that members of the family have made vows of silence—she has taught them to do it. In the very first scene of the play she asks Wayne to "restrain" himself in talking to Billy about his mission, for fear of discouraging his younger brother (2).

Throughout the play the family members make and break such vows. For example Jerold says, "Maybe we should take a vow of silence. That might be best under the circumstances" (54), in response to Wayne's breaking a former vow not to quarrel. All the children seem to believe that it is better to maintain a facade than face the monstrous truth behind the angelic mask of silence.

Arthur claims that he believes otherwise. He asserts that "Anybody is a lot stronger for facing up to the truth, wherever it might lead him" (48), and quotes the Bible: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (54). In the end he is right; it is only after he has admitted his own manipulation of his children that they are able to forgive him. Mildred has supported him by supporting his fiction of fatherhood, yet she is made to look the monster—Arthur even obliquely blames her for the
problems of the family. If he had never met Mildred, he would never have joined the Church (58), and would not be facing the difficulty of balancing the demands of the cultural facade with the requirements of the gospel. In a speech which could just as well be calling for the abolishment of cultural role stereotyping, Arthur exclaims:

Because the gospel, the gospel, as I see it, requires us to trust each other. If we can't trust each other, if we can't tolerate one another's mistakes and bear one another's burdens, then what's the point of it? What's it all for? (58)

Mildred's dedication to maintaining a protective facade keeps her family from learning to trust one another. In trying to support Arthur, she has actually turned the family into what Arthur describes as "some kind of artificial refuge that holds a group of people together for a period of time and restrains them from becoming savages" (15).

The family begins the process of tearing down the facade in a long and involved session that takes up the whole of Scene Two. In this scene Arthur dredges up past mistakes, and Wayne, Jerold, and Chris attack each other until Mildred is reduced to muttered "Oh, dear": (57, 62). She is in actuality powerless to stop the process, as she does not preside in the home; it is up to Arthur to say "That's enough, boys" (53). By the end of the session Arthur is wallowing in guilt, Chris is embarrassed, Wayne and Jerold are furious, and Billy is disillusioned enough with his family that he may not even go on a mission (77-78). Mildred is left in the ruins of her home moaning:
Dear me. My head is nearly bursting. What happened? All this tension. All this strain. The day began so beautifully. So peaceful and unruffled. And now everything's falling apart. Why...

Mildred finally suppresses herself into another migraine headache, and into bed (80) until her family regains its balance and makes new vows of silence (101). Instead of monstrously exploding, the way her family has, she manages to self-destruct, ending up in a temporary coffin as surely as if she had been Snow White. Angel or monster—either choice turns out to be damaging to Mildred. The facade she tried so valiantly to maintain has almost destroyed her as well as her family.

A Husband-Prodder

Finally, a woman must be a husband-prodder, for husbands do need to be prodded—some of us with longer sticks than others, but prodded nonetheless. (Turner 12)

This role is the hardest of all for Mildred to angelically perform, as it is paradoxically opposed to an earlier role, that of supporter. How can she support her husband as he is if she is simultaneously supposed to alter him? In this role she must become her husband's mother, monstrously prodding her spouse to improve himself. Mildred would like Arthur to improve in his ability to bring in a more comfortable income, surmising that if he did so she could better perform her homemaker function: "If Arthur could have only earned a little more we wouldn't always be making payments to somebody out of the food money. We could have done so much more for our family..." (6). In this
light, it is quite understandable that Mildred might resent Arthur's quixotic gesture in leaving the seminary system and taking an even lower paying job.

Mildred does the best she can in "prodding" her husband without actually attacking him. She uses a mild prod combined with an expression of gratitude to refer Arthur to the good example of her father: "The potatoes are all scrubbed. Beautiful bakers. At least we've always been able to afford good potatoes. My bishop father, bless his memory, who made his money..."(15). Arthur, however, has heard this line too often, and expresses his resentment of her manipulation by "sassing her," completing her sentence "raising Idaho spuds--" (15) in the manner of an obnoxious child. No one likes to be nagged, even if the nagger attempts to be subtle.

This mild confrontation between Mildred and Arthur underlines the most destructive stereotyping of women in the whole play. While the common saying is that "money is the root of all evil," this play asserts that "women wanting more money is the root of all troubles."

The men in Reunion blame their misery on the materialistic desires of women. Wayne leaps to the defensive when his mother comments that "We don't see you very often, you and Beverly" (5), assuming that she is nagging him for not making enough money as a school teacher to afford frequent travel. Wayne blames his wife for their separation:
I’m not sure [I’ll go back to her]. She’ll have to be satisfied with what I earn, which will never be much....If that mother of hers would just keep her nose out of it and quit giving her ideas. Always lambasting me about Bev’s wardrobe or getting a more "respectable" car. (22)

Additionally, Wayne blames his wife for the fact that he hasn’t paid tithing: "As a matter of fact, I haven’t paid a full tithe for the past several years....My wife has spent our money faster than I could earn it. That’s why we’ve..." (52). Wayne is separated from both the Church and his wife because of his wife’s spending habits, habits taught his wife by her monstrous mother. Wayne is tempted to solve his problem by leaving his prodders, to "just get lost somewhere and start writing" (23).

Jerold tries a different approach on the problem of materialistic mothers. He has fulfilled his mother’s wish for higher income by becoming successful monetarily, as well as achieving prominence in the church, similar to his grandfather. Like his mother, Jerold confuses material success with righteousness, claiming that he is better than Wayne because he has paid more tithing (50-52). As Jerold says "It’s the Lord’s standard, don’t forget. Not mine" (52).

Jerold believes that tithing is the "real cutting edge" in the church (50), a tangible measurement of piety. He has faith in the things he can see, in outward conformance to the gospel. For example, when Billy promises to keep his hair short on his mission, saying "I want to do everything just right," Jerold approves "That’s the spirit" (39)--
perhaps the only "spirit" Jerold can understand. Jerold may have chosen his profession as a stock broker in rebellion against his father, who was ruined by buying fraudulent stock, but he is supported in his choice by his mother—the mother who would rather see her daughter marry a nonmember stock-broker and conform him than marry a lower-income Mormon who didn't even go on a mission (44). As noted before, Jerold's wholesale adoption of his mother's limited values have resulted in the loss of his own son.

Arthur, the deep-thinking and spiritually seeking head of the Robison family, has a special antipathy towards materialistic women. This feeling is exhibited in his memories of his brother's family. Arthur believes that, after Fred lost all his money and prestige due to investing in the same bad stock, Fred was never forgiven by others whom he had urged to invest with him. Even worse, Fred was not forgiven by his own family. Arthur recalls one fateful night.

Even his wife, even Esther couldn't hide her humiliation, so that on the day before Christmas—when his kids wouldn't be getting what they'd always been so used to getting...and his oldest daughter stayed out all night with a married man, a man who could buy her everything her father couldn't—Fred drove up the canyon that same Christmas eve, stumbled through the snowdrifts till he reached the man's cabin and pounded on the door, calling to his daughter, and they wouldn't open the door but cursed him instead with their drunken laughter....Then the gun he was going to use to threaten that man and get his daughter back...standing there in the snow,...with his daughter dead to him with hateful laughter, and his humiliated wife...he put the barrel of that gun into his mouth....(57-58)
Arthur also felt that Fred's former medical associates and fellow priesthood holders, and especially Arthur himself, were partially to blame for Fred's death, but it was his daughter's betrayal that propelled Fred to the actual suicide--the daughter who had taken her attitude from her mother.

Worse still, Arthur is mentally putting himself in his brother's shoes, as surely as he vividly imagines the details of Fred's final night. He continues to describe his brother's death:

But, if anyone was really with him at that moment, it was his brother, who'd never stopped thinking about what he'd done to him, what he'd put him through. So if someone really pulled that trigger, it wasn't Fred, not in his confused state of mind. It could only have been me. (58)

Arthur surmises that, even if she suppresses it, Mildred has been embarrassed by his disgrace in leaving the seminary system. He may also have guessed that Christine has taken up with a married man; 'hough that has never been stated in his presence, he might have surmised it from some clues mentioned by Jerold and Chris's suspicious behavior. If so, Arthur's situation now parallels Fred's. At the time, Arthur kept his sanity by forgiving the man who had sold Arthur the stock, George Knox. If Knox had been deceived by the Texas oilmen, then he was innocent, and Arthur was innocent in selling stock to Fred, even as he feels Fred should have been forgiven for bringing in other investors. Arthur confirmed Knox's innocence by standing up for him with the seminary board (58-59), but he also saw it as a
penitent act. He still felt responsible, and almost lost his sanity over the incident (59). Even twenty years later he feels that it is "unnatural" that he is still alive (59-60). In Arthur's "confused state of mind," he is even more responsible for Fred's death than Fred's daughter—he is his murderer (60).

Now, surrounded by his "savage" family, his humiliated wife, and his adulterous, betraying daughter, Arthur could naturally commit suicide himself, merely by ignoring the cancer in his prostate. Instead, he allows Mildred to take him to the doctor, and asks his sons for a blessing. Arthur can deal with his part in his brother's death, because he can in turn blame his death angel--Mildred.

Mildred herself has tried to take the blame to support her husband. Though she does not understand Arthur's reasoning, "How the people in this family love to exaggerate" (60), she is willing to follow her husband's lead:

Why if you want to blame someone, you might as well blame me. I encouraged you to look into George's investments. I wanted that extra income even more that you. I'd thought that after the hard times were over, when after the war everyone else became so prosperous--well, never mind....(60)

Mildred angelically will not blame her husband outright for not becoming prosperous. She even blames others for Arthur not fulfilling her dreams by becoming a bishop, continuing, "Though what's hurt me most is the way you've been overlooked since then..." (60). Arthur gives her no credit
for trying to build up his confidence in his innocence, and instead orders her bitterly to "shut up" (61). He believes she is a monster, a death angel, and her proddings are monstrous. Just a few minutes before he had stated his wish that

...things had worked out some other way, or that that saintly spud farmer had stayed in Idaho after his retirement instead of moving to the city. Then I never would have met his daughter. (58)

In Arthur's convoluted reasoning, Mildred initiated the chain of events that led to Fred's death. Arthur states that he joined the Church after "You [Mildred] and your father had your way with me" (40). If Arthur had never joined the church, he never would have killed his brother

...with that same gullibility that made me believe George in the first place, that made me go to Fred and urge him to invest in that oil stock. I'd brought him into the Church. So he accepted what I told him. (56)

Arthur has been gulled by Mildred into joining a church that has brought him so many troubles. He does not blame the "saintly spud farmer," he blames his own wife. Even Larry's death has been brought on by the stocks that Mildred encouraged Arthur to investigate. The angel in the house has brought death to both Arthur's beloved brother and his oldest son. As Mildred herself admits, "I can't seem to keep anything alive in this house very long" (1).

Mildred's dutiful attempts to fulfill the Victorian interpretations of her Mormon roles have brought nothing but unhappiness to the home she tried to protect. Though she never really had any control over others' choices, her
example led others to make bad decisions, and also provided a convenient scapegoat for them to blame. Mildred could not be an angel, so she instead inadvertently became more than a domestic queen; she became a mad queen leading her family in a destructive dance.

Chris

Chris, unlike Mildred, has not yet been wholly assimilated into the full cultural wife and mother-oriented roles. She is, however, just as much defined by her relationship to men as is her mother. Chris has proved insufficiently angelic to obtain the "best" sort of Mormon husband, and is thus denied the position of Domestic Queen, the Angel/Monster. Conditioned by her religious culture, she believes that the only choice she has is to become a Monster, and she has tried unsuccessfully to adapt herself to that role. Chris, like Julie in Saturday's Warrior, is caught in a struggle between her angel and monster halves.

Chris first appears on stage in answer to the summons of two men. Her brother Wayne summons her downstairs, informing her that she has a long distance phone call. According to the stage directions, "Chris, in her mid-twenties, runs down the stairs, wearing a diaphanous low-cut negligee. In her hands are a hairbrush and a makeup kit" (18). She pauses only long enough to apologize off-handedly, "'Scuse me, Wayne. This is all I could find to
put on..." (18) before proceeding to the phone. Once again a daughter character has been introduced as an art object.

Chris herself promotes her image as an object displayed before a man. Instead of spending a few moments finding more substantial clothing, she snatches up both her brush and her makeup. While she nervously conspires with her married "sweetie" on the telephone, she somehow manages to brush her hair and make up her face, engaging in a fit of "mirror madness," and adorning herself for a man who cannot even see her. Chris does what she can to keep her artistic mask fully in place, emphasizing her availability. Like a teenage girl with low self esteem who puts on a "hard" exterior to hide her fears, Chris uses make up paradoxically to both try not to become a monster, and to act like one.

After the phone call she continues to flaunt her monstrous behavior in front of her brother, advertising the illicit flair of her phone call by asking Wayne if their mother had "snuck n" or "eavesdropped" (19). She thus makes him privy to her desire to keep the "folks" from knowing that her boyfriend might visit. When Wayne merely reacts "So...?" (19), she tries to shock him by announcing that "He smokes. Cigars in fact" (19). Again, Wayne is unimpressed: "Come off it, Chris. They’re not that prissy--not even Mom" (19). Chris tries again to draw Wayne into her conspiratorial game, asking, "What about the preacher?" (20). Wayne must not have heard Chris use this term before,
as he does not understand her reference. She has to prompt him: "Jerold."

Having thus put her mother and her self-righteous brother in their places, Chris abruptly changes her tactics. Now she becomes innocuously angelic, describing her youngest brother as "Dear, sweet Billy...the best of the bunch" (20), explaining how she had to "trade shifts with three other girls" in order to come, "but it will be worth it to see Billy up there at the pulpit tomorrow" (20).

Wayne, however, doesn't believe that Chris is angelic, and confronts her: "I don't believe that...[,] the Church doesn't mean that much to you. Not anymore" (21). He knows this because "Actions speak louder, you know." Chris once more declares her love for Billy, asks about her father's health, and then suits words to her new "hard" character by adding, for no obvious reason, "even so, damn! Son of a--" (21). Despite his comment about Chris and the church, Wayne is startled by her abrupt change of tone, asking, "What?" Chris continues to try to shock Wayne, childishly taunting him: "Damn it, I said. Is that all right?...I can do better than that....I'm in good practice, wanna hear me?" (21-22). "What's eating" Chris is that, once again having her angelic side denied by her brother, she tries to prove her monster nature, sarcastically using the very "words" Wayne had declared ineffective.

After finally having managed to make Wayne uncomfortable, Chris again returns to angelic behavior,
stating that she "won't defile the dear nest" (22). She draws Wayne out, helping him to talk about the shaky state of his relationship with his wife, and refusing to complain or encourage her brother to desert his wife and daughter. Wayne cannot understand why she will not enter into his conspiratorial game: "I thought we were kindred spirits" (23).

This scene sounds remarkably like a variation of the intimate scene between Jimmy and his "kindred spirit" Pam in Warrior. This "Pam" has descended to her brother's level, but she still does not talk about her own feelings. Rather, she helps Wayne talk, urging him to make a reconciliation with his family and helping him renew his own vow to at least maintain a pleasant facade while at the reunion. In this case her silence speaks louder than words, showing that, for all her monstrous behavior, Chris is still also an angel and will do her part to support the family's angelic front. Besides using an occasional swear word no worse than High Councilman Jerold uses, Chris behaves almost like an angel in this home. She spends her visit drawing Wayne out, defending Wayne from Jerold's attacks, encouraging Billy, and helping her father forgive himself. Once Chris has descended the stairs "in a day dress" (32), the only concrete evidence that she continues to behave like a monster is that she smokes and leaves the bathroom window open. Chris cannot quite get up the nerve to openly "defile the nest" with her smoking, but instead sends a type of
smoke signal to her mother that expresses that she feels like a monster. Only homemaker Mildred, who pays the heating bills and tends to the other daily realities of the house, is bothered by the open window and the funny smell in the upstairs bathroom.

Chris's whole life at this time seems to be a mad dance to prove both halves of her stereotypical existence. She tries to live up to her own belief that she is a monster by rebelling, insisting on working, adopting "mannish" language, and acquiring a cigar smoking, nonmember lover. On the other hand, she continues to minister to the psychological needs of her father and brothers. Even her rebellion is couched, in a sense, in angelic terms. For instance, she rebels in actions, not in words. Waterstradt documents her choice of dissension:

Christine is not the only Robison in revolt. In Act II we see all four Robison males, including Billy the missionary-to-be, in rebellion. But their rebellion is expressed in discussion, in argument, in debate. It has an intellectual and philosophical dimension denied to Christina's dissension. Chris rebels in all the stereotyped ways associated with doubts about the Church; while Arthur, Wayne, Jerold, and even Billy rebel mostly in discussion of behavior. (10)

Chris chooses to demonstrate her monsterhood in ways that are both stereotyped and, in her family's view, feminine. As an apprentice homemaker, she is not supposed to be intelligent and participate in discussions of "fancy notions," and indeed, throughout the long "therapy session" of the afternoon, she imitates her mother by reacting to the reasoning of the men, and not offering any insights of her
own. In reality, however, Chris is not stupid—she is simply hiding her mind.

When Waterstradt comments on "Christine's apparent lack of intellectuality," she is as much misled as Chris's family. Chris tries to fit her family's expectations by appearing less gifted than her brothers. At times, however, her mind shows through. For example, when Billy asks Wayne about his book, "Whatcha reading?" (7), Wayne answers "A Russian novel. Tolstoy." Much like his mother, Billy is uninterested, and, dropping a grammatical beat, he replies "I wanted to go there on my mission." Wayne amiably refrains from commenting on his brother's lost antecedent and discusses missions and philosophical morality with him at some length, only once trying to return to his reading (7-11). When Chris asks "Whatcha reading?" (24), Wayne answers "Anna Karenina," and then repeats, at her query "who?," "Karenina," adding somewhat patronizingly, "Tolstoy's finest wo k—the great European novel." Chris makes a show of her ignorance, commenting "it's awful thick. Do you make your students read it?" But instead of changing the subject, she draws him out, asking "What makes it so special?" Wayne answers, "The question it poses, I guess" (24).

Earlier in this scene, Chris has flaunted her monster status in front of Wayne and so now feels safe enough to ask, "Question?" (25). Wayne's explanation sums up the
whole dramatic question of the *Reunion*. Both the play and the book talk about

...why people behave the way they do--why some make those terribly fateful choices, like Anna's, that lead to their destruction, while others like Levin...finally reconcile themselves to God and life. (25)

Chris uses Wayne's comments, discreetly applying them to her own situation. Finally, she reverses their places by asking, "But you tell me, how does Tolstoy answer his own big question?" (26), to which Wayne replies "Question?"

Chris's query sums up her own dramatic question of *Reunion*--she would like to know "Why the man ends up all right and the woman doesn't" (26).

Wayne, however, is not as interested in coming to a conclusion. He tells Chris that "Tolstoy doesn't tell us. He keeps the whole thing open. That makes it all the more lifelike--to keep things so uncertain. Don't you agree?"

According to the stage directions, he then "returns to his book" (26). Chris, taking the hint, drops her question and changes the focus back to Wayne, and thus gets him talking again. Yet her next questions, "What kept you from being more like Jerold? With the same parents and all?", is drawn from their discussion of the book. Wayne consents to continue the conversation for several more minutes, as long as he is talking about himself and his own feelings and struggles. The conversation conclusively ends when Chris tries once more to discuss the book, asking, "This Anna...What was her problem?" (28). Wayne, "looking at her
"hard" (s.d. 28), answers, "She was an Adulteress." Between her actions and her questioning words, Wayne has definitely been convinced that Chris is a monster.

Tolstoy may not "tell us" why the woman does not end up all right, but the play Reunion demonstrates one reason why Chris is having difficulties. Expected to live her life as a wife and mother, she has been unable to procure a mate. Chris is supposed to exist in relationship to a man, and so ends up returning to her father.

Chris has not been banned from the marriage market by her parents. Rather they have tended to be overly involved in this aspect of her life. Mall developer Jim Thornley, whom Mildred wanted Chris to marry, had married a girl he met at BYU immediately after his mission (43). Phil, the man Chris had wanted to marry, is engaged to another woman (42). By the time her family has discussed these two men, and Jerold has said "sorry to hear that Chris," Chris is "lustered" (s.d. 44), and announces "I think I'll go freshen up" (44). Once again Chris feels like a monster because she does not have a husband. Once again she tries to use exterior improvements to at least keep from turning into a total monster.

When Chris is safely out of the room, her mother and brothers continue to talk about Phil. Wayne is under the impression that Mildred's interference drove Phil away, rejected because he had never been on a mission, and therefore didn't have the right image to go far in the
church. Later, however, it is revealed that Arthur had "grilled Phil so badly...about his testimony and commitment to the Church--" that Phil gave up, even though he and Chris were "serious" (86).

Arthur had also rejected Phil, for less tangible reasons than his wife, but again over the church. Arthur, it seems, wanted a different boy for Chris--one with intelligence. "I was hoping something would develop between you and that Harris boy who became a Rhodes Scholar" (86). Instead of trying to develop Chris's brain as he had his sons, he wanted her to marry a "brain." He has just finished admitting to his sons the strategies with which he tried to improve them while they were growing up, plans he had tailored to their individual personalities. However much his plans went astray, he was still involved in their lives. When Chris asks, "What about me, Dad....?" (86), Arthur replies, "I made my worst mistake with you, Chris. I was used to sons. But I never did know what was best for you." Chris wants more of an answer, and insists, "Tell me what you did." Arthur admits that he wanted Chris to marry Randy Harris because "I thought you deserved the very best" (86). Chris, however, had been too much of a monster for Randy. Explains Chris, "I didn't fit his image. Believe it or not, he didn't want anyone with brains. All he wanted was a potential Relief Society President--Bo Derek with a testimony" (86). Even this smart Mormon boy prefers a pious art object to the woman monstrous enough to be intelligent.
Arthur's only idea of how to care for Chris has been to marry her off. In all her life, he has never gotten to know his daughter well enough to realize that she already had brains. Arthur never created a plan to help her develop as he had for his sons. He would be successful if he could just pass her along to an acceptable man. Phil was unacceptable, so, even though Chris had "caught" Phil, so to speak, Arthur "drove him right out of [her] arms" because he "thought he was too immature" (86). Chris has no say in the matter.

Chris, rejected by the better catches, feeling like an utter monster, is desperate. She rails at her father:

...if you really wanted me to end up with a model Mormon husband, you should have realized that Phil was my very last chance. Now I've had to settle for...a more mature non-member.... (86-87)

Chris knows that her father has only seen her as an apprentice angel in the house, yet she has been proved insufficiently angelic to catch any but the least desirable mate, according to her parents' scale of judgment. Her acts of rebellion, her "disobedience" to her "parents," as the home teachers preach, have, like her use of make-up, been attempts both to prove her monstrous wickedness and to reform herself into an angel. Mildred and Jerold both doubt that Chris would actually choose to work as a flight attendant if she were married (35, 71). Jerold can't even believe a stockbroker would allow "his future wife to sling hash in the friendly turbulent skies..." (71). Both he and Mildred ask several times "are you sure?" (35, 71). Chris
at first acts defiantly, answering, "And she does [want to work]," and "I am sure I'm doing what I want to do--", before breaking down a little and continuing, "--at least in terms of what still is or ever made itself available" (71). Despite his mother's warning--"Jerold, I really don't think you should--" (71), Jerold continues to confront Chris with her monstrous behavior: "Because the way you're acting--with the style of life you lead.... You won't make points with any Elder, Seventy or High Priest who's worth his savor...." Jerold has ripped the mask off Chris. After "a long pause, then in a restrained tone of voice" (s.d.), she answers, "I never did" (71). Chris cannot hide her monster half. She has taken the job as a "stewardess" because she knew she needed to "take flight" and leave the nest sometime. She accepted the only solution she could after not qualifying for marriage--she found a job that matched her angel/monster feelings and assessment of herself. In this job she could "sling hash" (71), and subserviently be abused by others. Chris describes her working conditions as less than ideal:

> What you don't have to listen to just working in the bay or up in the cockpit, or, worst of all, from some fresh passenger who's trying to make out and can't hold his liquor. There's at least one on every flight. (22)

In her job Chris must "listen" and uncomplainingly put up with verbal and perhaps physical assaults from men who see her as an available object. Every "flight" is accompanied by men who prove that she is a monster. Her affair with the married, cigar smoking stock-broker, whom she met on the
job, is an utter mockery of the marriage she desired. Chris is trapped in the "cockpit", a wingless, deformed, fallen angel who cannot defend herself from the attacks of others. Her symbolic flight becomes as much a penance as Arthur's shoe sales.

Having admitted that she never did make points with faithful priesthood holders (71), Chris now asks her father to come with her out of the house; "Let's go Dad." Arthur, however, is oblivious as usual to his daughter's needs, and replies, "Just a minute, Chris. I'd still like that blessing, Wayne" (71). Arthur cannot respond to his daughter's pain; he is concerned with his own needs. He is right to worry, as he has been in pain for some time. He cannot break his pattern of ignoring Chris at this time. Her brothers or mother, however, might be expected to show some reaction to Chris's discomfort, but it seems that she has sunk below notice.

This is not the first time Chris's feelings have been ignored in relation to a priesthood ordinance. The only mention of Chris's childhood is her memory of how her brothers Larry, Wayne, and Jerold had stood at the bottom of the stairs waiting for her to come down on her baptism day. Larry was to have baptized Christine, but her other brothers "egged" him to hold her under the water--"and so he threatened that he would" (13). Even on the day when Christine would have been as morally, spiritually, and angelically clean as she could ever be, she was still fair
game to be held under by the ones with power over her. The act was so unimportant to Jerold that he cannot even recall the incident. To Wayne, it was only "kidding." Christine, however, had been so frightened that she refused to be baptized by Larry, making her father do it instead (33).

During the long last scene of the play, Chris turns once more to her father. With her mother safely asleep in bed, she is at last able to use some of her angelic manipulative powers to help her father forgive himself and come out of the hell of his memories and come to terms with each of his sons. She has found a man who needs her, and becomes once again Daddy's "little girl" (94). When her boyfriend calls again she tells him that "I want to be with my family while I'm here. Just with them" (102). She then picks up the book Anna Karenina and begins to read about happy families. Her mother has come into the room, and her brothers explain how Chris has revived the dying African violet that her mother has almost killed by lack of attention. Chris is once again an apprentice angel.

Mildred, describing her nap as if she had died, says, "My headache's gone...I'm quite at peace....Somehow the strain has lifted" (103). Christina has finally harnessed her monster energies for the good of the household, and revived the family. The play ends as Arthur receives his blessing after carefully arranging his family: "And you sit next to me, Mother. You and Chris. Now the three of you [priesthood holders] stand behind me. Close together"
(105). The men then discuss which of them will do what part of the ordinance. In the end, the "ritual" (x1) that brings about the "reunion" physically unites the family yet once more separates the active men from the passive women.

Arthur directs, the sons bless, and the women "stand by," silent. One hopes that Arthur meant that his wife and daughter would support him with their faith, as his sons do, although Wayne has earlier disparaged his mother's power to aid Arthur in just such a way.

In the end, Chris is quiet and stilled. Her dance was self-destructive, and she finds peace only in returning to her childhood powerlessness. Though the play hints that she will be rewarded with Phil's love, she cannot accept it, because she would be breaking up an engagement, a family in the making, something she has told Wayne she will not encourage (23). Nor did she press her lover to break up with his family. In symbolic terms, Chris has been offered Cinderella's beautiful glass dancing slipper to try on. But the cultural roles that on the surface are so pleasing have proved too small for her feet. Like the wicked sisters of the tale, she has cut portions of her foot off to try to fit the shoe, but the prince noticed the bloody footprints and rejected her. She is now left diminished in the house of her father, waiting upon others.
Conclusion

A feminist literary critical analysis of *Saturday's Warrior* and *Reunion* reveals that though both plays intended to present women in a positive light, both the "home literature" style play and the "artistically challenging" play portray female characters stereotypically as subordinate and self-destructive. These women do not serve out of genuine compassion and love, but out of forced obedience to a suppressive cultural pattern.

The underlying message of *Saturday's Warrior* is definitely less positive than the testimony building, Church validating image for which it is revered. Like a monster behind the angel facade is the message that a woman's role is to be happily subservient, and if she fulfills that destiny all will be well in Zion. Likewise, the message of *Reunion* is that LDS women believe the message taught by *Warrior*, and try to fulfill their culturally endorsed roles to the detriment of both themselves and their families. As Gilbert and Gubar said, "It is debilitating to be any woman in a society where women are warned that if they do not behave like angels they must be monsters" (53). It must also be debilitating to the men. *Warrior's* simplistic message that women are created only to serve men ignores other consequences of female passivity: date rape; wife abuse; depression; some eating disorders and other health issues; problems adjusting to life past children or deceased spouse, etc. Yet this
message will persist as long as LDS artists or audiences mistake sentimental feelings for true spiritual insights, or continue to place left-over Victorian culture above inspired truths. To do either closes us off from the real progress achievable by both men and women under the guidance of the gospel.
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ABSTRACT

Saturday's Women traces the influence of two styles of LDS literature--"home literature" and a more artistically challenging literature--on the LDS theatre. The study then differentiates between LDS doctrinal and LDS cultural images of women.

Using theories of feminist criticism as explained by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, the study concludes that both Saturday's Warrior, a "home literature" style play, and Reunion, a more artistically challenging play, reflect repressive cultural images of women. Both plays cast female characters into the roles of passive Angel, domestic Angel/Monster, and active Monster.
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