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Editor’s Note

Four years ago, this journal was created by the graduate students at California State University, Long Beach in hopes that it would display the inspiring and progressive voices of students in our program and others like it. With this volume, I think we have exceeded our original goal. The overwhelming response we received to our call for papers, from campuses around the world, affirms the caliber of our project as a platform for scholarly research among graduate students.

This year, in particular, we emphasize interdisciplinary communication through research in topics as diverse as religious movements, digital rhetoric, proto-environmentalism, and the dialectics of self, as well as the study a wide range of works from Virginia Woolfe to the Terminator films and John Webster to the hibakusha. I hope that you will experience the same excitement I have as you read through these unique voices.

While I would like to write as little as possible so the contributors can speak for themselves, it would be glaringly inappropriate if I did not take some space to thank the many people who have dedicated themselves to this project. In particular, thank you to Melanie Buckowski, whose diligence and calming aura have saved me in moments of near-panic. I would also like to acknowledge the entire staff of Watermark 2010 for their invaluable comments and hard work; thank you as well to Benjamin Blanchard who created the work of art that you see on this cover. Equally invaluable is the support of Dr. George Hart—this journal simply would not exist without his guidance and dedication to the students involved in its creation. We also appreciate the assistance and encouragement of Dr. Eileen Klink, Lisa Behrendt, Courtney Isbell and all of the faculty and staff of the English Department at CSULB. Finally, I must thank my partner in everything, Jeffrey Douglas, who helped with the layout and design of this issue, as well as the maintenance of my mental well-being.

Geri Lawson
Editor
The interest in the concept of self, our ways of understanding who we are and what we are about, has played a significant role in literature in the past centuries, and perhaps especially in the twentieth century. In modernist fiction, the idea of the authentic self, a concept reminiscent of romanticism with its emphasis on uniqueness, interiority and autonomy, holds a prominent position. However, the devastation caused by World War I generated a clash with the traditional nineteenth century confidence in rationality, progress and the origin of self. Hence, modernists question the existence of a core identity and yet they remain believers in the notion of a true, essential self. In Postmodern novels, on the contrary, the notion of an authentic self is
rejected and deconstructed. With the dissolution of absolute ideas like reality, meaning, and the essential self, these novels show how identity is nothing but an artificial construct, which is directed by others, by institutions, power-systems, cultural traditions, and language. Although the modernist conception of self reached its zenith in the early twentieth century, it can be argued that this view remains alive in postmodern fiction. This essay will explore how the dialectic between the modernist and postmodernist conception of self is expressed in the breakthrough novels of two of America’s greatest postmodern writers, Don DeLillo and Paul Auster. While the novels differ from each other in many respects—DeLillo’s domestic drama *White Noise* is a traditional novel in terms of structure whereas Auster’s *City of Glass* appears as a mystery novel but turns out to be genre defying—they both offer some of the sharpest reflections available on postmodern identity. Under the conditions set by the meaninglessness of postmodern society, Auster and DeLillo’s protagonists both set out on a quest for meaning, a quest that is primarily a desperate search for their authentic selves.

*White Noise*

In *White Noise*, DeLillo delineates a world that is completely controlled by media and its endless flow of information, a world that leaves the novel’s protagonist, Jack Gladney, in a state of both curious excitement and profound alienation. Critics have noted that the universe depicted in *White Noise*, with its focus on the way in which we are influenced by media, offers a depiction of the postmodern universe that is strikingly similar to that described by Jean Baudrillard in his theoretical writings on information and media (Wilcox 346). Both the Baudrillardian world and the world depicted in *White Noise* are characterized by a collapse of reality and an endless flow of signifiers emanating from the media. In this media-saturated world common to Baudrillard and DeLillo, images and codes eventually replace reality, thus threatening the very concept of meaning.
According to Baudrillard, the replacement of an older modernist world with an increasingly simulative and nonreferential postmodern society has lead to fundamental changes in the way we perceive ourselves. The modernist understanding of self includes a distinction between exterior (or public) and interior (or private) spaces, and, as the interior space separates the individual from others, the modernist experience is characterized by a feeling of alienation and anxiety. However, “something has changed,” Baudrillard claims, and the older order “gives way to the ‘proteinic’ era of networks, to the narcissistic and protean era of connections, contact, contiguity, feedback and generalized interface that goes with the universe of communication” (127). This modernist distinction between alienation and inner autonomous self is disappearing in the new era, and as a result “[w]e are no longer a part of the drama of alienation; we live in the ecstasy of communication” (Baudrillard 130). Unlike the modernist experience of alienation, which confirms the existence of an inner autonomous self, this new feeling of ecstasy attests to the “extermination of interstitial and protective spaces” (130-131). In other words, Baudrillard asserts that in postmodern society the individual is deprived of its secrets and repressions by mass media and this leads, eventually, to the hollowing out and dispersal of self.

Likewise, White Noise is concerned with the emergence of a new understanding of self as the postmodern era replaces the modernist order. As Stephen N. doCarmo notes, White Noise is a novel filled with characters who are caught between two alluring impulses; they search for autonomy and individuality, feeling alienated by and skeptical about postmodern society, and yet they are attracted to absorption and dispersal of the self into larger power systems such as media, shopping malls, and cultural traditions (3). Most obviously caught between these two seductive urges is Jack Gladney, DeLillo’s protagonist and the chairman of Hitler Studies at the College-on-the-Hill, who exhibits a
modernist impulse toward authentic selfhood and yet is unconsciously attracted to the postmodern order in which any notion of an essential self is practically erased. He attempts to carry on bravely as an autonomous individual by preserving earlier notions of an authentic and coherent identity, but his modernist urges seem oddly out of place in postmodern society. Hearing his daughter, Steffie, talking in her sleep, Gladney expects that her authentic self—or, in Freudian terms, her unconsciousness harboring her dreams and repressed desires—will be revealed, but instead the words uttered, “Toyota Celica,” symbolize nothing but white noise, that is, the endless background noise from commercials and fragments of television shows that continually interrupts the narrative (DeLillo 154-55). Gladney, the modernist searching for authentic selfhood and meaning, is “ready to search anywhere for signs and hints, imitations of odd comfort” and the words strike him “with the impact of a moment of splendid transcendence” (DeLillo 154, 155). Here we are witnessing the effacement of the modernist distinction between exterior and interior spaces as Steffie’s authentic self is replaced with the white noise surrounding her. She has, in other words, disappeared into Baudrillard’s “ecstasy of communication.”

Literary critic Matthew J. Packer correctly observes that White Noise shows how identity is dominated and constructed by others, by media, cultural traditions, and language (650-51). An example of this is Howard Dunlop, Gladney’s German teacher, who describes how he “turned to meteorology for comfort,” building his world around the weather because “[i]t brought [him] a sense of peace and security [he]’d never experienced. [...] [He] began to come out of [his] shell, to talk to people in the street” (55). Similarly, Gladney is attracted to the postmodern order where the individual is assembled in signs. When he is warned by the chancellor of the university that he has a “tendency to make a feeble presentation of self,” Gladney follows the chancellor’s
advice and changes his appearance by wearing heavy-rimmed glasses with dark lenses and using the name J. A. K. Gladney instead of the more indistinctive Jack Gladney (16-17). Yet Gladney cannot, unlike his German teacher, surrender carelessly to surface and simulacrum, and his modernist desire for authentic selfhood makes him feel that he is “the false character that follows the name around” (17).

No matter how uncomfortable this sign-dominated society makes him feel, Gladney also submits himself to the Baudrillardian world on several occasions, unwittingly letting go of his individuality in the mire of media, technology, and consumerism. When Gladney visits a doctor after his exposure to the toxic material Nyrodene D. during the Airborne Toxic Event, he is asked if he has “been feeling tired,” and in response Gladney wants to know what “people usually say.” Told that “mild fatigue is a popular answer,” he concludes that he “could say exactly that and be convinced in [his] own mind it’s a fair and accurate description” (277). Moreover, Gladney tends to feel uneasy when reminded of his own individuality such as the time he encounters one of his colleagues in a hardware store who tells him that without his glasses and gown, he looks different, is “a different person altogether,” just a “big, harmless, aging, indistinct sort of guy” (83). Thus confronted with his own subjectivity, Gladney suddenly finds himself “in the mood to shop,” and together with his family, he heads for an enormous, ten-story shopping mall (83). Here Gladney shops “with reckless abandon,” giving up his individuality and becoming “one of them, shopping, at last” (84, 83). By engaging in Consumerism, Gladney succeeds in suppressing what seems to be a painful condition of individuality and enters Baudrillard’s world of hyperreality, his self becoming dispersed into larger systems of consumer society and mass media. Symbolically, he keeps seeing himself “unexpectedly in some reflecting surface,” his image appearing “on mirrored columns, in glassware and chrome, on TV monitors in
security rooms” (83, 84). Critics have complained that DeLillo does not succeed in providing his characters with depth, fails to provide an “intrinsic self for his characters,” but, in fact, he shows his readers how the autonomous self may only remain a myth in postmodern society (Billy 273).

Because the modernist ideal is merely an illusion, Laura Barrett concludes that the search for meaning and essential self can only be portrayed as parody and pastiche (109), the latter being described by Fredric Jameson as “the wearing of a stylistic mask, speech in a dead language […] without parody’s ulterior motive, without the satirical impulse, without laughter, without that still latent feeling that there exists something normal compared to which what is being imitated is rather comic” (114). An important aspect of the modernist experience of individuality is the idea of an autonomous and authentic self, a source of vision and illumination, which is often revealed in literature through the so-called epiphany, a moment of spiritual clarity in which true meaning is revealed. In White Noise such moments of autonomous and authentic self are replaced with a Baudrillardian euphoria. Immediately before shooting Willie Mink, the former project manager of the Dylar research group, Gladney finds himself in a state of ecstasy, experiencing an intensified awareness of the world around him and believing that he is suddenly able to grasp the true meaning of life: “I stood inside the room, sensing things, noting the room tone, the dense air. Information rushed toward me, rushed slowly […] I sensed I was part of a network of structures and channels. I knew the precise nature of events. I was moving closer to things in their actual state as I approached a violence, a smashing intensity” (305). However, according to Wilcox Gladney’s ‘epiphany’ is a twisted version of the traditional modernist epiphany because his “perceptions are related in a dry, toneless fashion appropriate to pastiche” (Wilcox 354). Unlike the modernist epiphany, Gladney’s vision does not give him a unique
understanding of his own individuality and true meaning, but he experiences, instead, a loss of self, realizing that life is nothing but networks, and that he is just one small part of these networks: “I understood the neurochemistry of my brain, the meaning of dreams (the waste material of premonitions) [...] I believed everything. I was a Buddhist, a Jain, a Duck River Baptist” (310). By turning moments of vision of the authentic self and meaning into parody and pastiche, as is the case with the dramatic showdown between Gladney and Mink, DeLillo indicates that the modernist vision of autonomous and authentic subjectivity is lost in the postmodern order.

Besides illustrating the exhaustion of the modernist ideal, *White Noise* also offers a serious critique of the postmodern universe. It has been noted by critics that Mink is the embodiment of white noise and serves as the personification of the postmodern world; with his concaved face, unascertainable accent, vaguely ethnic features and loss of memory, Mink’s identity is indefinable (Wilcox 355). Indeed, his self has been fully dispersed by chemicals and media; the words he utters are completely detached from reality and, in fact, he has no language of his own as he is either repeating TV phrases—“The pet under stress may need a prescription diet” (307)—or talking in schizophrenic riddles—“the point of rooms is that they’re inside. No one should go into a room unless he understands this” (306). Wilcox points out that in many ways Mink’s condition is similar to Jameson’s description of the postmodern schizophrenic, who suffers from a linguistic disorder characterized by the “breakdown of the relationship between signifiers” and who “does not have our experience of temporal continuity either, but is condemned to live in a perpetual present” (Jameson 119). One of the side-effects of the Dylar that Mink swallows in order to eliminate his fear of death is indeed a loss of temporal sense, leaving Mink without a past. He experiences all signifiers in the present, and when Gladney says
"plunging aircraft" he folds himself into the recommended crash position; when he whispers "fusillade" Mink runs for cover (309, 311).

While implying that the modernist ideal of an essential self and true meaning may be an illusion, *White Noise* also hints that we nevertheless need this ideal in order to carry on as free and rational beings in the postmodern world. DeLillo’s protagonist is increasingly nonplussed by the postmodern order. The terrifying nature of the simulated world depicted in *White Noise* is most clearly revealed during Gladney’s conversation with a SIMUVAC (short for simulated evacuation) employee. SIMUVAC, an emergency preparedness organization, regularly arranges rehearsals for tackling real disasters, and volunteers (among them Gladney’s daughter Steffie) play injured or dead. However, during the Airborne Toxic Event Gladney finds out that SIMUVAC uses the real event to rehearse and improve future simulations: the SIMUVAC man complains to Gladney that “we don’t have our victims laid out where we’d want them if this was an actual simulation [...] You have to make allowances for the fact that everything we see tonight is real. There’s a lot of polishing we still have to do” (139). Gladney, surprised by the SIMUVAC employee’s statement, finds himself in a state of bewilderment and confusion over this striking irrationality.

Though Gladney is unable to happily submit himself to the postmodern order, he is not left without hope; *White Noise* implies that the individual may be able to experience life as meaningful, but only so long life presupposes an ending, that is to say, death. When Gladney, who exhibits an existential angst of death, asks Winnie Richards, the psychobiologist at the College-on-the-Hill, about Dylar (the drug which is meant to eliminate the fear of death), she argues that “it’s a mistake to loose one’s sense of death, even one’s fear of death. Isn’t death the boundary we need? Doesn’t it give a precious texture to life, a sense of definition? You have to ask yourself whether anything you do in this
life would have beauty and meaning without the knowledge you carry of a final line, a border or limit” (228-29). In a world of simulation, death is the last absolute and unavoidable truth. White Noise implies that the awareness of death is closely related to another issue, that of subjectivity; Winnie Richards describes our knowledge of death as a gift that gives us “a fresh awareness of the self,” letting us “see [ourselves] in a new and intense way” (229). What Dylar, in fact, is meant to erase proves to be the very last remains of a modernist consciousness that gives the individual some sense of meaning and authenticity. Because significant existential moments, such as the fear of death, are rejected by postmodern society, the individual is left with little chance of experiencing meaning and establishing a notion of autonomous selfhood.

For DeLillo, then, the individual’s pursuit of the modernist ideal of an autonomous self and the possibility of true meaning is not merely a negative aspect of human character. The realization of this ideal also entails rationality, hope and development. After the Airborne Toxic Event, Gladney informs us the sunsets over Blacksmith have become “almost unbearably beautiful” as a result of the “drift of effluents, pollutants, contaminants and deliriants” that remain in the air (170). However, these stunning sunsets evoke mixed emotions in the onlookers, and Gladney tells us that “it is hard to know how we should feel about this. Some people are scared by the sunsets, some determined to be elated, but most of us don’t know how to feel, are ready to go either way” (324, emphasis ours). Here we find, as doCarmo points out, White Noise’s ultimate message to its readers (28); Gladney’s reflections on what is also called “postmodern sunsets” may be elaborated to postmodern society in general: we “don’t know” whether to feel “elated” or “scared”; we are left “ready to go either way” (324).

The final pages of White Noise are remarkably open-ended. This lack of narrative closure does not, however, indicate that the novel
is yet another example of the meaninglessness and pastiched depthlessness so often associated with postmodernism. While implying that there is little chance of returning without encountering problems to a modernist awareness, with its possibility of authentic self and true meaning, *White Noise* advocates a postmodernism that holds on to the modernist desire to explore consciousness and selfhood. Wilcox correctly notes that the final image of Gladney strongly suggests that DeLillo hopes to retain some aspects of the modernist sensibility (like the ideal of a rational, autonomous subjectivity), and that he is critical of a simulational and media-dominated society that threatens to bring about the end of authenticity and rationality (363). Gladney’s refusal to be swallowed up by postmodern society is most clearly expressed on the final pages of the novel where he refuses to participate in further analyses of his Nyrodene D. exposure: “Dr. Chakravarty wants to talk to me but I am making it a point to stay away […] He wants to insert me once more in the imaging block, where charged particles collide […] But I am afraid of the imaging block. Afraid of its magnetic fields, its computerized nuclear pulse. Afraid of what it knows about me” (325). DeLillo’s sympathies are not with Willie Mink—that is, *White Noise* does not encourage disappearance into postmodern society—its overreaching voice is that of DeLillo’s protagonist who clings to his fear of death, to his modernist impulses, and his search for true meaning in a society where nothing makes sense.

*City of Glass*

Just like the protagonist of *White Noise* the characters of Paul Auster’s *The New York Trilogy* are also on a modernist search for true meaning and individuality; a search that is explored within the realms of the detective genre. The three novels comprising the trilogy—*City of Glass*, *Ghosts*, and *The Locked Room*—appear to employ the conventional elements of the detective story, but Auster gradually transmutes the
traditional end-dominated detective story and opens up to the world of
the metaphysical detective story, giving rise to a more elusive and
complex quest. What motivates the detective reader is a desire for
meaningful narrative; in other words, the desire for a narrative that
provides an end and a solution. Hence, driven by this desire for
meaning and closure the readers of the trilogy willingly commit to the
quests in the novels, as they are expecting to enter a universe that is
governed by linear structure and the logical notion of progress toward
a desired end. The reader, however, is deluded because in Auster’s
trilogy, subjects and signs are always double and deceptive rather than
self-evident, and the reader is led astray into a world of chaos and non-
solution.

William G. Little points to this lack of solution and closure as the
major theme in *The New York Trilogy*. In his article “Nothing to Go On:
Paul Auster’s *City of Glass,*” Little ascertains that Auster subverts the
goals of detection which is to uncover the mystery and solve the case,
thereby challenging the teleological notion of progress toward a desired
end. Furthermore, Little characterizes the plots of these detective stories
as foiled; that is, Auster prevents the reader and his characters from
attaining the desired end and leads them into nothing (Little 133-34).
Examples of the negation of closure and meaning can be extracted
everywhere from the novels. The protagonist Daniel Quinn and Peter
Stillman’s interminable wanderings in *City of Glass* clearly mirror a
search for meaning and solution, in which the random objects and clues
that are found reveal nothing of the case and simply add to nothing.
Likewise, in Auster’s novels life is depicted as being “no more than the
sum of contingent facts, a chronicle of chance intersections, of flukes, of
random events that divulge nothing but their own lack of purpose” (*The New York Trilogy* 256). However, the theme of
nothingness and meaninglessness is most importantly displayed in the
fact that we follow a writer-turned-detective or detective-turned-writer,
who find themselves decoyed into a quest that does not lead to any climatic discovery or closure as anticipated. This quest reflects the modernist pursuit for meaning and identity, a quest that results in nothing but the perpetual deferral of meaning.

Auster’s novels can thus be read as a response to the belief in meaning, absolute truths, and an autonomous self that is ascribed to modernism. The transmutation of the conventional detective quest into a quest that denies closure and grants nothing, leaves the reader with a postmodernist version of the detective genre. Here reality becomes increasingly ungraspable and the solution to the puzzle is either continuously deferred or non-existent. In this context the trilogy represents a postmodern world order that has replaced the modernist world order dominated by the idea of true meaning and autonomous selfhood. Moreover, it can be argued that Auster’s novels signal a rejection of the fundamental modernist beliefs. This interpretation joins the assertion of many critics that Auster’s work is a deconstructive investigation of truth and meaning, which operates to illustrate the repressive effects of modernist beliefs that claim to be able to arrive at the truth and to gain absolute knowledge (Little 134). However, this does not necessarily affirm that Auster’s novels are a warm embrace of postmodernism; they also function as examples of the conflicts of identity that exist in the postmodern age.

While the search for meaning and identity is an essential preoccupation in all three novels of the trilogy, the first novel, *City of Glass*, perhaps attests to this search with the most intensity and clarity. In this novel, the detective’s quest is overtly and inextricably intertwined with a search for meaning and identity based on modernist and postmodern impulses. Auster’s engagement with the metaphysical detective quest in *City of Glass* is closely linked to another issue, that of identity.

In postmodern society the idea of an authoritative self has
been replaced by a perception of self as fragmented, unstable, and contradictory; a perception that can be seen in relation to the poststructuralist understanding of the subject as constituted and existing of multiple and oppositional subjectivities (Sarup 34). Jacques Lacan adheres to this understanding of self in his writings where he prioritises the fragmented subject based on a shifting and uncertain self. In contrast to ego-psychologists who believe in an autonomous self, this idea of a unitary subject is unthinkable in Lacan’s work and perceived as mythical and illusory. Instead, Lacan’s theories emphasize language acquisition as the primary process through which the formation of the subject occurs. An awareness of oneself as a distinct entity is thus conditioned by the subject’s acquisition and use of language.¹ The understanding of self as fragmented and that of language as the precondition for the production of subjectivity are exhibited in many of the characters of *City of Glass*. However, most obviously representative of this postmodern identity is the protagonist Daniel Quinn. After the loss of his wife and child, Quinn struggles to redefine his true identity and regain meaning through a pursuit for the mysterious linguist Peter Stillman.

Before the death of his family Quinn was a poet, a writer very close to his own words. When becoming a writer of mystery novels, he lost control of his words, speaking only through the narrator of his detective fiction. At the prompting of a wrong number, Quinn impersonates the supposed detective Paul Auster, hoping to redefine his identity. He is hired by the Stillmans to save the young Peter Stillman from his father, Peter Stillman (senior). Quinn’s goal as a detective is to establish the intentions and identity of the elder Peter Stillman and thereby hinder a possible murder attempt on the young Peter Stillman. However, Quinn’s investigation advances into an obsessive search for meaning and selfhood. This quest for identity and meaning is identified by Alison Russell as inextricably linked to the
quest for correspondence between signifier and signified (72). In the postmodern world signifiers have drifted away from what they signify, that is, clues no longer point to anything certain. As Quinn is tailing the older Stillman through the streets of New York, he tries to decipher Stillman’s behavior by noting down his every move in a red notebook. Through his writings Quinn seeks to obtain some kind of meaning in Stillman’s behavior, and he seems to have regained closeness to his own words. However, the clues in the red notebook do not provide any solution to Stillman’s mystery; in rereading the red notebook Quinn discovers that he has often “written two or even three lines on top of each other, producing a jumbled, illegible palimpsest” (City of Glass 76). Although Quinn’s own words fail to produce an absolute meaning, he still continues his search for meaning. Writing in the red notebook becomes an obsessive action that reveals Quinn’s desperate need to find meaning and realize his own self. This leads him to finally appear as totally conditioned by his writings in the red notebook; when he has reached the last page, he himself can no longer exist. In other words, the relationship to language is of such importance in City of Glass that, as also noted by Russell, “characters ‘die’ when their signifiers are omitted from the printed page” (75). Affirming Lacan’s understanding of language as the precondition for the formation of the subject, Auster’s protagonist seeks identity through his written language; Quinn’s awareness of his own self is achieved through his use of language.

Quinn’s search for meaning through language also reveals his modernist impulses. Comparable to Jack Gladney, Quinn too is trapped between two alluring impulses: On the one hand, he displays a modernist urge to gain meaning and attain absolute truth, and on the other hand, he is attracted to the dispersal of self in postmodern society. Quinn’s modernist urges arise from the decentring deterioration of his world after the death of his wife and son. He is experiencing a
profound sense of loss of the rationally ordered world he once lived in and seeks refuge from the chaos surrounding him not only through his writings, but also in the mystery novels he is so obviously devoted to: “he had little trouble reading ten or twelve of them in a row. It was a kind of hunger that took hold of him, a craving for a special food” (Auster 9). The linear structure of the traditional detective story and the fact that nothing goes to waste but adds to a whole, is a concept that appeals to Quinn: “What he liked about these books was their sense of plenitude and economy. In the good mystery there is nothing wasted, no sentence, no word that is not significant. [...] Everything becomes essence” (Auster, 9). Quinn is seduced by the teleological notion of beginning and end—a construct that reassures him of closure and of not roaming around in a wasteland of ambiguous signs unable to find resolution. Ironically, the mystery within City of Glass is not representative of these conventional detective stories that absorb Quinn. Therefore, his devotion to these books comes across as parody as Quinn’s own investigation is delineated as a ceaseless straying amongst signs and fragmented clues that do not come together and form a whole but result in nothing. Furthermore, Quinn is drawn to the identity of the detective; a person who can “pull all these things together and make sense of them [...] because of the attentiveness he brings to them, they might begin to carry a meaning other than the simple fact of their existence” (9). The identity of the detective as it is displayed here connotes the modernist idea of a character that is able to gain meaning from his search, and thus Quinn’s attraction to this character also verifies his modernist urges. As indicated, Auster has constructed quite a complex character in Daniel Quinn. While seeking to realize his modernist impulses Quinn assumes the identity of others, creating a paradoxical character that explores his modernist desires through a postmodern fragmented identity. Anne Marit K. Berge explains that Auster’s play with identities is crucial in order to
understand the quest for meaning and identity in *The New York Trilogy*. The linkage between each main character and their parallel identities has an essential function because the characters strive to form and redefine their identity through the relations with others. According to Berge, a stronger sense of meaning, which can be achieved through a secure identity and meaningful relations with others, will strengthen the feeling of identity (103-4). This theory can be applied to Quinn who seeks meaning and individuality through the identity of others. In the beginning of the novel Quinn’s attraction to the postmodern fragmented self is clearly revealed as he literally oscillates between three distinct identities. As a writer of detective fiction Quinn has taken on the pseudonym of William Wilson (ironically named after the narrator of an Edgar Allan Poe story about doppelgangers). Furthermore, the detective narrator of Quinn’s mystery novels, Max Work, is a character he strongly identifies with: “Work had become presence in Quinn’s life, his interior brother, his comrade in solitude […] Quinn wanted to be Work, or even to be like him” (7, 10). Work is Quinn’s “private ‘I’” (9). Here Auster has created a role assignment that could have taken place in a marionette theatre with Wilson as the ventriloquist, Quinn as the dummy, and finally Work as the animated voice that brings life to the show. Quinn is obviously drawn to his fictional characters, and it seems as if the more fictitious the characters, the more real their identities appear to him. These characters function as a motivation for Quinn’s own being; they appear stronger and more real to Quinn than his own existential self, and as he himself professes, they give “purpose to the enterprise” (6).

This role-play is a strong illustration of the postmodern fragmented self, which is composed of multiple subjects and acknowledges the notion of a constantly shifting and uncertain identity. However, Quinn’s oscillation between his own self, two fictitious characters, and eventually Paul Auster is not only an affirmation of the
postmodern and Lacanian assertion that the unitary self is an illusion. Via Quinn’s extreme role-play, Auster also recognizes the conflicts of identity that are caused by the presence of the existential doubt inherent in postmodern society. Despite the feeling of a real and secure identity that Quinn experiences through this triad of selves, this masquerade leads his real self to a very complex and fragmented state. In addition, the confirmation of individuality that Quinn receives through his role-play is ambiguous because it eventually leads to dissolution of his real self.

The complexity of Quinn’s character is taken a step further when he assumes the identity of Paul Auster in order to solve the Stillman case. The adoption of Paul Auster’s detective identity puts Quinn in a state of absorption; he identifies so strongly with the role of the good detective that he looses more and more of himself. Whereas the identity of Gladney in White Noise becomes dispersed by his attraction to the postmodern world of simulation, media and consumerism, it can be argued that Quinn’s dispersal of self is caused by simulating the identity of others. In the world of White Noise simulation has become the ground of the real, likewise Quinn’s simulated personifications become more authentic than his own real self. Both Gladney and Quinn attest to a disintegration of self that is a consequence of the postmodern tendency to simulate.

Bit by bit Quinn experiences a loss of self in consequence of his role-play, and when he realizes that Paul Auster, the detective, is in fact a writer like himself, his image is torn, and the state of his self is aggravated. Quinn’s identification as a detective falls apart, and he turns toward a state of selflessness and indifference: “Now, as he looked at himself in the shop mirror [...] he did not recognize the person he saw there as himself” (142). Ironically, Quinn actually appears to be subject to an epiphany of identity. After seeing his own mirror image, he experiences “a sparkling of light and shade” that
strikes him “as miraculous and beautiful” (143). This moment is described in a spiritual and euphoric manner very close to the way in which a modernist epiphany is characterized. Similar to Gladney’s moment of epiphany Quinn’s experience does not give him an elevated moment of profound spiritual clarity, nor a revelation of essential meaning. Instead, Quinn acknowledges his own loss of self through this vision of illumination. Moreover, Quinn’s epiphany is described in a parodic manner, reflecting Quinn’s ignorance about his own self at the time: “He looked at this new Quinn and shrugged. It did not really matter. He had been one thing before, and now he was another. It was neither better nor worse” (143). Again, Auster prevents Quinn and the readers from attaining a revelation of meaning and instead mocks the modernist epiphany, revealing a critical outlook on the modernist vision of autonomous self and essential meaning.

Stillman’s disappearance leads Quinn to his final attempt of redefining his real self. Quinn seems to adopt the role of Stillman by obsessively continuing to regain meaning through language. Stillman, who is on a quest to discover the origin of language, can be characterized as the ultimate modernist. His ascetic project of saving the world by recovering the prelapsarian language aims at giving back the signifier its signified, and thus regain a reliable reading of the world—a project that is doomed to failure in the postmodern non-referential world. Wandering through the streets of New York, providing any piece of rubbish with a proper name, Stillman’s state of self can be characterized as mad-like. His modernist search does not lead him to the origin of language but to disappearance and supposedly suicide. With the last remaining hope of attaining some form of identity and meaning, Quinn continues Stillman’s language project, which drives him into to a state of madness. As he is stowed away in a garbage can, looking up at the clouds, “studying them, trying to learn their ways, seeing if he could not predict what would happen
to them,” Quinn, like Stillman, is portrayed as a madman (140). This state of self is worsened, and eventually Quinn only exists to express words. Lying in the Stillman apartment obsessively noting down in the red notebook “no longer [having] any interest in himself,” he is almost dissolved and on the verge of disappearing into nothingness (156). The words he so compulsively writes down have “been severed from him” and “no longer [have] anything to do with him” (156). Quinn’s final disappearance from the novel leaves us with a feeling of ambiguity. On the one hand, by letting Quinn’s final role-play lead him to a total dispersal of self, Auster’s concluding characterization of Quinn provides quite a critical perspective on the postmodern identity. On the other hand, Auster takes a critical standpoint toward modernism by allowing his character to fully disintegrate on the basis of his modernist impulses.

Indeed, throughout City of Glass Auster exposes a critical perspective on both postmodern identity and modernist ideals. It seems, however, that Auster principally adheres to a radical skepticism toward modernism. In City of Glass and in the other works of the trilogy it appears that the act of seeking for absolute knowledge and final solutions is a form of madness. The effects of Quinn’s search for meaning are fearful. In the end it destroys everything human, all connection, all community, and life itself. Not only does Auster promote his skepticism by letting his protagonist reduce himself to nothing through his search for meaning; in allowing the third person narrator of City of Glass to interrupt the narrative in the end of the novel by suddenly claiming authorship of the text as a first person narrator, Auster undermines any possibility of solution and truth. Leaving the reader in a state of nothingness, this critical perspective on modernism is emphasized. The assertion that Auster exhibits a notable skepticism toward the modernist claim that it is possible to arrive at the truth is furthermore supported by his discussion of Hunger by Knut
Hamsun. Here, Auster suggests that a true understanding of the postmodern condition “begins with the knowledge that there are no right answers” (Art of Hunger 13). Essentially, Auster criticizes the modernist ideal of autonomous self and absolute truth as a repressive influence that forces the individual on a perpetual quest for meaning and identity, a quest that in a postmodern universe will eventually lead to madness and, finally, obliteration.

Auster stresses that the realization of the modernist role model functions as a hindrance because the individual is compelled to search for a condition that is unattainable in the postmodern world. DeLillo, on the other hand, seems to be stressing the importance of retaining a fraction of the modernist ideal, implying that the desire for authentic self and ultimate meaning may function as a kind of road sign that shows the direction for survival in a seemingly meaningless world. It could be argued that either Auster’s criticism of modernist impulses or DeLillo’s emphasis on the importance of a modernist awareness put postmodern identity in the right perspective, but such a conclusion overlooks the essential value of White Noise and City of Glass. Together these novels attest to one of the crucial problems of postmodern fiction: the tension between the idea of the authentic self and the lack of its realization. This dialectic of idea and realization remains without the possibility of synthesis. As readers we are thus left with Auster’s perception that “there are no right answers”, and it becomes irrelevant to discuss whether Auster or DeLillo’s depiction of postmodern identity is correct. Postmodern fiction should not be read through a firm adherence to the belief that there exists only one possible solution. We should, instead, be “ready to go either way.” Admitting to the dialectic inherent in postmodern identity, that is, not continuously struggling to deconstruct it, may well prove the best way of understanding the complex nature of the postmodern self.

Notes
1. See Lacan’s Ecrits: A Selection for further discussion of his theories of the fragmented
subject and his notion of language as the precondition for subjectivity.
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MYSTORYING: EXTOLLING THE POSSIBILITIES OF ELECTRIFYING COMPOSITION THROUGH AN UNKNOWN BECOMING

by Luis Orozco

Luis Orozco is currently completing his English Master of Arts Degree at California State University, Long Beach. His main academic interests are in rhetoric and composition, especially in new and alternative ways to write and compose.

“Mystery does for postmodern persons what allegory did for medieval persons: allows them to locate their position in the popcycle of their epoch.”

—Gregory L. Ulmer, Internet Invention

“The only evil is to regard potentiality itself, which is the most proper mode of human existence, as a fault that must always be repressed.”

—Giorgio Agamben, The Coming Community

My mystery is mystorying. In its mystorying, it carries out the potentialities of an electronic world just as Martin Heidegger observes that by “thinging, things carry out world” (1128). Even though it may have no audible sound, the mystery’s mystorying is not silent, but becomes a “manifold enunciating” (1126) that speaks through the collage and juxtaposition of images, text, sound, and hyperlinks in an electrical performance—a performance that privileges heuretics over...
hermeneutics. By mystorying, the mystery animates itself, becoming, pulsing, exploding into an act of creation—a heuretical Big Bang.

Instead of hermeneutics, which Gregory Ulmer explains in *Internet Invention: From Literacy to Electracy* as the “use [of] theory to interpret existing works,” heuretics is utilized for the “invent[ion of] forms and practices” in the mystery (4). In other words, heuretics emphasizes “invention, production, [and] generation” (81) as opposed to analysis and interpretation, breaking with the modes most commonly used in traditional literacy which value hermeneutics. Thinking and acting heuretically is important because, as Lisa Gye attests in “Halflives, A Mystery: Writing Hypertext to Learn,” heuretics “tak[es] into account the full potential of literacy as it converges with a new apparatus,” an emerging apparatus that Ulmer calls electracy.

While heuretics may sound new, Michael Jarrett contends that heuretics is a concept with origins in theology from the Middle Ages that was forgotten, probably since heuretics “generated the sneaking suspicion that ‘readings’ were not recovered; they were made—made from the text.” Jarrett argues that heuretical thinking was dangerous and heretical to an ultra-religious society, especially if applied to the Bible, which explains why heuretics was abandoned. Nevertheless, heuretics needs to be popularized in today’s society, especially since heuretics is important to new media. After all, heuretics is ideally suited to new media’s visual, aural, and auditory capabilities, given that images, text, video, and sound can be put together and juxtaposed to create meaning. Since heuretics emphasizes invention and creativity, the possibilities for writing and composition result in endless new creations.

Seeing the power in heuretical logic, Ulmer creates a new way of writing and composing for electracy: the mystery. In *Text Book: Writing through Literature*, Robert Scholes, Nancy R. Comley, and
Gregory L. Ulmer describe the mystery as a “cognitive map by means of which one locates one’s position within the ‘popcycle’—the set of institutions and their discourses that construct one’s identity” (246) and as an approach to learning that stems from “a desire to know, rather than from the side of knowledge as information” (247). The mystery consists mainly of four discourses: career, family, entertainment, and history (community and school). A mystoriographer can begin within any of these four discourses by examining an important image, song, film, memory, person, etc. belonging to any one of these discourses and then making lateral connections with other things and/or discourses. The mystoriographer, then, uses the space for the mystery as a chora for creation.

Instead of taking a theory, an image, or a text and analyzing it, the mystery takes the theory, the image, and the text together and recontextualizes them in a new setting that creates meaning through this new contextualization. As Gye claims, “the mystoriographer is not concerned with getting to the bottom of things […], but rather in seeing the possibility of connections between things.” This is an important aspect of the mystery since it does not limit the extent and number of connections in the electrate composition, connections that have the potential to create new understandings that arise while working heuretically. Additionally, this method does not penalize the “mystoriographer” for making connections that at first glance might seem irrelevant but that can reveal several layers of meaning. In the mystery, an irrelevant piece might be central to the composition as it adds a further dimension of complexity. In this manner, the mystery not only disseminates findings in a new manner that is relevant to electronic environments, but it also has the potential to create knowledge in its becoming—becoming as a mystery and becoming as an apparatus of electry.

In an academic setting, the mystery is essential because it
emphasizes student inventiveness as opposed to student passivity and the regurgitation of ideas. In mystorying, the student breaks from a passive role and into an active one that demands the potentiality of the student and the potentiality of various connections, which may lead to new modes of thinking and new knowledge more readily than in a traditional essay (where students are confined to linear arguments that do not incorporate video, images, or audio). The traditional essay, after all, does not support free thinking, but constrains it; the traditional essay restrains thinking in a struggle that is often hidden behind the prose on the page. The traditional essay “close[s] discourse down” through its linearity and by “let[ting] the conclusion dictate [...] thinking” (Gye). Conversely, the mystory frees thinking and writing as a person “writes with the whole page, so to speak—text, picture, layout” (Ulmer 2) while “juxtapos[ing] the products of [...] different discourses in one composition” (246). In this inventive mode, students are freed from having to adhere strictly to any method of argumentation, especially since the “mystory has no innate form of its own” (248), an important characteristic that opens the passage to creative and inventive channels.

Arguing for the mystory as a relevant and important form of knowledge-creation and composition, however, is not enough to prove the mystery’s benefits for thinking, writing, and composing using new media and the electrate apparatus; because of this, I have created my own mystory, and I encourage readers to visit my mystory at http://sites.google.com/site/mystorying/ concurrently or after reading this essay. Additionally, I will only reflect on a few of my discourses, and I encourage readers to make their own connections, thereby adding to the becoming of my mystory.

As I reflect on the mystory, the most exciting parts are finding and coming up with connections, as well as not knowing where those connections might lead. The “mystery” of the mystery intrigued me, as
well as facilitated connections between images, text, music, and discourses since I could let my thoughts float instead of shackling them via the structure of a single argument. Instead of an essay where I would have to cover certain aspects of my topic in order to support my claims, (thereby limiting the potentiality of my writing and cognitive skills) the mystery encouraged me (and continues to encourage me) to investigate any tangential discourses that arise while creating the mystery and thinking about the various discourses that comprise the mystery. In this way, the mystery “allows for the idiosyncratic generation of knowledge in ways that are meaningful for the learner” (Gye). Whatever is generated may seem idiosyncratic, but is nonetheless tied together by the arching themes present in the mystery and in the person making the mystery (whether the person is conscious of them or not). A side effect of the mystery’s meaning/fullness is to encourage people to enjoy conducting research and to enjoy creating knowledge in a relevant manner, thereby pushing the potentialities of the electrate apparatus and stretching the possibilities of the mind; this is especially the case when it comes to writing and composing in electry. Additionally, the mystery is not only meaning/full to the creator/learner, but it is also meaning/full for the viewer (more so than an essay where everything is dictated to the reader) in its “becoming,” as I will further demonstrate in my reflection of certain parts of my mystery.

In my experience, the mystery allowed my thoughts to flow barrier-free as, through introspection and research, I discovered connections between seemingly disparate theories, images, texts, and discourses—something that might not be possible while writing a traditional essay. For instance, under “The Real Madame,” I juxtapose a quotation from Jean Baudrillard’s “The Precession of Simulacra” and a video of a “Japanese” woman in a Madame Butterfly movie. This juxtaposition of text and video reveals that the “Japanese” woman is
not Japanese at all, but an actress pretending to be Japanese; in other words, she is an imitation. However, she is not an imitation of something “real,” but an imitation of an imitation—a simulacrum that reveals the emptiness behind not only the figure, but also the stereotypes of being “Japanese,” and more broadly, Asian women.

Because of the collage and juxtaposition that is a part of the mystery, the theory of the simulacra can be further applied to other aspects of “The Real Madame” composition. For example, in the space between the quotation and the video of a “Japanese” woman, a critique of culture and people’s understandings of culture arises. While many people might believe that culture is something particular and real that can be codified a la Claude Lévi-Strauss, instead, culture escapes structuralism, alluding not to what is real, but only to what people take as real; this, in turn, deconstructs identity from a definitive “being” to a “whatever being” that Giorgio Agamben claims forms part of the coming world community (1). Whatever being reclaims being “not for another class […] but for its being-such, for belonging itself” (2), and the “The Real Madame” provides an examination of this emerging form of being and belonging.

The video of a “Japanese” woman (and the dialogue therein) also encompasses issues of performance, gender, and feminism by provoking the following questions: What does it mean to act/be/become “Japanese?” What does it mean to act like/be/become a woman? What are the assumptions? What are the expectations? What are the consequences? While I do not expect a viewer of my mystery to see or understand all of these connections, the mystery allows for the presence of all of these discourses, letting the complexities of several larger contexts arise without providing a concluding “truth”—a “being” that ends all discourse. On the contrary, the mystery creates and encourages discourse through its juxtapositions. More importantly, the mystery complicates the notion that people, concepts, or ideas exist
in isolation; it reveals that anything is part of much larger discourses that interconnect (in my example) race, gender, theories of community, performance, and feminism.

An interesting link that arose while creating the mystery is one between “The Real Madame” and “IQ Testing.” Although I had not thought about linking the two ideas/webpages, Darren Tofts and Lisa Gye in Illogic of Sense: The Gregory L. Ulmer Remix claim that the “[a]ssociation and the audacious conduction of [the mystery’s] threads guide the creative act as an ongoing process of discovery and assemblage.” Because the mystery allows for this, I was able to connect the two discourses, even when in a traditional essay, such a connection would have been impossible, confusing, or off-topic. In my mystery, however, the connection is not off-topic, but alludes to the simulacra of IQ testing results and to what it means to be/become intelligent. The connection also questions the validity of test results as truth and clear measurements of cognitive skills (all without the need for hermeneutic explanations). Furthermore, the cartoon and the music video not only highlight the mood of the “IQ Testing” page, but also critique the values of a society that promotes standardized testing as a measurement of achievement and cognitive capabilities. Interestingly, another connection that I had not thought about while selecting the music to accompany this page of the mystery is that the music video on the “IQ Testing” page is by Nirvana. Nirvana, in itself, is a Buddhist concept, which ties into other parts of the mystery about becoming and the Buddhist concept of dependant arising. It seems that my thought process was making connections without consciously thinking about these connections, but such is the power and potential of the mystery’s becoming.

After completing further exploration into discourses of the mystery, I noticed that there was a recurrent theme, or wide image. The wide image is one of the most important aspects of the mystery.
Ulmer contends that the wide image “is an embodiment of themes or ‘themata’ (abstract orientations) that we propose to locate through mood” (Ulmer 248). Although a more accurate wide image will not emerge “until the end of your career, as expressed in the pattern of lived events and works, whatever they might be” (248), it is still helpful to see a wide image surface earlier in life to further understand a person’s place within and among the various mystory discourses and, more broadly, society. After all, Ulmer contends that “part of finding our own ‘compass’ or wide image involves locating the default mood of our own society and culture” (52).

Throughout the discourses of community/school, entertainment, family, and career, for example, the being and becoming theme recurred as a pattern, framing the many discourses. However, what I later noticed was not that being and becoming were recurring, but that becoming could not be avoided in my discourses (similar to how the concept of becoming has pervaded this essay). In essence, my becoming is a reaction against stasis, a reaction against labeling, shattering the image of a static, unchanging self. Pondering how to represent the becoming not only of the mystory, but also of myself, I discovered the ensō (the Zen circle). The ensō is never just a circle; it is a becoming and is ever-changing. Even when the same person returns to the same point on the ensō, or, more broadly, in life, as Gilles Deleuze argues in Pure Immanence: Essays on A Life, “[i]t is not the same that comes back, since the coming back is the original form of the same, which is said only of the diverse, the multiple, becoming. The same doesn’t come back; only the coming back is the same” (87); this is the image and the mood that I hope to evoke with my mystory’s homepage. I do not want my “home” to be the beginning, but always already a middle in the process of becoming. Even if a person returns to the same place on my mystory, the viewer’s experience with and reaction to that place will be different. The ensō, then, encompasses my discourses beautifully, as if I had been
following this image all along.

The wide image is an important part of the mystery; nevertheless, it is not the most important part. The most significant part of the mystery is the process of mystorying—the becoming. In mystorying, the mystoriographer begins a search through various discourses that does not end with enlightenment, but continues and is recognized by multiple enlightenments. As Deleuze argues, “[m]ultiplicity is affirmed as multiplicity; becoming is affirmed as becoming. That is to say at once that affirmation is itself a multiple” (85). In other words becoming occurs all of the time throughout the mystery just as learning and knowledge-creation take place in the process of the mystery. By mystorying, a person does not encounter “truth,” but wisdom—wisdom “that it is not housed at the terminus of the search, but is the environment” (Ulmer 286) and that continues to grow and operate via the connections and becoming of the mystery. In essence, the mystery is an endless learning experience unlike an essay that is completed and possibly never revisited again.

The mystery, then, “position[s] the learner as an active participant in the production of knowledge rather than as a consumer of already decided ‘truths’” (Gye). In this manner, the “mystoriographer” creates knowledge instead of allowing knowledge to dictate the limits of the creation. By criticizing the myth of “truths,” the mystery also shows anyone that knowledge is not static, but continuously created, changed, and recreated—continuously becoming. Just as the mystery is a “cognitive map of its maker’s ‘psychogeography’” (Ulmer 81) that is continuously expanded, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari claim that “becoming […] has neither beginning nor end but only a milieu” (110). In a similar manner, the mystery is never finished and is, from the onset, a middle. Located in the chora of the electrate apparatus, even when it is not touched for a prolonged period of time, the mystery is still becoming, mystorying its potentiality, which (re)animates its becoming.
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When Thomas Carlyle referred in 1831 to the religious culture in England as consisting of “the shrieking of hysterical women, casting out of devils, and other ‘gifts of the Holy Ghost’” (921), he might well have been describing the prevailing Christian community of mid-nineteenth century America. Between the death of Jonathan Edwards in 1758 and the publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe’s sentimental novel *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* in 1852, Christianity in America underwent radical transformation. If, as Carlyle has suggested, “Literature is but a branch of Religion, and always participates in its character” (914), then any attempt to understand the public response to the most popular novel of the nineteenth century—written by the daughter of one of the most famous Calvinist ministers of the period—might merit an examination of Christianity in antebellum America. Although published three years before the date Oliver Wendell Holmes suggested for the sudden “[e]nd of the wonderful one-hoss shay” in his humorous depiction of the demise of
Calvinism, Stowe’s novel reflects nineteenth century rejection of the difficult Calvinist doctrines that characterized early American Christianity. Implicit in her sentimental appeal to end slavery are assumptions reflecting the gradual shift to Arminian theology associated with the rise of revivalism in nineteenth century America.

That *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was the most popular novel of the nineteenth century is clear; the reason for its success is more enigmatic. In the United States, the novel received credit for rendering the Fugitive Slave Law unenforceable; in France, it renewed enthusiasm for Bible study. In England, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* inspired 6,000 women to fill twenty-six volumes with signatures endorsing an anti-slavery address to the Christian women of America (Adams 112). Oddly, initial response to Stowe’s novel was positive both in the North and the South. The scathing anti-slavery message that is so obvious to modern readers worked more subtly with its nineteenth century audience. In 1905 Seth Curtis Beach noted that Stowe’s Southern readers did not at first perceive the novel’s virulent attack on the system of slavery: “It was not till the sale of the book had run to over 100,000 copies that a reaction set in” (241). Southern reaction to the novel seemed slow, but once the book’s influence became apparent it “was effectively banned in the South” (White 53). Nonetheless, by writing a novel that ultimately sold, according to some estimates, over two million copies, Stowe accomplished what no other American novelist had been able to achieve (Ross 60).

While efforts by critics such as Ann Douglas, Jane Tompkins, and Charles Foster to re-evaluate *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* as a work of literary merit may or may not satisfy modern readers, Stowe’s rhetorical power is indisputable—if elusive. The broad appeal of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* suggests that numerous complex and intertwined factors may have contributed to the work’s success. Although some scholars (Tompkins, Pilditch, Bense, Ducksworth, Meyer, and Nuernberg, for example) have
argued persuasively about the rhetoric of humor or race in Stowe’s novel, critics more often have discussed Stowe’s work in terms of the rhetoric of domesticity or religion. Both approaches to the novel have validity.

Recent attempts to consider the place of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* in the literary canon tend to approach the work primarily as a reflection of gender issues in nineteenth-century culture. Ann Douglas’ discussion of the ways in which “nineteenth-century American women [...] gain power through the exploitation of their feminine identity” is useful in understanding how Stowe’s largely female audience could wield such power in the anti-slavery cause (8). Catherine O’Connell’s analysis of Stowe’s rhetorical strategies acknowledges the importance of religious and republican appeals in the novel, but concludes that “the novel ultimately privileges the rhetoric of sentimentality” (13). Shaw, Roberson, and Haynes also examine the novel in terms of the rhetoric of domesticity. Gender issues alone, however, do not seem adequate to explain the influence of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. As Gladys Lewis has noted, “Contemporary feminist concerns can explain the turn to Stowe today. They cannot account for the book’s phenomenal impact in its day” (5).

More satisfactory considerations of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* acknowledge the relationship between Christianity and gender in nineteenth-century sentimental fiction. Jennifer Hynes’ discussion of Stowe as a spiritual mentor to other female authors highlights the difficulty of separating religious and feminist concerns in her writing. The literary merit and the rhetorical power of the novel depend on both factors, though modern readers often find Stowe’s anti-slavery argument unpersuasive. One problem in evaluating *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* stems from modern perceptions of difficulties that did not exist for Stowe’s audience. Jane Tompkins’ discussion of the significance of millennialism in inspiring Stowe’s audience to social action is one of the more effective presentations of the interconnection between religion
and domestic fiction. As Tompkins has noted, “it is difficult for [most modern readers] to take seriously a novel that insists on religious conversion as the necessary precondition for sweeping social change (133). Nonetheless, any serious attempt to understand the rhetorical power of the novel must include consideration of nineteenth-century religious culture.

The complexity of Stowe’s religious rhetoric, however, precludes simple conclusions. Despite her suggestion of the limitations of feminist approaches to *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Gladys Lewis’ own analysis fails to identify convincingly the key to the novel’s success. Her discussion of Puritan influence in Stowe’s use of genre, tone, and style is more useful in increasing appreciation for the literary merit of Stowe’s work than in explaining its impact on the antislavery debate. The suggestion that the audience for this work of popular domestic fiction would have been galvanized to social action by the more educated author’s use of seventeenth century Puritan genres seems an overstatement. Arguments by Newell and Lowance about the rhetorical power of Stowe’s use of typology and other strategies related to Biblical hermeneutics are more persuasive. More plausible still are arguments by White, Westra, Ducksworth, and Nuernberg that consider Stowe’s emphasis on sin, divine judgment, and salvation—all concerns that connected her with a growing evangelistic audience. Still, something seems missing from the discussion. Although Patricia Hill and Joan Hedrick address Christian themes in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* that would have appealed to Stowe’s evangelical Christian audience, neither specifically examines the extent to which the shift among American Christians from Calvinism to Arminianism contributed to the success of Stowe’s anti-slavery message. The omission seems significant.

Soteriology, or the doctrine of salvation, was for Stowe, as for her predominantly Christian audience, of primary importance, and her
association of political freedom with spiritual liberty was a powerful rhetorical strategy in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. As the daughter of Lyman Beecher, Harriet Beecher Stowe fully understood the theological debates that contributed to the emotionally-charged Arminian undertones in her challenge, “O, he who takes freedom from man, with what words shall ye answer it to God?” (Stowe 550). The immediate context of her statement may have been the Harris family’s escape from the bondage of slavery, but Stowe certainly was aware that the decline of Calvinism in America reflected nineteenth-century preoccupation with the rights of the individual and theological debates related to the individual’s right “to choose [his] spiritual destiny” (Noll 184). The success of her attack on slavery was due, at least in part, to the compatibility between her personal search for a soteriology that confirmed a just and loving God and nineteenth century emphasis on self-determination that characterized the revivalist fervor of Jacksonian democracy. The issues that divided the New England Calvinist intellectuals were the issues that led to the rise of Stowe’s largely Arminian audience.

A closer examination of the doctrinal debates that absorbed Calvinists during the nineteenth century suggests that, in spite of Holmes’ clever assertions, Calvinism did not go “to pieces all at once” as “bubbles do when they burst.” By the early nineteenth century, Calvinism was in a state of decline, but the primary threat was not, as is sometimes supposed, the rationalism of the Deists and Unitarians. The shift toward “reasonable religion” at the end of the eighteenth century was a trend among the elite. The presence of only two professed Christians at Princeton in 1782 (Noll 164-5) did reflect changing attitudes among the educated that contributed to renewed emphasis on revivals in the early nineteenth century, but the formation of the evangelical audience to whom Stowe appealed in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was not primarily the result of rejection of Puritan theology by the
Conflicts among nineteenth-century Calvinists extended back to disagreements between Jonathan Edwards and his congregation over church membership, the significance of sacraments in salvation, and the importance of the affections in confirming a regenerate state. Following the Great Awakening, Old School Calvinists rejected Edwards’ emphasis on revivals and “philosophical justifications for Calvinist theology” (Reid 238). They viewed conversion as a process best aided by church sacraments and preaching, and their renewed support of the Half-Way Covenant led to direct conflict with the New Haven branch of Calvinism (Reid 238). New Haven Calvinists became uncomfortable with doctrines that seemed to define God as arbitrary and unjust. The Calvinist system was beginning to weaken as its own proponents argued over its essential doctrines.

Among the concerns of Jonathan Edwards’ successors that were to influence the public reception of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* were Calvinist doctrines of predestination, original sin, and total depravity. Timothy Dwight, president of Yale and the grandson of Jonathan Edwards, continued the emphasis on revivalism of Samuel Hopkins, Joseph Bellamy, and Nathanael Emmons, but found these New Divinity theologians’ emphasis on a sovereign God who denied human “free agency” to be illogical (Caskey 38-9). Dwight de-emphasized the doctrines of election and predestination in his own teaching and insisted on the role of man’s free choice in salvation (Caskey 39; Reid 110). His students at Yale, Nathaniel Taylor and Lyman Beecher, became leaders of New Haven theology, a modified branch of Calvinism that took Dwight’s ideas even further and rejected original sin and total depravity as doctrines they considered inconsistent with God’s justice. As Taylor expressed the shifting views of many New England theologians, “‘There can be no sin in choosing evil […] unless there be power to choose good’” (qtd. in Noll 224). To Taylor, the
Consistent Calvinism espoused by Old School Calvinists such as Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge at Princeton seemed detrimental to revivalism and out of touch with the common man.

This was no minor conflict between denominations. Tensions over the nature of God and the process of salvation resulted in the schism between Presbyterians and Congregationalists that led to heresy trials against Taylor and Beecher in 1835 and two years later nullified the Plan of Union that had joined the two denominations (Noll 224, 232; Reid 39, 241). Even the most outspoken defenders of Calvinism were unable to convince the next generation of the intellectual viability of the theological system that had satisfied their Puritan forefathers. Although all of Lyman Beecher’s sons followed their father into the ministry, none of his eleven children accepted his modified Calvinism.

The idea that God would elect some to salvation and some to damnation seemed a worn-out elitist doctrine to the Christians of a new democratic nation. To many, Calvinist emphasis on human dependence upon a sovereign God’s “exclusive initiative in salvation” (Reid 62) seemed incompatible with the revivalism that was necessary to insure the dominance of Christianity as the nation expanded westward. The concessions that Calvinist revivalists such as Lyman Beecher and Charles Finney made to human free agency only blurred the distinctions between Calvinism and Arminianism and increased hostilities between Old School and New School Calvinists. As a culture insistent on man’s right to determine his own political and spiritual destiny developed, Christianity began to grow among sects that appealed to the common man.

After the Revolutionary War, the traditional New England denominations that formed the early religious education of Miss Ophelia, St. Clare, and Simon Legree began to decline, while the religious culture of camp meetings and “shouting Methodists” (Stowe 277) that welcomed Uncle Tom and Mammy grew rapidly. In 1776,
55% of American Christians attended Congregational, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian churches (Finke 55). In spite of suggestions by mainline ministers, such as Lyman Beecher, that religion was declining in the early years of the nineteenth century, church attendance actually increased from 17% to 37% between the American Revolution and the Civil War. Methodist membership grew from 4,921 to 130,570 between 1776 and 1806; by 1850, the number had risen to 2.6 million. At the time of the publication of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, more than two-thirds of American Christians were Methodists; 70% of American Christians were either Methodist or Baptist (Finke 22, 57-9; Noll 172). Of the traditional Calvinist denominations, Presbyterians sustained some growth, largely due to the impact of revivalist ministers like Charles Finney, a liberal Calvinist who had not even read the Westminster Confession and whose emphasis on freewill and perfectionism aligned him more closely with Arminianism than with the theology of seventeenth-century Puritans (Noll 177).

These changing religious demographics were an important factor in the success of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Stowe’s simple appeal to scriptural principles that were accessible to a large evangelical audience resembled the strategies of the Baptists and Methodists in the early nineteenth century. That Stowe was capable of engaging in sophisticated religious debate is certain. Both records of her conversations with her siblings and her letters to her husband, a theology professor at Lane Seminary, revealed a woman well acquainted with the complex doctrinal disputes of the period. Sophisticated intellectual debate, however, was no more successful in defeating slavery than it was in preserving the dominance of Calvinist churches in America. The educated ministers of mainline denominations had little in common with most Americans in the early nineteenth century. According to the *Baptist Almanac*, “in 1823 only
about 100 of the 2,000 Baptist clergy had been ‘liberally educated.’” The famous Methodist itinerant Peter Cartwright estimated that at the General Conference of 1844 fewer than 50 (of approximately 4,282 traveling ministers) had anything more than a common English education, and scores of them had not that” (Finke 76-7). The elitist educational background of mainline ministers made them more out of touch with most Americans. According to the Bureau of the Census, only two percent of American seventeen-year-olds, for instance, had completed high school in 1870 (Finke 79). Of the forty seminaries founded between 1780 and 1829, not one was Methodist; in fact, the first Methodist seminary did not open until 1847 (Finke 77). The simple but emotional message of the Methodists, who prided themselves on their reliance on the scriptures that the uneducated average American could understand, was more effective in winning converts than the complex theological discourse of the educated Calvinists of Princeton or Yale.

To a large extent, the changes from Calvinism to Arminianism reflected a shift from the seventeenth-century intellectual religion of the elect to a theology more attuned to Romantic emphasis on individual rights. As Christianity became less God-centered and more man-centered, nineteenth-century Christians wrestled with the justice of the Puritan’s sovereign God who arbitrarily chose whom He willed. Ironically, theologians like Lyman Beecher, who tried to modify Calvinism to make it more palatable to a democratic nation, actually contributed to its decline. By rejecting the doctrine of total depravity, Beecher and other liberal Calvinists ultimately robbed Calvinism of the essential doctrines that distinguished it from Arminianism. Without total depravity, man might choose salvation—a good action impossible to those incapable of a single righteous act. Rejecting the first point of Calvinism inevitably led to the rejection of all five points. If, as Beecher argued, man possessed free agency to accept God, he must also possess
the freedom to reject Him. Irresistible grace then seemed illogical. If he could choose God, he did not need God to choose him, and grace must be available to anyone who accepted it. Unconditional election and limited atonement no longer were convincing. Without irresistible grace, the Christian would be free to reject God at any time; perseverance of the saints lost validity. The religion of Jonathan Edwards had been a logical system of interdependent parts. Like Holmes’ one-hoss shay, when one part failed, all failed. Without God’s sovereign decree in election and irresistible grace, salvation became dependent upon man’s actions. The fact that even Calvinists were no longer satisfied with a doctrine that limited human choice is evidence of Jacksonian democracy’s influence on nineteenth-century religion. Human liberty replaced the supremacy of God’s sovereignty for most nineteenth-century Christians.

If Calvinism had still dominated the United States in 1850, Stowe’s presentation of the injustice of slavery as a hindrance to evangelism would have lost force. While the missionary efforts of Jonathan Edwards and David Brainerd made it clear that Calvinism was not incompatible with evangelism, Calvinist belief in predestination and irresistible grace diminished concern over the power of human oppression to influence individuals to view God as unjust. A Calvinist audience would trust that slaves who were among the elect would eventually come to God in spite of the wrongs they suffered. Human injustice might elicit their compassion, but it would not have soteriological implications. A growing Arminian audience, on the other hand, would have feared judgment for tolerating the brutal system that discouraged conversion to Christianity.

Stowe appealed to this evangelistic fervor through her creation of characters who could not accept a Christian God who permitted their suffering. Throughout the novel is the implicit assertion that slavery is a stumbling block to grace. Stowe’s novel took full advantage of the
changing Christian demographics in nineteenth-century America that created an audience particularly sympathetic to such an argument. The novel, that began with the introduction of a Christian slave whose life so conformed with his faith that his master could trust him to travel alone to Cincinnati to conduct business, quickly shifted focus to the system that was a deterrent to conversion. Early in the novel, George Harris confesses to his wife his inability to accept saving grace: “I ain’t a Christian like you, Eliza; my heart’s full of bitterness; I can’t trust in God” (Stowe 62). Cassy later confesses her inability to turn over her circumstances to God: “O! Father Tom, I can’t pray,—I wish I could. I never have prayed since my children were sold! What you say must be right, I know it must; but when I try to pray, I can only hate and curse. I can’t pray!” (Stowe 562). Stowe’s repetition of “I can’t” would have impacted nineteenth-century Christians in a way that would not have been true for Jonathan Edwards’ congregation. The idea that circumstances could destroy an individual’s ability to accept salvation would have held no merit with Calvinists. Similarly, Prue’s admission that she prefers “gwine straight to torment” if it allows her to escape “Mas’r and Missis,” whom she assumes are “gwine to heaven” (Stowe 323-4) might draw the sympathy of a Calvinist reader, but the Arminian who believed in human power to choose God would have been even more outraged at a system that made damnation a more appealing choice than God’s grace.

The Calvinist belief in the preservation of the saints also would have rendered Stowe’s rhetoric less effective with an earlier American audience. The adult Cassy may not be able to pray, but such had not always been the case: “When I was a girl, I thought I was religious; I used to love God and prayer. Now, I’m a lost soul, pursued by devils that torment me day and night” (522). A Calvinist might suggest that Cassy’s early interest in religion did not reflect her salvation since one of the signs of true conversion is perseverance in the faith. To the
Arminian who believed in the possibility of losing salvation, Cassy would seem a Christian who falls from grace, and slavery would be the system that causes that fall. Arminian Christians would sympathize with Tom’s advice that Cassy flee slavery, even though he plans to submit to the unjust authority over him. Only after escaping the bondage that makes her conversion impossible can Cassy return to her childhood faith and become “a devout and tender Christian” under the influence of her daughter’s “steady, consistent piety” (Stowe 607). If humans had the ability to lose salvation, then defiance of human laws that kept them from grace was reasonable.

Although Stowe’s references to New England theology reflect respect for the doctrinal system her father defended, the faith that she portrays most positively is essentially Arminian. In fact, Stowe’s alignment with popular evangelical culture has led one scholar to suggest that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* “proves that popular culture can do the ethical teaching for society, which may have been the most damaging blow [Stowe] dealt Calvinism” (Lewis 160). In *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, human choice and influence supercede the Calvinist emphasis on a sovereign God drawing the reprobate to Himself.

The Calvinist catechism that Miss Ophelia teaches St. Clare in his childhood is no more effective in winning Topsy’s salvation than it is in preserving St. Clare’s. Little Eva’s compassion, not the theological truths of the catechism or the doctrinally rich hymns Miss Ophelia locks her up to study, is the first step in winning Topsy to the faith (Stowe 376, 407-9). Perhaps if Miss Ophelia had shared the more emotional gospel hymns of the Methodist meeting she has “hunted up” (Stowe 407), she would have sooner discovered the secret to the child’s heart. The simpler words of evangelical hymns that provide “a rich, intensely devotional experience by which one could rise above the ordinary world” (Noll 187) might have been more effective than the heavy
theological texts familiar in the mainline churches of New England. It is the emotional support that she provides Topsy after Eva’s death that finally gives Miss Ophelia “an influence over the mind of the destitute child”—an influence, Stowe adds, “that she never lost” (Stowe 432). Although St. Clare has fond memories of “his mother’s prayers and hymns” and “his own early yearnings and aspirings for good” (404), he does not profess the Christianity of his New England childhood. He wants to believe what his mother taught him, but if his childhood prayers are evidence of Christianity, he has lost the faith (437). St. Clare may have addressed his final words to the Christian mother who had instructed him in childhood, but his deathbed conversion seems more directly influenced by the death of a child and the prayers of a suffering servant.

If Stowe viewed the Calvinist doctrines expressed in the catechism and traditional hymns as unable to convert sinners, she depicted the Calvinism of Old School theologians like Alexander and Hodge as even less effective. Simon Legree’s childhood brow may have been “bedewed with the waters of holy baptism” (Stowe 528), but the Calvinist sacrament fails to secure his salvation. Stowe’s novel included a strong appeal to the evangelical masses who were turning away from her father’s intellectual faith.

Arminian understanding of the doctrine of sanctification also influenced Stowe’s anti-slavery argument. As nineteenth-century Christians shifted away from the Calvinist doctrine of total depravity, the pursuit of personal holiness became popular among Arminian denominations. The topic became a common subject of debate within the Beecher family, particularly when Stowe’s brother George Beecher committed suicide in 1843 following his struggle with the doctrine (Hedrick 349). Although Stowe herself rejected John Wesley’s teachings of perfectionism, she did experience “a baptism of the spirit” that was associated with the emotional Holiness movement. The
perfectionist movement’s insistence on a second work of grace that filled the Christian with “perfect love” appealed to Stowe (Hedrick 347; Reid 255, 264). She became interested in Phoebe Palmer’s modified teachings about sanctification and her “altar theology which required that one lay one’s ‘all’ of the altar, receive the blessings and be empowered for service” (Hill).

In this religious culture attracted to the teachings of John Wesley and Phoebe Palmer on the sanctified life, Stowe’s reminder that slavery did not permit Christian slaves to obey the moral teachings of scripture would have particularly angered her Arminian audience. George Harris’ rejection of Eliza’s pleas that he trust in God’s beneficence illustrated the power of slavery to thwart human efforts to do what was right: “I wish I could be good; but my heart burns, and can’t be reconciled, anyhow” (Stowe 63). His further suggestion that his Christian wife would be unable to continue to trust God when she learned that his master planned to force him to commit adultery highlighted the power of the institution of slavery to damn individuals. George’s inability to obey scriptural commands, and thus to submit to the authority God had placed over him, illustrated the injustice of a system that made salvation and godly behavior impossible. George’s language emphasized his inability to make the religious choices he desired: “my wife is a Christian, and I mean to be, if I ever get where I can” (Stowe 184). Under the bondage of slavery, he could not choose to obey scripture. His sister, “a member of the Baptist church” was also denied the right to choose “to live a decent Christian life, such as your laws give no slave girl a right to live” (186). Neither the Methodist church membership of the mulatto woman nor Emmaline’s Biblical instruction “by the care of a faithful and pious mistress” gave the freedom to choose a pious life when “any man, however vile and brutal, however godless and merciless [. . .] [could] become owner of her [. . .] body and soul” (Stowe 473). One of Stowe’s most effective
arguments was her assertion that slavery denied individuals the right to the pursuit of holiness. Whether an intentional rhetorical strategy or a fortuitous accident, Stowe’s appeal to the concerns of Arminian Christian culture was an important factor in the success of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*.

Understanding the shifting religious demographics that contributed to Stowe’s ability to influence large numbers of evangelical Christians to join the antislavery cause, unfortunately, only adds to the shame that American Christians bear for their callousness to the suffering of their enslaved brothers and sisters. If the nation had only needed to be convinced of the depravity of the system that permitted slavery, then slave narratives like Frederick Douglass’ 1845 autobiography should have been sufficient to end the institution. The fact that Stowe’s sentimental novel had more success than Douglass’ eloquent first-hand account of slavery raises disturbing questions about the Christians who joined the abolition cause after reading *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Although nineteenth century Christians’ concerns for the eternal destiny of those in bondage were consistent with their religious beliefs and, to that extent, laudable, other aspects of their slow conversion to the abolitionist cause are more troubling. As both Stowe and Douglass point out, many Southerners treated their animals—creatures that most evangelical Christians did not consider to have souls—with more compassion than they treated their slaves. To her credit, Stowe did appeal to her audience’s compassion with passage after passage intended to elicit tears over the cruel treatment of slaves. From the first chapter to the end, however, the issue that dominated her novel was the response of her characters to Christianity. Would Stowe’s audience have found her argument equally compelling if Cassy, Topsy, and George Harris had found freedom and decided to move to Africa to learn about the religion of their ancestors? Might her readers then have concluded that the system of slavery that encouraged Uncle Tom’s
conversion was part of God’s plan for the salvation of his race? If “[l]iterature is but a branch of Religion, and always partakes of its character,” then Harriet Beecher Stowe’s appeal to retailored Arminian Christianity reflected American preoccupation with self-determination and freedom—but less national commitment to the Christian requirement to “love your neighbor as yourself.” Ironically, the Christians who could not accept Calvinist doctrines that seemed to reflect an unjust God were less concerned about their own injustice. The fact that large numbers of evangelical Christians only rallied to abolish slavery once Stowe convinced them, through her sentimental novel, that the institution was a hindrance to salvation is not a particularly proud moment in the history of American Christianity.

Nonetheless, Uncle Tom’s Cabin opened nineteenth-century Christians’ eyes to at least some of the evils they had tolerated for too long. Stowe’s personal religious struggles mirrored those of the nation at that time and allowed her to reach an audience that had been deaf to far more eloquent appeals. The nation cannot always wait—and indeed, is not always ready—for a perfect messenger. Stowe’s retailored use of sentimental fiction gave her the voice to reach Arminian evangelical Christians in the campaign to end the institution of slavery. Modern critics might do well to reconsider the rhetorical power of her sentimental appeal.
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At the opening of John Webster’s The Duchess of Malfi, the Cardinal offers a succinct piece of advice to his sister: “We are to part from you, and your own discretion / Must now be your director” (I.ii.223-224). While the Cardinal initially seems to encourage the Duchess’s self-regulation, he, and more specifically his brother, Ferdinand, contradict this encouragement by employing Bosola to monitor her behavior. Much of the criticism concerning Ferdinand’s monitoring of his sister focuses on the threat the Duchess’s re-marriage would pose to the purity of the family line and the way the brothers use the Duchess to understand themselves as both aristocrats and men. Roberta Barker, Frank Whigham, and Theodora A. Jankowski, for example, all discuss the relationship between the brothers’ efforts to control their sister’s body and their fears regarding the changing social structure that surrounds them. Jankowski’s main argument, that the Duchess maintains agency by challenging societal norms within her behavior is complicated by Whigham’s and Barker’s discussions of how the other
characters in the play, namely Ferdinand and the Cardinal, attempt to invade the Duchess’s space of agency. With their discussions of the play’s use of both sleep and severed hands, Garrett A. Sullivan, Katherine Rowe, and Albert H. Tricomi focus the question concerning the brothers’ surveillance on the various ways conscience is disrupted in the play and how this both represses and strengthens self-identity. For Rowe and Tricomi, these disruptions of conscience center more on the alienation of a person from one specific part of their body. Sullivan, on the other hand, explores the idea of disruption in terms of how varying states of consciousness can be used to both expand and contain the self. While these discussions all provide convincing ways to read the relationship between the self and the outside forces that can impede upon it, one aspect of the conversation regarding the construction of identity that could use more focus is how individual selves can re-create their identity to contend with these outside forces. Unlike Ferdinand, who needs the Duchess’s body to understand himself, the Duchess is able to both define and redefine her identity based on the outward space she is occupying. In other words, the Duchess’s ability to adapt to her surroundings is the reason for her external and internal survival throughout the course of the play. The result of the ability or lack of ability to redefine the self is seen in the divergent ways Ferdinand and the Duchess respond to the Duchess’s death. By having the Duchess able to affirm her identity as Ferdinand loses his to fragmentation, Webster reveals that while identity must not be determined by a submission to outside conceptions of the self, it must continually be re-created to adapt to the outward space it occupies.

The discussion of identity in the play starts at the opening when Ferdinand employs Bosola to make sure the Duchess is confined to his conception of her, thus passing the responsibility of upholding the current structure of their family completely onto her. Explaining his duties as intelligencer to Bosola, Ferdinand tells him “[t]o live i’th court,
here; and observe the Duchess, / To note all the particulars of her 
‘havior; / What suitors do solicit her for marriage / And whom she best 
affects. She’s a young widow; I would not have her marry 
again” (I.ii.182-188). While Ferdinand’s directions to Bosola reveal the 
extent to which he wants to keep the Duchess in her current role as 
widow, his insistence that Bosola “note all the particulars of her 
‘havior” (186) is especially confining. With this instruction, Ferdinand 
makes his sister into an object to be monitored in order to make sure 
she does not overstep her bounds. To further define this boundary, 
Whigham, discussing Ferdinand’s behavior in the context of the 
period’s upper class paranoia regarding class mingling, comments, 
“I read Ferdinand as a threatened aristocrat, frightened by the 
contamination of his supposedly ascriptive social rank and obsessively 
preoccupied with its defense” (62). Whigham asserts that because he 
understands that his social position is based only on the fortune of his 
birth, Ferdinand is aware of the insecure foundation that supports his 
standing and his drive to defend it is heightened.

Whigham’s conception of the threatened aristocrat opens a 
discussion about the extent to which Ferdinand is already aware that 
his identity as upper class is simply a construction. Roberta Barker 
develops this discussion when she describes the relationship between 
the Duchess and the men around her as a resistance in which each 
character attempts to achieve mastery over themselves or the other (57). 
Barker’s focus on mastery and resistance defines the means in which 
Whigham’s threatened aristocrat defends his social rank. By mastering 
the body of his sister through regulating her sexuality, Ferdinand can 
defend against the entrance of individuals he feels would reduce the 
purity of his line. Ferdinand’s attempt at the mastery of his sister 
involves his constructing an identity for her that he expects she will not 
diverge from. In Ferdinand’s initial meeting with his sister, he, along 
with the Cardinal, defines her identity for her stating, “You are a
widow. You know already what man is; and therefore / Let not youth, high promotion, eloquence—[...] No, nor anything without the addition, honor, / Sway your high blood” (I.ii.225-228). Although use of the phrase “You are” in Ferdinand’s statement conveys the sense that the Duchess’s state as a widow is prescribed, the rest of his statement coupled with the Cardinal’s suggests that they are both concerned with the fluidity of identity. Therefore, Theodora A. Jankowski’s assertion, that the intensity with which Ferdinand questions the Duchess’s sexuality is evidence of both his sexual desire for and fear of her (228), does not take enough account of the manner in which Ferdinand and the Cardinal convey these questions. By suggesting that her high blood can be swayed, the Cardinal reveals a concern that his and his brother’s high blood, through the actions of his sister, can be reduced.

Since the brothers see the fluidity of identity as a threat, the Duchess can only perform her self-constructed identity in her private chamber. Although some critics see this confinement to her chamber as a submission to her brothers’ control, it is evidence of the fluidity of her identity in comparison to theirs. After telling her brothers she will never marry, the Duchess reflects privately, “Shall this move me? If all my royal kindred / Lay in my way unto this marriage, / I’d make them my low footsteps / [...] Let old wives report / I winked and chose a husband” (I.ii.273-281). The significance of the phrase “winked and chose” as the Duchess describes her private behavior is revealed in Garrett A. Sullivan’s analysis of how the behavior of sleep is used in the play to both regulate and reinvigorate the conscience. In his discussion of how her brothers attempt to limit the Duchess’s will, Sullivan states, “While her brothers seek to reform both her behavior and her ‘privat’st thoughts’ (235), the Duchess responds by expelling not only their influence but also ‘all discord’—meaning their dissent and interference—from the space generated by both her marriage and the willfulness that brought it into being” (112). Sullivan makes this point
about the Duchess’s construction of her private space to explain how sleep enables the activity she refers to when she uses the phrase “winked and chose.” Since the Duchess is able to act out her desires in her chamber, Sullivan suggests that within sleep, she has found a place where she can act on her own wishes. The Duchess reveals her conception of this place in responding to Antonio’s concern about her brothers: “Do not think of them. All discord, without this circumference, / Is only to be pitied, and not feared” (I.i.402-403). Speaking of her brothers, the Duchess disparages their attempts to control her by describing them as not having any boundaries. In doing so, she associates the term “circumference” not with outward confinement, but with a more internal self-control. In her view, the brothers’ lack of boundaries comes in their excessive interference in her life. The Duchess feels this excessive interference is cause for pity since it means her brothers do not have the same power over themselves as she does herself.

Furthermore, the brothers’, specifically Ferdinand’s, extreme rage after discovering the Duchess’s pregnancy reveals the extent to which she has become their space of self-definition. Since, through her pregnancy, the Duchess no longer fits his conception of her, Ferdinand begins to lose his understanding of who he is. Ferdinand, reacting to the Duchess’s pregnancy as if she were diseased, exclaims, “Apply desperate physic: We must not now use balsamum, but fire, [...] To purge infected blood, such blood as hers. / There is a kind of pity in mine eye, / I’ll give it to my handkercher; / and not ‘tis here, / I’ll bequeath this to her bastard” (II.v.24-29). Ferdinand’s use of the words “infected” and “purge” re-make the condition of pregnancy into a disease from which the Duchess needs to be cleansed. Ferdinand continues to rage at the Duchess, exclaiming to the Cardinal, “Methinks I see her laughing—Excellent hyena! Talk to me somewhat, quickly, / Or my imagination will carry me / To see her in the shameful act of
sin” (II.v.39-41). Ferdinand goes from using the language of disease to describe his sister to animalizing her behavior. The dehumanizing nature of Ferdinand’s descriptions of the Duchess comes from a developing insecurity in his understanding of himself. Expanding on her discussion regarding the alternating fear and desire Ferdinand feels toward his sister’s body, Jankowski, while noting the misogyny of the outburst, blames the root of it on the Duchess’s conflation of her public and private selves (240). Whigham responds to Jankowski’s argument stating, “In her secret forbidden marriage the duchess becomes no longer, like Queen Elizabeth, married to her country. Her brother’s correspondent rage at his sister’s theft of herself marks his futile incapacity to rule the body politic as his own” (60). The issue with Jankowski’s argument regarding the Duchess’s inability to separate her body natural from her body politic is revealed in Whigham’s observation that the Duchess is only in her position because of her status as widow to the former Duke and mother to the not yet of age future Duke (58). Because of this, the Duchess is not faced with the same responsibility a king is in terms of having to separate these identities. Whigham, while convincing in his argument that Ferdinand sees the Duchess’s pregnancy as a “theft” against his possession of her, does not go far enough in discussing how this “theft” reflects back onto Ferdinand’s understanding of himself. As Ferdinand continues to rage, he exclaims, “Foolish men, That e’er will trust their honor in a bark / Made of so slight weak bulrush as is woman, / Apt every minute to sink in it” (II.v.34-36). Here, Ferdinand goes from dehumanizing his sister’s specific body to admonishing men for ever considering the female body as stable enough to carry the representation of their honor. By doing so, Ferdinand is, in essence, blaming the social trope that places so much importance on keeping family lines pure. Whigham explains this trope as he writes, “In the differentiated society of Jacobean England, strategic intermarriage remained central for the social elite, typically
serving by both identification and differentiation to maintain and confirm distinctive group status” (61). Ferdinand participates in this Jacobean social elite discourse concerning identification and differentiation by identifying the Duchess’s body as diseased when, through her pregnancy by a member of a lower class, it forces him to see the ease with which his blood can become mixed. Ferdinand’s over-the-top reaction to his sister’s pregnancy comes from his narcissistic tendency to insist that the Duchess’s behavior is a reflection of him. Because of this, the Duchess’s pregnancy for Ferdinand does not merely change the makeup of her body, but makes him see his own body as a vessel that can likewise be contaminated.

As Ferdinand’s rage regarding the Duchess’s loss of self continues, he switches from animalizing his sister to blaming witchcraft for her actions in an attempt to redefine the Duchess’s behavior and reclaim his identity. While discussing the Duchess with Ferdinand, Bosola offers his hypothesis for her current condition: “I do suspect there hath been some sorcery / Used on the Duchess / [...] / To make her dote on some desertless fellow / She shames to acknowledge” (III.i.65-66). Although Bosola’s explanation of sorcery for the Duchess’s behavior may seem similarly dehumanizing to Ferdinand’s animalizing language, a difference exists in how it shapes the Duchess’s body more as being victimized by outside influences than as being contaminated by them. Katherine Rowe, in analyzing how the personal wills of characters are submitted to others both willingly and through force in the play, suggests that Bosola sees the Duchess’s hand as working against her self-interest and disobeying the agreement that should be in place between the body and the self (97). The idea of one part of the Duchess’s body working against the concerns of the other parts means her intentions are no longer related to the effect that they cause (98). By accepting a lack of connection between intention and effect, it would seem more likely that Ferdinand would have compassion for his sister.
since her behavior would no longer be within her control. However, when Ferdinand finally confronts his sister, he tells her he will never look at her again (III.ii.140) and curses her saying, “I would not for ten millions / I had beheld thee; therefore use all means / I never may have knowledge of thy name; / Enjoy thy lust still, and a wretched life, / On that condition” (III.ii.95-99). Ferdinand’s response here contrasts with his response when seeing his sister’s body as diseased. Although his language when describing his diseased sister dehumanizes her, he still conveyed the possibility of his sister being reformed through cleansing. When Ferdinand sees witchcraft as the source of his sister’s behavior, she becomes no longer worthy of his sight. In his article focusing on the presence of witchcraft in *The Duchess of Malfi* with specific focus to the severed hand in the torture scene, Tricomi comments, “Webster’s horrific staging of the severed hand bearing a wedding ring enacts a communal anxiety that unseen agents from the demonic world will, through lycanthropic possession, sever the bonds that join husband to wife, indeed family member from family member” (356). Although Tricomi makes his point regarding the anxiety of demonic possession in terms of the prison scene, his argument can also be applied to Ferdinand’s use of the language of witchcraft. Tricomi’s argument regarding the severed hand focuses primarily on how the anxiety about forces beyond the control of the individual can break the bonds that one has created for himself. This anxiety comes especially from these forces being “unseen” which makes them difficult, if not impossible, to overcome. Whereas with disease the body can, through medication or treatment, be possibly returned to its former state, a possession by witchcraft means, in Ferdinand’s view, that the Duchess’s body has been forever lost and the only hope Ferdinand has for his own survival is to completely abolish her from his sight.

Although Ferdinand believes that through his language and dismissal he has regained control of the Duchess by denying her
existence in his view, the Duchess’s creation of a plan for Antonio to escape enables her to reassert herself by keeping a part of her identity in a space removed from both Ferdinand’s reach and dismissal. Aware of Ferdinand’s rage, the Duchess arranges for Antonio to be sent away by pretending he is a thief and tells Antonio, “Our weak safety / Runs upon enginous wheels; short syllables / Must stand for periods” (III.ii.176-178). The Duchess’s language here shows that she is aware that the space of both her and Antonio’s existence is shrinking while her brothers’ is expanding. By dismissing the Duchess from his view, Ferdinand reduces the spaces that she and Antonio can occupy since he, by virtue of his Dukedom, is in a position of ownership over that space. Critics have debated whether the Duchess’s turn to hiding Antonio and her children to contend with Ferdinand’s tyranny constitute an assertion of her will or a submission to outside control. Like Jankowski, Rowe speaks of the Duchess’s actions from the perspective of her identity within her political role and argues, “If the compact between Bosola and Ferdinand dramatizes the dynamic of an uncertain relation between servants and masters bound by contract, the Duchess herself embodies the problem of what it means to voluntarily alienate portions of the self in this way” (109). Rowe asserts that this self-alienation exists for the Duchess in the fact that while as part of the ruling class she can give away property, as a woman she herself is property (109). Therefore, from Rowe’s perspective, the Duchess’s position merely gives her the power to enforce her own submission. Sullivan, however, counters this claim by arguing, “[T]he Duchess’s subjectivity emerges out of her resistance to the identity that her brothers attempt to craft for her and impose on her, the identity of a ‘figure cut in alabaster / Kneel[ing] at [her] husband’s tomb’” (125). For Sullivan, the Duchess’s attempt to create any space for herself within her brothers’ tyranny is a reflection of the extent of her willfulness. Although Jankowski and Rowe convincingly establish the problems
surrounding the Duchess’s assertion of self, those problems are not a reflection on her, but of the constructions surrounding her. While the Duchess might technically be property by virtue of her womanhood, her behavior when feeling the presence of her brothers encroaching further upon her space more reflects a position of defense than submission. Therefore, it is not simply that, as Sullivan argues, the Duchess resists the identity her brothers enforce upon her, but that she is able to rework her identity and space to create a situation that would best suit her purposes.

After the Duchess creates this space, however, she is unable to remain within it for an extended period of time because, whereas she can only depend on herself and Antonio to create her space, her brothers’ abilities to use outside intelligence enables them to maintain a reach that allows them to transgress the boundaries that had formerly been protecting the Duchess. After Bosola admonishes the Duchess for her treatment of Antonio, the Duchess responds by assuming he will be a friendly ear to her secrets since he seems to have an admiration for her husband (III.ii.304-405). The Duchess’s trust of Bosola reveals the way surveillance disrupts the power that she has achieved through her reworking of space. Prior to her comment to Bosola, the Duchess had dealt with intruders to her space by creating a strategy for her escape, for example her initial arrangement to send Antonio to safety (III.ii.176-78). However, the difference in that instance was the Duchess’s awareness of the identity of her opposition. With that knowledge, she was able to alter her behavior to suit the demands of the specific situation. Since the Duchess does not realize that Ferdinand has employed intermediaries in his attempt to possess her identity, she is unable to remain in her created space since she is unaware, in this circumstance, of her need to defend it. Sullivan, describing Ferdinand’s use of intermediaries, argues, “His seeming sleep masks the fact that Ferdinand is awake, but his wakingness is constituted through and
across the bodies of those who provide him with information” (115). Sullivan’s characterization of Ferdinand’s state of sleep demonstrates the way that he, even with his outward rage toward his sister, is able to lull the Duchess into a false sense of security. Although aware of her brother’s rage and his encroachments upon her space, the Duchess believes that her identity is safe as long as it is out of his sight. By using surveillance, Ferdinand expands the reach of his sight to include his sister’s private spaces.

When this surveillance eventually leads to the Duchess’s seizure, her reflections on her lack of freedom do not reveal a submission to her brothers’ attempts to reduce her since she refuses to give in to the ideology of passive suffering. Although the space of her body is seized, she continues to find a way to create her selfhood. After Antonio consoles the Duchess by telling her to make patience a virtue, the Duchess responds, “Must I, like to a slave-born Russian, / Account it praise to suffer tyranny? / And yet, Oh, Heaven, thy heavy hand is in’t / ” (III.v.76-78). The Duchess reflection here is interesting in how it both questions the virtue of suffering and sees heaven, or perhaps more specifically fate, as being the cause of this suffering. Although in reference to the prison scene, Jankowski’s following comment is useful here:“In a society that limits woman’s options to those of wife or mother, creatures whose identities can easily be subsumed by their husbands or children, a talent for suffering nobly (and quietly) becomes the only means by which a woman can be viewed as ‘heroic’” (243). Jankowski’s explanation of suffering as the quintessential mark of feminine bravery sheds light on Antonio’s advice for the Duchess to “[m]ake patience a noble fortitude” (III.v.74) prior to the Duchess’s reflections. By advising her to quietly suffer, Antonio, like her brothers earlier in the play, asks the Duchess to fulfill a prescribed identity. Although Antonio’s request differs from the Duchess’s brothers’ since it comes more from a place of protection than domination, it still asks her
to suppress her own feelings in favor of ones that would make her behavior easier for the men around her to understand. However, the Duchess resists this identity when she, after Bosola advises her to forget Antonio, tells him, “Were I a man I’d beat that counterfeit face into thy other” (III.v.18). By threatening Bosola and framing that threat as a behavior that would be possible if her gender were male, the Duchess reveals that she recognizes the emptiness of passive suffering since it would do nothing but reduce her individuality.

Ferdinand again attempts to reduce this individuality by imprisoning and torturing the Duchess in such a way that attempts to create a madness in her that would completely eliminate her connection to herself. When taken in the context of Ferdinand’s other behaviors toward his sister, the prison scene in *The Duchess of Malfi* is the culmination of a progression of efforts by Ferdinand to shape the Duchess in a way that makes sense to him. For example, Ferdinand’s response to Bosola’s initial description of the Duchess shows his refusal to understand her as she is. After listening to Bosola comment on the strength the Duchess shows in her imprisonment, Ferdinand exclaims, “Curse upon her! / I will no longer study in the book / Of another’s heart” (IV.i.15-17). Ferdinand’s comment seems to suggest that he will no longer look for meaning in his sister’s identity. Whigham, discussing Ferdinand’s role as ruler and his relationship with his subjects writes, “[S]elf-defeated Ferdinand also fails his political subjects: instead of acting as the traditional fount of identity to them, he generates the loss of their identity, striving to become more himself by reducing others” (67). Whigham’s phrase “traditional fount of identity” reveals the role that the Duke should be playing as ruler. Therefore, the fact that Ferdinand’s extreme fear of losing his identity controls his behavior makes him unfit to occupy his position. Ferdinand’s awareness of the extent of his unworthiness to his position compounds his need to reduce the being of his much more self-actualized sister. As
Ferdinand begins the actual torturing of his sister, his actions toward her focus on attempting to disperse her identity the same way his had been through his use of Bosola’s surveillance. After entering the space where the Duchess is now confined, Ferdinand tells her, “It had been well could you have lived thus always; for indeed / You were too much i’th light. But no more. I come to seal my peace with you” (IV.i.40-41). At first, Ferdinand’s observation that the Duchess was “too much i’th light” seems to be an incorrect one since most of her time in the play is spent within the confines of her chamber. However, Ferdinand could also be using the phrase to describe the openness of the Duchess’s sexual behavior and by using the phrases “But no more” and “seal my peace,” he makes the Duchess aware of his intentions to enclose her permanently.

One way Ferdinand attempts to enclose his sister is by employing the same type of redefinition the Duchess used earlier in the play to now change the meaning of an essential part of the Duchess’s identity: her marriage. While giving his sister a dead hand, Ferdinand tells her, “Here’s a hand / To which you have vowed much love; the ring upon’t / You gave” (IV.i.42-44). As Ferdinand presents the hand to his sister, he describes it as an object on which she acted upon by vowing it love and giving it a ring. By doing this, Ferdinand is revealing the extent of his awareness of the Duchess’s private behavior. Of this scene, Tricomi comments, “Read iconographically, this purported severing of the ringed hand from the body exhibits Ferdinand’s desire to revoke, untie, dissociate, his sister from a marital union he will not approve” (355). Although it is clear Ferdinand’s “gift” of the dead hand to his sister displays his disapproval of her marriage with Antonio, the significance of the scene comes more from the way it conveys Ferdinand’s intention of dislocating his sister’s parts. While there are, of course, many disturbing elements about the presence of the dead hand, perhaps the most disturbing in the context of the play is that its
meaning has been redefined by Ferdinand, who had previously been so concerned with keeping his definition of his sister consistent. By employing redefinition in this scene, Ferdinand changes his intentions toward his sister from suppressing her identity to eliminating it. Whigham, arguing from the perspective of Ferdinand seeing his sister as a contamination asserts, “To destroy her is to destroy the necessarily potent source of doubt, to cauterize, to repress. And the process of destruction reconstitutes them both: she is now the felon, the outlaw; he, the transcendent judge and voice of the community” (72). Whigham argues that by this point in the play, the Duchess’s presence for Ferdinand has created such insecurity regarding his own aristocratic identity that only her destruction will restore his sense of self. Whigham’s argument explains the way in which Ferdinand’s use of redefinition is incorrect. Whereas the Duchess was able to redefine herself through creation, Ferdinand’s use is more reactionary and destructive.

The Duchess confirms the difference between her and Ferdinand’s understanding of redefinition when she is able to proclaim “I am Duchess of Malfi still” (IV.ii.152) while in prison. Although this response is seemingly provoked by Bosola’s responses to her pondering of identity, those ponderings are not directed at Bosola, but at herself. Prompted by the Duchess’s question, “Who am I?” (IV.ii.130), Bosola goes on a long rant about the disgusting nature of the body only to be responded to by the Duchess’s rephrasing of her initial question: “Am I not thy Duchess?” (IV.ii.143). While much criticism has been directed to the Duchess’s eventual claim of identity, this scene is also interesting in its representation of the process by which the Duchess arrives at that claim. Barker, for example, reflects on the tragic nature of this claim since it only serves to establish her position as the wife of her late husband (75). Jankowski, on the other hand, focuses on how the proclamation contradicts itself since it uses her political title to affirm
her private self (243). Although it is true that by stating she is Duchess of Malfi, the Duchess claims herself more in the form of a title than a person, the questions she asks herself prior to this claim, and her ignoring of Bosola’s descriptions of her, demonstrate that there is a power that exists for the Duchess in claiming that title. To reveal this power, Sullivan’s discussion of sleep in terms of how it used when associated with death is helpful in explaining how the Duchess’s claim is an assertion of her selfhood. Sullivan explains, “[W]e see in this instance that the meaning of sleep has in the Duchess’s case undergone a transformation […] Instead of connoting hedonistic self-forgetting, sleep suggests a still conscience and the acceptance of death” (127). In the context of Sullivan’s conception as sleep as a “still conscience,” the Duchess’s use of “still” does not come to mean that her identity is no longer fluid, but that she is content in her personhood as her death approaches. By using “still,” the Duchess’s assures that she has not forgotten who she is and can die while possessing what Sullivan terms as a “still conscience” since she is satisfied in her affirmation of her identity.

Conversely, Ferdinand’s response at the end of the play to the Duchess’s death demonstrates how he has forever lost himself to fragmentation. After receiving news of her passing, Ferdinand exclaims to Bosola, “Let me see her face again. Why didst thou not pity her? […] I bade thee, when I was distracted of my wits, / Go kill my dearest friend, and thou hast done’t” (IV.ii.286-292). For the first time in the play, Ferdinand has referred to the Duchess as his “dearest friend” and thus re-defines the Duchess away from his earlier objectification of her body. Whigham explains Ferdinand’s response by stating, “For Ferdinand the gaze of his sister’s dazzling eyes is likewise intolerable, perhaps as reproachful witness, perhaps as a vision of his own dead face, perhaps as a witness to the limits of his power” (72). In each circumstance that Whigham presents, Ferdinand views his sister’s
death from the perspective of how it changes his identity. From this perspective, Ferdinand is made into a passive vessel that requires his sister’s presence to understand the meaning of his identity. Ferdinand’s use of “dearest friend” in reference to his sister seems curious since throughout the play, the two are not shown to have any relationship other than predator and preyed upon. Because of this, Ferdinand’s reference to his sister here is an attempt by him to recreate their relationship in a way that would best support his identity. However, this recreation fails since the Duchess’s body is no longer present to be acted upon, leaving Ferdinand nowhere else to turn except to madness and, finally, his death.

The ending of The Duchess of Malfi shows that the Cardinal and Ferdinand would have been wise to leave the Duchess to follow the Cardinal’s initial advice. Since Ferdinand cannot tolerate the Duchess being her own director, he loses his own identity by attempting to make the Duchess’s body his space of self-knowledge. By doing this, Ferdinand requires the Duchess to remain constant since he intends to use her body to understand the power his social standing provides him. Since the Duchess does not stay constant because she allows herself to experience sexuality as well as to occupy a variety of roles, Ferdinand determines that the only way to preserve his own identity is eliminating hers. Because this elimination does not work in strengthening Ferdinand’s self, The Duchess of Malfi is revealed to be a play about the power that comes from independent self-creation.
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Since its first publication by Woolf’s own Hogarth Press in 1927, To the Lighthouse has garnered commentary, critique and revision from a range of diverse sources including renowned literary critics, contemporary dramatists and filmmakers. While the re-imaginings of Woolf’s novel by recent artists continue to be innovative, much of the literary critique of the past thirty-odd years has continually revisited a handful of theories and aspects of the text. Many literary critics make reference to the highly autobiographical aspects of To the Lighthouse and find much evidence and support for their typically psychoanalytic readings of the text in Woolf’s own journals and letters. Woolf is often quoted as saying that she intended the novel to capture her father, Leslie Stephen’s likeness precisely. Critics have asserted, however, that
it is Julia Stephen, Woolf’s mother, whose presence dominates the text in the form of Mrs. Ramsay. Laura Marcus, in her essay “Woolf’s Feminism and Feminism’s Woolf,” argues that the influence of Julia Stephen / Mrs. Ramsay in To the Lighthouse might in fact be read as a fictional extension of the feminist manifesto Woolf would later present in A Room of One’s Own and Three Guineas. Marcus theorizes that through her creation of Mrs. Ramsay, Woolf attempts to create a space in which she might be reconciled with her own mother and, by extension, those Victorian ideals which her mother represented.

Several other critics have used the autobiographical nature of To the Lighthouse to cast Woolf herself in the role of impressionist painter Lily Briscoe. Although such an assertion has occasionally lent itself to a discussion of gender or sexuality in the text, most critics have instead used the character of Lily to discuss the novel as Woolf’s meditation on the role of the artist in the modern world, particularly that of the woman artist. Critics such as Randi Koppen have argued that the text may in fact be read, along with the essay “Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown,” as Woolf’s aesthetic treatise promoting the importance and legitimacy of a break with representational or mimetic art in favor of more abstract expression.

Recently, however, critics have become more interested in the ways in which the forces of empire and the First World War may be seen to influence Woolf’s novel. In “‘Something Out of Harmony’: To the Lighthouse and the Subject(s) of Empire,” Janet Winston makes an argument for the novel as imperial allegory, and more specifically, for Mrs. Ramsay as symbolic representative of Queen Victoria and, therefore, the entirety of the British imperial project. Other critics, such as Jane Lillienfield, have made reference to those places in the text where the influences and spoils of the British Empire are explicitly and undeniably present. While Lillienfield is specifically concerned with the use of opium by Mr. Carmichael, it could also be noted that such
objects as Mrs. Ramsay’s jewels “which Uncle James had brought her from India” (To the Lighthouse 80-81), and Mr. Ramsay’s fantasies of expedition and desire to be found “dead at his post, the fine figure of a soldier” (36) are undoubtedly additional instances in which Empire presents itself within To the Lighthouse.

When discussing the presence and influence of empire in Woolf’s novel, it may be noted that previously examined ideas of biography and art are still relevant, and indeed intimately linked to Woolf’s evaluation and treatment of empire in To the Lighthouse. But how might it be determined where and how that evaluation is taking place, and in what ways might Woolf’s attitude towards empire be characterized in terms of the novel? One possibility is the reexamination of perennial points of interest throughout the text with an eye to how they might be related to and influenced by aspects of Victorian empire. In what ways does Mrs. Ramsay represent both Queen Victoria and British imperial prowess, but also where and in what ways is she deployed as a means of interrogating those very constructs? How might issues of familial and interpersonal connection be read as commentary by Woolf upon the institution of empire? Might Lily as artist represent not simply a discussion of aesthetics, but also one of past versus Woolf’s present? An argument might be made, using these familiar topics of critique from To the Lighthouse, that what Woolf is attempting to represent and comment upon is in fact the ways in which Victorianism and empire continued to inform the lives and emotions of not only her characters but also her readers even after the ostensible end of Victorian and British imperial hegemony. However, given the presence and representation of such elements and notions throughout the text, what Woolf is arguing for must not be read as an utter and complete breaking with tradition, but rather the creation of what postcolonial critics have termed a “hybrid” identity, a sort of “third space” from which society and history are discussed.
Perhaps a logical point at which to begin this reexamination is with the much-debated and examined character of Mrs. Ramsay, in addition to being read as a fictionalization of Woolf’s mother Julia Stephen, is typically interpreted to be the embodiment of what Virginia Woolf had termed the “Angel in the House” (Daugherty 290). In Woolf’s essay “Professions for Women,” adapted from a speech given to the National Society for Women’s Service, Woolf described this illustrious figure as someone who

was intensely sympathetic. She was immensely charming. She was utterly unselfish. She excelled in the difficult arts of family life. She sacrificed herself daily...in short she was so constituted that she never had a mind or a wish of her own [...] Above all—I need not say it—she was pure...In those days—the last of Queen Victoria—every house had its Angel. (275)

This description would appear to coincide perfectly with not only the character of Mrs. Ramsay, but the ideal of Victorian womanhood and perhaps notions of Queen Victoria herself. Indeed, representations of Mrs. Ramsay and Queen Victoria appear to be so closely tied in To the Lighthouse that at one point the two become one as Mrs. Ramsay is superimposed upon a portrait of the late monarch (14). She is presented as a person to whom one pays homage, just as if she were a queen (111). It is indeed the case that at various points throughout the first section of the novel, “The Window,” Mrs. Ramsay seems the very embodiment of the Angel in the House. She repeatedly consoles and encourages Mr. Ramsay in his philosophic pursuits, and she appears to care deeply for her children, their happiness, well-being and future remembrances of childhood. This is particularly true of the youngest Ramsay child, James, for whom Mrs. Ramsay worries the failed eponymous trip to the lighthouse shall have terrible effects. “[S]he was certain that he was thinking, we are not going to the Lighthouse tomorrow; and, she thought, he will remember that all his life” (62).
Not only does Mrs. Ramsay express great affection for her children, the fact that there are eight Ramsay progeny speaks to their apparent investment not only in their own family, but in the continuation of British Empire and society. Christina Hauck, in “Why do the Ramsay’s Have So Many Children?: Birth Control and To the Lighthouse,” makes the connection between the “desire to be needed all over the world [and] the issue of (diminished) empire, and suggests the link made frequently during the birth-control debate between large families and on-going imperial strength” (116).

Indeed, the Ramsay matriarch is painted as protectress of all those present at the Ramsay home, particularly the men:

she had the whole of the opposite sex under her protection; for reasons she could not explain […] for the fact that they negotiated treaties, ruled India, controlled finance; finally for an attitude towards herself…something trustful, childlike, reverential. (6)

Critic Janet Winston argues that Mrs. Ramsay in fact “makes everyone her subject,” and that further description of her “alludes to both Mrs. Ramsay’s and Queen Victoria’s philanthropic ambitions” (49). Just as “Queen Victoria envied Florence Nightingale” (49) and expressed interest in caring for the sick and impoverished, Mrs. Ramsay expresses her interest by actually donating her time to care for the ill and professes interest in local dairy and hospital needs in the surrounding area. Woolf’s allegorical monarch is additionally charitable towards the lighthouse-keeper’s family, knitting socks for the man’s son.

Unlike Queen Victoria, however, who aspired to a life of charitable sacrifice, or the idyllic Angel of the House, Mrs. Ramsay performs her assigned role merely in action, not in thought. Although Daugherty claims that Mrs. Ramsay “wholeheartedly supports patriarchal values” (290), upon closer reading this would not appear to be the case. In fact, Mrs. Ramsay spends a good deal of “The Window”
portion of *To the Lighthouse* questioning her prescribed duties under the societal structure of imperial Britain. She asks herself whether her charity is performed as a means of “self-satisfaction,” and admits that secretly this is in fact the case (*TTL* 41). Additionally, her much-loved children are silently encouraged to “find a way out of it all,” and the Ramsay daughters specifically are allowed to “sport with infidel ideas...of a life different from hers...not always taking care of some man or other” (6-7). Hauck argues that Mrs. Ramsay in fact “seems to cling to maternity as a defense against charges that she is less than perfectly womanly” (118). And indeed, Woolf would seem to show that Mrs. Ramsay is in ways resentful of her children, rather than grateful for them. They impede her proposed desire to perform charitable works, causing her to ask how it may be possible for her to divide her personal and public desires and responsibilities. “But how,” she asks might one be able to pursue their professed desires “[w]ith all these children? When they were older, then perhaps she would have time; when they were at school” (*TTL* 58). Although she repeatedly consoles her husband, she finds it trying and tiresome. Mrs. Ramsay is at odds with her assigned role, is indeed lost to it, feeling at one point that “[s]o boasting of her capacity to surround and protect, there was scarcely a shell of herself left for her to know herself by; all was so lavished and spent” (38). Mrs. Ramsay is not an angel who willingly sacrifices herself, but rather submits to the mandates of her society, and eventually finds it impossible to continue doing so. Towards the end of the novel’s first section she admits that “[h]e wanted something—wanted the thing she always found it so difficult to give him; wanted her to tell him that she loved him. And that, no, she could not do” (123). Ultimately, it does not matter whether Mrs. Ramsay performs her duties or inwardly interrogates them and rebels, so associated is she with Victorian perfection that her acquiescence is presumed by all around her. Woolf tells her reader that “[s]he (Mrs.
Ramsay) had not said it: yet he (Mr. Ramsay) knew,” giving explicit voice to the patriarchal assumption of Mrs. Ramsay’s compliance with her assigned role of woman, mother, and perpetuator of Victorian empire (124).

As though Mrs. Ramsay’s explicit, though silent, interrogation and resentment of her role were not enough to differentiate her from the Victorian ideal, Woolf portrays her innermost thoughts as subversive to the entire institution of empire. Mrs. Ramsay would appear to view the entire system as transitory. She imagines her role in life and society in general as being “like a ghostly roll of drums […] [it] made one think of the destruction of the island and its engulfment in the sea, and warned her whose day had slipped past in one quick doing after another that it was all as ephemeral as a rainbow” (16). It would seem, as Daugherty states, that Mrs. Ramsay possesses a dual identity: the public persona of Angel in the House, and the private as subversive, the private forced to cede power to the public (291). These interrogations and doubts on the part of Mrs. Ramsay seem to occur more frequently as “The Window” reaches its end. Her failure or refusal to internalize the role of Angel begins the creation of a void at the center of To the Lighthouse, which becomes more pronounced during the novel’s second section, “Time Passes.”

If there is one section of Woolf’s novel in which Mrs. Ramsay may indeed be said to “assum[e] the role of Queen Victoria, [and], like Victoria herself, [function] synecdochially to signify the British Empire in the Victorian age,” it is in “Time Passes” (Winston 49). Much like the death of Queen Victoria signaled the beginning of an era of momentous change for both British society and empire; so Mrs. Ramsay’s death, a mere four pages into the second portion of the novel, ushers in great change for Woolf’s text and characters. Not only is the domestic sphere which Mrs. Ramsay supposedly represented as the Angel in the House disintegrating, but the institutions which she was charged with
upholding seem to be in a state of disarray as well. The Ramsay’s eldest child, Prue, dies from complications of childbirth, dealing a blow to the future success of empire through the failure of continued reproduction. Additionally, the institution of marriage is seen to falter when it is later learned that the union of Paul Rayley and Minta Doyle, so hoped for and encouraged by Mrs. Ramsay, has turned out to be less than ideal considering Paul’s infidelity. Finally, the death of Andrew Ramsay in the First World War offers a commentary upon the effects of conquest and exploration which Mr. Ramsay had extolled in “The Window.”

It is of note that Prue and Andrew die, and the Rayley’s find personal dissatisfaction while performing the duties assigned to them by the British imperial order, much as Mrs. Ramsay demonstrated in the previous portion of the text. It would seem that these incidents are not merely plot points deployed by Woolf, but rather instances of allegorical concern in the novel. As Winston argues in relation to the presence of other symbols of empire in *To the Lighthouse*, the parenthetical deaths of Mrs. Ramsay, Prue and Andrew might be read “as representing a pervasive anxiety about the sinking British Empire, whose political and economic hegemony in the world was rapidly declining in the first half of the twentieth century” (47). By placing such jarring events in parenthesis, by setting them apart and creating interruptions in the narrative progress of “Time Passes,” Woolf may indeed be drawing attention away from the construction of the novel and placing it instead upon her true concern: the ways in which imperial societal order affected and continues to affect the very lives of the characters she has created, and in turn her readers. Regardless, the deaths and failures of Prue, Andrew, the Rayleys and most importantly Mrs. Ramsay, by giving symbolic voice to the ostensible decay and breaking of Empire, further create the void of hegemony that must be filled in order for the novel to reach its conclusion in which the
previously hegemonic powers of Victoria, Mrs. Ramsay and empire will, although reexamined, remain palpable despite any and all apparent changes.

However, Woolf seems unwilling to fill this void by creating a vision of a new hegemonic order but rather attempts to represent a means by which past, present and future might be reconciled into a new hybrid moment. In order for this hybridization to occur, for the necessary “third space” of commentary to be achieved, Woolf offers up the complex character of Lily Briscoe as replacement for Mrs. Ramsay as the main point of view through which the remaining action of the novel will be witnessed. Indeed, it is only Lily to whom this role may be given since she is the only character in the novel who would seem to represent the diametric opposite of the Victorian, imperial ideals for which her predecessor, Mrs. Ramsay, appeared to stand.

Most notable of the oppositional perspectives which Lily seems to embody would be the way in which her performance of femininity differs from that of Mrs. Ramsay. In *Gender Trouble*, theorist Judith Butler asserts that “gender is a kind of persistent impersonation that passes as the real,” and that the continual and accurate performance of gender within the binary system of male/female results in part from the existence of “compulsory heterosexuality” within patriarchal systems of power (2489). For *To the Lighthouse*, the patriarchal power system at play is of course that of British imperialism, and Lily repeatedly fails to accurately perform either her assigned gender role or conform to the heterosexual mandates put forth by the society in which she exists. Her attempts to “urge her own exemption from the universal law” (*TTL* 50) occur chiefly as a refusal to marry, but more specifically as a refusal to perform those tasks for men which are her assigned duties under the rule of patriarchal empire. “A woman, she had provoked this horror; a woman, she should have known how to deal with it. It was immensely to her discredit, sexually, to stand there
Unlike Mrs. Ramsay, who with her husband appears to Lily as the quintessential symbol of marriage (72), Lily takes solace in the fact that “she need not marry, thank Heaven: she need not undergo that degradation. She was saved from that dilution” (102).

In place of marriage, and in perhaps her most subversive act of all, Lily harbors romantic and sexual feelings towards the perceived emblem of empire within the text: Mrs. Ramsay. Early on in the text Lily expresses difficulty in “control[ling] her impulse to fling herself […] at Mrs. Ramsay’s knee and say to her—but what could one say to her? ‘I’m in love with you?’” (19). By stating that Lily’s feeling is rather an impulse which she must control, Woolf makes clear the fact that there is something different about Lily, something transgressive which must be kept hidden in order to function within the patriarchal, imperial order. Indeed, when Lily wonders “[c]ould loving, as people called it, make her and Mrs. Ramsay one?” (51), her sexual desire becomes conflated with her desire for acceptance by the hegemonic order as supposedly represented by Mrs. Ramsay as the Angel in the House. By expressing such desire for Mrs. Ramsay, Lily in fact challenges the very power by which she wishes to be accepted through a transgressive sexualization of the empire-sustaining maternal figure. Although no explicit sexual act occurs, Lily’s unsanctioned sexual interest in Mrs. Ramsay begins a recontextualization of the allegorical head of empire and the ideals which that figure represented during Victorian empire.

Through her role as artist Lily is able to engage in what Ellen Bayuk Rosenman calls an “act of recovery rather than emulation” (112) in which Mrs. Ramsay, and the past ideals which she had come to represent, are transformed. It is only through this transformation that To the Lighthouse may reach a conclusion and that Lily may have her vision. For Woolf that vision is one of a modern moment which is necessarily informed by and predicated upon the Victorian past. In
order for that modern moment to become one of creation, one in which it is possible for a female artist to have a vision, elements of the past must not merely be accepted, they must be reevaluated.

Upon coming to occupy the central role of “The Lighthouse” section of the novel, Lily and the other remaining women of the text initially attempt to assume the role of Mrs. Ramsay. The long-awaited trip to the lighthouse is finally to occur, and the task of providing for Mrs. Ramsay’s former allegorical subjects must be performed. However, bereft of the deceased matriarch’s angelic talents, the women must “[force themselves] to do what [they] despaired of ever being able to do” (TTL 146). This precise assumption of the role of protectress and provider is no longer an option, particularly for Lily. Branded as outsider by virtue of her “Chinese eyes” (17), subversive sexuality and failed gender performance, Lily can never occupy the role which her predecessor once filled. In response, she attempts to deny that such a position ever existed and states that “[w]e can over-ride her wishes, improve away the limited, old-fashioned ideas. She recedes further and further from us” (174). This objective in mind, Lily attempts to refuse those duties which were previously assigned to Mrs. Ramsay. When asked to continue the ritual of consoling the now-widowed Mr. Ramsay, she declines. However, this utter refusal is likewise destined for failure. Lily must ultimately make some small concession, and upon arriving at the “blessed island of good boots” (154), the homage once paid to her predecessor is nominally bestowed upon her. “Politely, but very distantly, Mr. Ramsay raised his hand and saluted her” (155).

It is only after this reconciliation of Lily’s modern desires to the past-mandates of Victorian patriarchy, this preliminary creation of a past/present hybrid identity, that the artist is able to achieve her vision. Ultimately, Lily acknowledges the continued presence and influence of Mrs. Ramsay and the social edicts which she represented.
through her art. Lily comes to understand that

[the great revelation perhaps never did come. Instead there were little daily miracles, illuminations [...] here was one [...] Mrs. Ramsay saying, ‘Life stand still here’; Mrs. Ramsay making of the moment something permanent (as in another sphere Lily herself tried to make of the moment something permanent)—this was of the nature of revelation. (161)

By re-contextualizing, by accepting those parts of past hegemony which fit “the outline, not the detail” (195), Lily is finally able to achieve both her artistic vision as well as some modicum of her societal ideal. She, and her creator, Woolf, are able to “[transform] a woman who worked to perpetuate the patriarchal society into the personal, feminist, and artistic heritage she herself needs” (Daugherty 289).

This transformation, however, does not negate what critic Laurie Lindopp calls the covert and clandestine attacks upon patriarchy which both Woolf and Lily have been attempting and continue to attempt to perpetrate (193). Rather, by acknowledging Mrs. Ramsay as the interrogator of patriarchy she truly was, and reconciling this with the necessary public persona of the Angel in the House, Woolf and Lily are capable of retaining their “allegiance to a purely feminine line uncontaminated by male involvements” (Rosenman 99). They are able to achieve the goal Woolf would later espouse in A Room of One’s Own of thinking back through their mothers, while acknowledging those mothers as complex, and at times flawed individuals (75). Lily need not give in to the compulsory heterosexuality or gendered mandates of the heritage of Victorian patriarchy, nor must she surrender her modern artistic vision. Indeed, it is only by acknowledging and reconciling herself to Mrs. Ramsay and social history, by developing a hybrid space of past and present from which to comment on both states, that Lily, and in turn Woolf and To the Lighthouse, may achieve the status of modern vision.
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WHAT CAN TELEVISION TEACH US ABOUT THE NOVEL?: INTERNET CONVERGENCE, COMMODITY AND SERIALIZED FICTION SURROUNDING THE TERMINATOR FRANCHISE

by Anna Brecke

Anna Brecke holds an M.A. in English from Simmons College in Boston and is currently pursuing an M.A. in Gender and Cultural Studies from the same.

The current abundance of intertextual relationships between television, film and internet sources can be compared to the proliferation of Victorian serialized fiction and the rise of the ‘penny dreadful’ in the second half of the nineteenth century. Both media forms are a way of actively engaging a reader over an extended period of time at low economic cost to the publisher or producer and low initial cost to the consumer. The advantage lies not in high-profit yield for a single purchase or viewing, like seeing a movie in the theater or purchasing a hardcover novel, but in extended reader or viewer involvement with multiple texts creating a long-term commitment to the narrative. In fact, “the economy of serialization avoided high up front expenditure to the consumer […] thus multiplying sales and Profits” (Brake 212). The myriad forms of serial publication also served to “maximize a stratified readership” (Brake 210). Serialized fiction and ‘penny dreadfuls’ were cheap and thrilling publications, often concerned with sensational and salacious subject matter that
gained popularity because of their mass appeal and extensive market availability. Innovations in the publishing industry and expanding railroads provided wider distribution bases for inexpensive publications as fiction was included in magazines and issued in serialized parts so that each installment could be purchased on its own (Springhall 157-8). Contemporary use of the internet to support television and film franchises operates in much the same way as serialized publication. It is comparatively inexpensive and engages an audience over long periods of time, frequently with materials that exist outside the text proper, and in a format that is interactive and includes advertizing. The internet text that supplements the original narrative taps into a preexisting pattern of information retrieval that the contemporary audience experiences daily. In Every Thing Bad is Good for You, Steven Johnson attributes this relationship between user and text to the rise of active involvement with internet texts saying, “exploring nonlinear document structures has become as second nature as dialing a phone for hundreds of millions—if not billions—of people” (170). The media consumer who traverses nonlinear document structures daily demands more from his/her entertainment sources than a single, sixty minute weekly engagement with a narrative. Like the Victorian audience, which devoured conceptually new serialized narrative over a period of months or years, the television audience of the last fifteen years has embraced the new multiple texts that surround a televisual narrative (Caldwell). In addition, the internet platform creates a space where the real and diegetic worlds can virtually interact, blurring the line that delineates what is real and what is fiction. The viewer or user participates and engages in the narrative diegesis and thus becomes more personally invested in the text. An examination of the Terminator franchise shows the way in which television, film and internet all act together to create a master text while perpetuating audience active and economic involvement with that text.
Serialized fiction has proven to be a successful form of disseminating a product because of its unique ability to maintain audience involvement over an extended period of time. When discussing syndicated television series, Johnson says, the “ultimate goal” behind producing a text is not “about capturing an audience's attention once” rather it “becomes more about keeping their attention through repeated viewings” (159)—but this goal did not emerge with the advent of syndicated television. Any producer of a text as commodity has the long-term goal of capturing audience members for an extended period of time. If it was the initial novelty of serialization that kept the Victorian interest, then it was the continuous nature of serialized narrative that brought them back again and again. In much the same way that the televisual fosters extended engagement, “such serialization encourages suspense and maintains the continuity of interest which more conventional publication in toto would have precluded, and there is no doubt also that serial publication encouraged precisely the kind of breathless [...] excitement” that ensured continued readership from installment to installment (Ackroyd 199). It is “breathless excitement” that spelled economic success for serial publications. Discussing the nature of serial publication, Laurel Brake notes the illusion that “it will never end” helped to create the “image of the provision of lifelong reading material and engagement” (211). A lifelong reader, or viewer, is a continued source of revenue but also a reader, or viewer, who has truly committed to the narrative.

Similar to the businessmen who participated in the serialized fiction enterprise as “editors, publishers, wholesale newsagents and distributors” (Springhall 571) of their product, the companies who own a franchise like Terminator are involved in each aspect of its production and marketing. Warner Brothers and Twentieth Century Fox are the determining figures behind Terminator: The Sarah Connor Chronicles, the recent movie T:4, and the websites Resistorbeterminated.com and
Skynetresearch.com. These websites served as elaborate interactive advertising platforms for the then upcoming movie by extending the narrative world of the televisual through an intertextual crossover, thereby increasing the text and narrative possibilities as a cheap and exciting way for the consumer to stay involved. The internet provides for the contemporary viewer a comparable experience to the initial Victorian serial publications because the serials were inexpensive and provided “three or four times as much matter […] for the same price” (Springhall 568). Like contemporary media formats, “publishing cheap fiction was first and foremost a commercial business” designed to gain long-term consumer readership (Springhall 570). Because they represent a branching away from the traditional space occupied by the televisual narrative and create an extended platform for audiences’ participation, internet sites, more than television or film, do similar work as serialized fiction. As Brake says “knowledge on the web offers another analogy of our time with the text of nineteenth-century periodicals and part-issue” in that this text is riddled with advertising, loosely regulated (209) and, I would add, inexpensively present in our homes and lives. Websites devoted to extending character or narrative are able to provoke consumers into long term participation with the televisual text.

In his article, “A Specter is Haunting Television Studies,” Jeffery Sconce discusses the “great scam” of late twentieth and early twenty-first century television in which intertextual media platforms have played a pivotal role. He calls our current relationship to television one of “proliferation and fragmentation,” which has “allowed us to find more and more content worthy of our attention” while “encouraging us to continue yielding our interiority to fantasy lives crafted by market force.” In other words, what was originally a free, hour long event (i.e., an episode of Moonlighting in 1988), can now absorb a much larger chunk of time and money, requiring that the
consumer/viewer participate in an ever-increasing world of websites and special features that supplement the hour long text of a 2009 episode of *Terminator: The Sarah Connor Chronicles*. The technological advancements surrounding the way we engage with televisual texts have provided twenty-first century consumers with multiple options and formats through which to follow the narrative and characters of their favorite program. Sconce calls this new multiple medium and multiple technological involvement the “opportunity to ‘inhabit’ a given television show for hours on end” (“What If?” 110). Internet sites like Fox.com/terminator and Skynetresearch.com effectively extend the text of the Terminator mythos by providing a seemingly endless series of possible engagements for the consumer.

In “Convergence Television: Aggregate Form and Repurposing Content in the Culture of Conglomeration,” John Caldwell discusses the way in which these types of website create a new “expansive text that dwarfs the traditional thirty and sixty minute time slots of traditional shows” (53). He uses the word migration to explain the way texts move back and forth between the televisual and internet platforms. Specifically citing Dawsonscreek.com as a “technological augmentation” which “thereby enables viewers to live vicariously in a constructed diegetic world and space outside the show,” Caldwell is creating a precedent for discussing the explosion of televisual based websites we can click our way through in 2009 (Caldwell 52). "Participatory media" infinitely expands the possibility of consumer engagement with text (Johnson 116-118), and “in this multimedia/ multi-image context, audiences are learning new ‘viewing protocols’ that allow them to interpret TV images in relation to the textual materials found on the Net” (Spiegel 6). New “viewing protocols” are exactly what the Victorian audience experienced when first introduced to serialized fiction, which appeared side by side with news stories and advertisements. This process allowed for a greater expenditure of time
and effort devoted to consuming the new media format.

Internet narrative extension has become so ubiquitous in 2009 that we expect our favorite narratives to weave between film or television and the internet. For example, Fox.com/Terminator is the official website of *Terminator: The Sarah Connor Chronicles* and provides the expected cast biography, photographic stills from the series, behind the scenes information and discussion forums that serve to extend the diegetic world. The site also provides a Community page which invites the user to click through from Fox.com to a diverse web network of other Terminator based sites, ranging from fan-hosted weblogs to Warner Bros. owned SkynetResearch.com. The entire franchise is represented in these websites, and a fan can reread the plot summary of the initial movies, speculate on narrative twists for the upcoming teleserial episodes or purchase Terminator memorabilia. The vast array of possible online activities keeps an audience member, or consumer, involved for hours. That the original film series is still an important part of this text is a crucial to the long-term survival of the text. As Caldwell says, the “most effective Web sites for TV succeed by keeping viewer-users engaged long after a series episode has aired” (51). The migration from film to television to internet of the Terminator series has revitalized interest in a narrative that supposedly ended six years ago. The relationship between internet and television texts that cross boundaries are a form of what Caldwell calls stunting, or breaking the diegetic world in a way that rewards a long-term viewer.

Boundaries between the real and the diegetic can be broken in two ways. In the confines of the main text of the narrative, like the canon of a televisual series, the characters may step outside themselves and acknowledge that they are actors playing roles. Either explicitly, as in Caldwell’s example of the episode of *Xena: Warrior Princess* which plays with series’ diegesis by having "the fictional characters debate the narratological choices about appropriate character arcs in the
series" (63) or *The Simpsons* episode "Behind the Laughter" which parodies the behind-the-scenes looks at their favorite stars that fans demand by having the Simpson family step outside their characters and become actors who play the Simpsons on TV. The boundary can also be broken in more subtle ways. One example would be when a fictional character is self-referential to the actor who plays that character (i.e., Brad Pitt doing a guest spot on *Friends* in which he plays a character who hates Rachel, who was played by his then real life spouse, Jennifer Aniston). This kind of stunt rewards long-term viewership by allowing consumers to feel a greater level of involvement with the characters and a sense of being allowed to participate in the creation of the show. Thus, the intimacy between viewer and character is increased and commitment to the narrative is strengthened.

The second way boundaries can be breached moves in the opposite direction. If characters can acknowledge their fictionality and participate in our world, however briefly, then the viewer can also participate in the diegetic world. The internet is uniquely suited to the second kind of interaction for obvious reasons. Users participate in virtual worlds online daily, some of which are fictional, some of which are real, and some are both fictional and real. We take classes in virtual classrooms for real grades and have avatars whose social systems mimic reality and interact with other avatars sponsored by real people (Secondlife.com). It seems like an easy extension of this already blurred relationship to assume that we can apply to a fictional college, like the Boston Bay College included on the *Dawson’s Creek* website, or be threatened by a fictional company like Skynet Research. The Terminator franchise has developed an internet community that engages in web based interaction with the diegetic world of the televisual and film series. Intertextual expansion provides consumers with the ability to immerse themselves completely in the Terminator diegesis, thus for the price of an internet subscription, say twenty
dollars a month, the consumer has unlimited access to and engagement with the diegetic world being offered by the production company. They are able to interact with the narrative as much as they desire and over as many weeks, months and years as they like. The continued existence of Dawsons Creek.com six years after the series’ cancellation attests to the internet’s ability to increase textual longevity.

The Terminator franchise began in 1984 with The Terminator, a feature film in which cyborgs from the future came back to the present to destroy the human, Sarah Connor, who would give birth to the man, John Connor, who would destroy Skynet, the company responsible for developing cyborg and artificial intelligence technology used to destroy the human race (The Terminator). If the premise of the film does not provide enough narrative complexity to occupy a fan, the subsequent incarnations of the franchise certainly do. Three movies were produced between 1984 and 2003, following the life John Connor and his mother Sarah at three distinct points in time. In 2007, the televisual Terminator: The Sarah Connor Chronicles (T:SCC) debuted on FOX television. The serial follows the Connors as they time jump between points in the narrative arc of the film series. In fact, in current T:SCC chronology, Sarah Connor has now time jumped over her own death from leukemia in 2005, making her existence in 2007 an anachronism. The success of the serial and the anticipation of a fourth movie, T:4 or Terminator: Salvation released on 18 May, 2009, resulted in a myriad of websites devoted through Sconce’s “proliferation and fragmentation” to the Terminator mythos.

I mentioned the fansites’ blended or intertextual approach to the diegetic world because it is important to the extension of the original text that all subsequent Terminator texts be viewed as part of the same world. Jonathan Culler states all texts essentially presuppose all other texts that have come before them (101-103). He cites Julia Kristeva’s definition of intertextuality as “the sum of knowledge that
makes it possible for texts to have meaning” (Culler 104). This idea of intertextual dependence is especially important in the franchised narrative where one media form, say a television program, is a spin off, or extenuation, of another, like a movie. *Terminator: The Sarah Connor Chronicles* presupposes the diegetic world represented in *The Terminator* and its sequels. Preexisting knowledge of the Terminator text is necessary for anyone who stumbles on to a website devoted to the text and such websites presuppose audience knowledge of the Terminator mythos. The extended web-text surrounding the Terminator mythos has expanded beyond the single site model to include a network of websites hosted by the television production company, Fox.com/terminator, the film production company, ResistOrBeTerminated.com, and the fans, theresistance.tumblr.com. The fansites do not make a distinction between the television and movie franchises and treat them as one intertextual diegetic world. The short lived website SkynetResearch.com is perhaps the clearest example of both the necessity of pretextual knowledge and the reward to users who engage over extended periods of time with this complex text.

Skynet is presented as a company that exists in the actual world and the website is a virtual representation of product line and services offered; a consumer who comes across Skynet Research is not given any visual or auditory clues that the company behind the site is fictional. In appearance, the corporate logo and site organization resemble any other technology company. The corporate jingle, a synthesized series of trills over a light drum beat, might be used in advertising any tech company. Corporate philosophy and the language of the website might be attributed to any tech or info-tech company in 2009. A comparison of the Skynet Research and Cisco Systems websites revealed the following similarities: both companies appear to offer security systems as well as hardware to improve business and personal productivity; both sites offer informational videos providing testimony to the invaluable
contribution company products have in human lives; and both offer the option to learn more about product offerings through a catalogue page. The Cisco Systems site even has a graphic novel style page devoted to protecting “The Realm” (read your computer network) from “a new class of criminals” (read computer viruses) that are threatening your home and business (Cisco.com). Complete with superhero costumes and theme music, this section of the Cisco Security service casts engineers in the role of protecting mankind from evil cyber organizations like the fictional Synocorp (Cisco.com). In this light, the Cisco Systems website appears more likely to be fictional than the Skynet site. The creators of the Skynet site have gone to great lengths to mimic a real data and security corporation while the producers of the Cisco Systems site are using fictional narrative as advertisement.

It is not until the user further investigates the “stunt” Skynet site that its involvement in the Terminator diegesis becomes evident. The text of this site includes lines like “Skynet is interested in learning as much about the details of our potential consumers as we are about changing the world. What makes you tick? Skynet wants to know.” This rewards the viewer of the film sequence and the televisual who know that Skynet researched humanity for years before ultimately beginning its campaign for world domination (Skynetresearch.com). The site allows a consumer to actively engage with the mythos, or diegesis, on a new level and rewards long term involvement with the text in several ways. First, the seemingly innocuous corporate lingo of the website can be interpreted as a series of subtle threats to the human race by a consumer who knows the preexisting texts well. Skynetresearch.com presupposes the greater text of the television and film series as fundamental required knowledge for understanding of the web-text. Second, the website allows the consumer to enter the diegesis in an entirely different way because it does not readily acknowledge that it is fiction. One has to look closely at the eight point
font copyright in the lower right hand corner of the screen to learn that the site is owned by Warner Bros. The Terminator franchise is not overtly referenced. The third way long term involvement with the narrative is rewarded is in the Skynet Research corporate jingle. When listening closely, users familiar with the Terminator franchise will recognize the movie and televisual theme music, a series of ominous drum beats, as the underlying rhythm in Skynet's gentle corporate jingle. This capitalizes on the extensive knowledge of the viewer/user who has engaged with the Terminator master text through film and television. Skynetresearch.com effectively stunts across the real and diegetic worlds but is also a form of “transmedia storytelling [...] designed to appear across different media platforms so that we can now access our favorite media ‘franchises’ and characters in multiple storytelling universes” (Speigel 6).

To reconsider the birth and evolution of serialized fiction, one needs to be aware of the way in which intertextual twentieth and twenty-first century televisual and internet narratives are involved in the process of capturing and maintaining consumer attention and consumption. Like the serialized novels in the nineteenth century, which were published and republished in different formats at different price points (meaning a text would be specially produced to match the spending potential of consumers from all social classes, thereby enabling the publisher to ensure that the lower economic classes were as able to access a text as the upper classes), the contemporary multimedia narratives are relatively inexpensive, readily available and ubiquitously present in our homes and lives. The internet platform allows extended narrative content to exist side by side with advertising, like the Victorian magazine platform for serialized fiction. Both formats promote and foster engagement with a single narrative text, in all its incarnations, over months and years, just as the serialized “publication format” was “intertwined with a vision of life” for the
Victorian audience (Lund and Hughes 2). Thus the experience of engaging with a narrative text across intertextual media platforms has become an essential part of twenty-first century life. If we are to consider what contemporary television can teach us about serialized fiction, the answer may very well be that although narrative form has evolved, our relationship to narrative has not.
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In Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s “This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison” and “Frost at Midnight,” the speaker begins each conversation poem by engaging in introspection in a manner that resembles self-pity. He expresses despair because his injured foot prevents him from joining his friends for an evening walk in nature in “Lime-Tree Bower,” and he frets over the dead calmness that envelops him during a cold night as he watches over his sleeping infant son in “Frost at Midnight”; consequently, both conversation poems capture moments that show Coleridge suffering from anxiety and isolation, which may be interpreted as evidence that the poet is solipsistic. According to Anne K. Mellor, the self-absorption of the male Romantic poets is a form of egotism and their works demonstrate their inability to form connections with others, causing them to remain permanently estranged from their loved ones. Mellor contends that some of the most celebrated poetry by male Romantics illustrates that “the [only] love
[they] feel is [...] self-love” (27); furthermore, her belief that the male poets succumb to “alienated self-consciousness and isolation” (13) results from their restricted, narcissistic perceptions (20).

Paul Magnuson, however, asserts that Coleridge uses his imagination in “Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight,” as well as in the other conversation poetry that he subsequently wrote, to project his consciousness within the minds of the individuals addressed in the poems in order to identify with their feelings and experiences (19). Magnuson clarifies his point by stating that Coleridge “places the other mind[s] at the center of [his] imaginative vision. In ‘This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison’ and ‘Frost at Midnight,’ Lamb, the Wordsworths, and Hartley participate in joy, and Coleridge reaches toward that vision through their perceptions” (19). Although Magnuson contends that Coleridge relies on his consciousness to transform his despondent outlook by absorbing the sensibilities of the two poems’ recipients, who are his family members and friends, Coleridge also establishes and strengthens intimate connections with these recipients of “This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison” and “Frost at Midnight” by engaging his imagination to resolve the internal crises he experiences and utilizing active dialogues in the two conversation poems.

At the inception of “This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison,” the speaker, or Coleridge, reveals that he experiences agitation after his friends leave him in a garden bower, nursing a lame foot, as they depart to enjoy a walk in nature. He appears to feel sorry for himself as he openly laments his misfortune:

Well, they are gone, and here I must remain,
This lime-tree bower, my prison! I have lost
 Beauties and feelings, such as would have been
Most sweet to my remembrance even when age
Had dimmed mine eyes to blindness! (1-5)
The speaker’s words seem to swell with fretfulness and self-absorption, sounding almost childlike as he likens his lime-tree retreat to a form of imprisonment; furthermore, he suggests that he will suffer severe aesthetic and emotional impairments as a result of his temporary confinement in solitude. His use of the word “loss” suggests that his exile to the garden bower causes him to feel permanently disadvantaged as he endures disconnection from his friends and nature.

Coleridge appears to express similar feelings of solipsism in “Frost at Midnight,” as he sits in his cottage late one night, observing the cold temperature and the deafening calm:

The frost performs its secret ministry,
Unhelped by any wind. The owlet’s cry
Came loud – and hark, again! Loud as before.
The inmates of my cottage, all at rest,
Have left me to that solitude, which suites
Abstruser musings; save that at my side
My cradled infant slumbers peacefully.
‘Tis calm indeed! So calm, that it disturbs
And vexes meditation with its strange
And extreme silentness. (1-10)

Unlike “This Lime-Tree Bower,” the speaker does not ostensibly engage in sulkiness; however, the calm darkness seems to inhibit his pursuit of meditation, which seemingly upsets him. Coleridge’s use of words like “disturb,” “vexes,” and “extreme,” implies that he feels troubled, confused, and, perhaps, severely imbalanced emotionally; moreover, although his family, including his infant son, provides him with a quiet household so that he can enjoy the solitude and opportunity for self-reflection, Coleridge still seems to feel unhappy.

A superficial analysis of Coleridge’s conversation poems, particularly “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight,” would
likely conclude that the speaker’s underlying problem is that he suffers from egotism and self-absorption, which is Mellor’s contention regarding male Romantic poets (27). Each of the two poems, after all, opens with the speaker experiencing an emotional crisis that focuses on his feelings of personal discontent; consequently, because Coleridge immediately places himself at the centers of both poems, without any initial regard for the other individuals present in the works, Mellor’s assertion that the male Romantic poets remain narcissistically trapped within their own perspectives may seem like a feasible explanation (20). A more in-depth study, however, illustrates that Coleridge suffers from, as Thomas McFarland terms, “massive anxiety” (112). According to McFarland, Coleridge’s mother lacked warmth and displayed little attentiveness towards him as an infant, which likely contributed to his agitated state (118); furthermore, McFarland states that Coleridge “developed a clinging reliance on his friends” as a result of his anxiety, and the poet constantly expressed the need to feel intimately connected with those he loved (121). The biographical details that McFarland provides, therefore, help to form a more accurate depiction of the speakers in “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight.” By revisiting the previous examples, the presence of anxiety, rather than egotism or self-absorption, is evident in Coleridge’s voice. For instance, he experiences genuine agitation in his garden bower captivity as he endures separation from his friends in the former poem, and in the latter poem, he feels troubled, confused, and emotionally imbalanced as a result of the calm darkness that surrounds him, since he perceives himself suffering in isolation after his loved ones symbolically perish into a gloomy, cold night.

Although McFarland’s contention that Coleridge’s desire to maintain strong relationships with friends and relatives originates from his struggles with a crippling anxiety disorder, the poet’s effort to preserve intimate ties also suggests that he places an elevated
significance on the concept of friendship. According to Gurion Taussig, “Family for Coleridge is an ideal to which friendship aspires” (27). Taussig further asserts that Coleridge considers the terms “family” and “friendship” as interchangeable, stating that the poet places equal importance on both types of relationships (27); in addition, he claims that, for Coleridge, friendships offer the opportunity to assimilate, or fit in, with others, resulting in a “nurturing affection” that he experiences from those he cares for (27). Although Mellor and other feminist critics may contend that Coleridge’s perspective of familial and other intimate relationships offers further proof that the poet engages in self-absorbed behavior because he mentions the benefits he enjoys from interpersonal relationships, the idea that Coleridge regards family and friends equally confirms the high esteem he places on both associations; consequently, the poet illustrates his capacity to care for others.

The notion that Coleridge possesses the ability to experience concern for other people, rather than maintaining the capability for feeling only egotism and self-love, as Mellor suggests, is further exemplified by examining the implications behind the phrase “conversation poems.” Because “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight” are considered conversation poems, the term indicates that Coleridge intends to engage in dialogue within the works; however, in order to understand the probable meanings of the phrase “conversation poem,” then a significant point is to understand the various denotations of the word “conversation.” Although the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) provides a comprehensive list of phrases that describe the noun “conversation,” the following four definitions offer a fundamental understanding of the word: “interchange of thoughts and words; a talk, colloquy; circle of acquaintance, company, society; the action of living or having one’s being in a place or among persons.” After considering all four of these definitions, one realizes that Coleridge’s conversation poetry demonstrates that he likely intends to initiate
connections with the addressees of the poetry. An “interchange,” “talk [ing],” situating oneself within a “circle of company,” and “being [...] among [other] persons” strongly suggests the objective of establishing attachments with other individuals, rather than engaging in one-sided monologues within “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight.” Because Coleridge seeks unity with others, he demonstrates that he desires to be in the presence of other individuals and cares for these people in his relationships; as a result, Mellor’s claim that Coleridge, a male Romantic poet, is narcissistic and lacks sympathy for others is further disputed.

In order to show that Coleridge seeks to form bonds with family and friends in “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight,” however, an examination of the poetry must first illustrate that the speaker eventually experiences relief from his anxious, alienated state. As Magnuson observes, the key for Coleridge to achieve his goal of escaping isolation, which is a result of anxiety, is to “brea[k] out of the emptiness of his self” (25). Since the speaker is alone in both poems, save the sleeping infant Hartley in the latter work, achieving the release that Magnuson describes is difficult without a catalyst to bridge the gap between feeling fretfully disconnected and establishing an interest outside of the self. According to James Engell, however, the key to breaking away from isolation involves utilizing the creative mind: “Through [the] imagination, [...] [an individual] becomes not an alienated fortress or island but a part of an organic whole, a special creature in whom lives the whole” (335); furthermore, Engell asserts that the way to effectively utilize the imagination is to form a connection between the creative mind and the natural world, observing that the “imagination is part of the creating and shaping spirit of nature” (341-42). Magnuson concurs with Engell’s assertion, illustrated by Magnuson’s contention that Coleridge “must follow [his friends] in his imagination” in “This Lime-Tree Bower” in order to find freedom.
from alienation (25). An examination of the two conversation poems supports Magnuson’s and Engell’s contentions that Coleridge employs nature as a means of stimulating the imagination and subsequently severs his feelings of anxiety and isolation.

As Magnuson notes, Coleridge begins his departure from despair and alienation by accompanying Charles Lamb and the Wordsworths on their nature walk, via his imagination, in “This Lime-Tree Bower” (25). In order for Coleridge to successfully connect with his friends through an inspired mediation, however, the poet must use the natural environment as a springboard to engage in the meditative process, according to Engell’s previously discussed claim that establishes nature as the catalyst to the imagination. Since the speaker sits in a garden bower, or shady thicket, he inhabits a space in nature as his friends commence their walk. In line seven of the poem, Coleridge enters his meditative state, envisioning his friends traversing “[o]n springy heath, along the hill-top edge” (7). The speaker’s sorrowful demeanor begins to change in line ten of the poem when Coleridge begins to visualize his friends walking along a small valley filled with trees, an image that he vividly recollects because of his previous walks along the same course:

The roaring dell, o’erwooded, narrow, deep,
And only speckled by the mid-day sun;
Where its slim trunk the ash from rock to rock
Flings arching like a bridge; — that branchless ash,
Unsunned and damp, whose few poor yellow leaves
Ne’er tremble in the gale; yet tremble still,
Fanned by the water-fall! and there my friends
Behold the dark green file of long lank weeds,
That all at once (a most fantastic sight!)
Still nod and drip beneath the dripping edge
Of the blue clay-stone. (10-19)
Once Coleridge pictures himself accompanying Lamb and the Wordsworth on their nature walk, the language in the poem begins to transform, emphasizing the shift away from the speaker’s anxious word choices as he moves towards descriptive and dynamic speech. For example, the words “roaring,” “flings,” and “fanned,” illustrate energy and vibrancy, which convey movement, unlike Coleridge’s static language of “gone,” “remain,” and “dimmed” in lines one through five of the poem. The speaker’s use of language, therefore, symbolically represents his progression away from anxiety and alienation and towards a connection to nature and others, sources outside of himself. Coleridge further demonstrates an accelerating bond with his friends as he visualizes them enjoying the sight of “the dark green file of long lank weeds” that “nod and drip” (17,19), which is a spectacle that he received pleasure from on prior occasions.

While Coleridge is able to use his direct presence in nature as a springboard to his imagination in “This Lime-Tree Bower,” his cottage in a small rural village is the venue that facilitates his meditation in “Frost at Midnight.” Even though the speaker sits indoors on a dark, cold night, he is, in effect, occupying a space within the natural world, since he senses the gloomy desolation of his environment and hears the piercing wail of the owlet, evidence that nature surrounds him; moreover, he reveals that “[s]ea, hill, and wood” (10) inhabit his natural environment, along with the cottage that serves as his dwelling place. Coleridge, therefore, firmly establishes his presence in nature that ultimately initiates his journey into the imagination. As in “This Lime-Tree Bower,” the speaker in “Frost at Midnight” seeks to overcome his feelings of anxiety and isolation, accomplishing this task by engaging in a meditation. Instead of imagining a real-time event that occurs in a separate location from the speaker, as in the former poem, his creative mind travels to the past in the latter work, recalling a period during his childhood:
With unclosed lids, already had I dreamt
Of my sweet birth-place, and the old church-tower,
Whose bells, the poor man’s only music rang
So sweetly, that they stirred and haunted me
With a wild pleasure, falling on mine ear
Most like articulate sounds of things to come! (27-33)

As Coleridge enters the imaginative realm, his thoughts shift from the agitation and loneliness he feels to pleasurable memories from his school days as a youth in the country. He ceases usage of language that illustrates his separation from others and emphasizes his agitation, such as “solitude” and “disturbs,” in lines five and eight, respectively; moreover, the speaker replaces words that express distress with language that conveys joy, including “sweet,” “sweetly,” and “wild pleasure” that reveals that his focus migrates from a preoccupation with the self to an interest in objects and events outside of himself. Coleridge’s meditation eventually leads him to a fond recollection of his sister, which provides further evidence that he distances himself from despair and isolation:

Save if the door half opened, and I snatched
A hasty glance, and still my heart leaped up,
For still I hoped to see the stranger’s face,
Townspeople, or aunt, or sister more beloved,
My play-mate when we were both dressed alike! (39-43)

By forming a connection with his sister, his beloved playmate during childhood, via his imagination, Coleridge further illustrates a capability to shift his thoughts away from himself in order to focus on others; consequently, he reveals that he, once again, disproves Mellor’s contention that he, as a male Romantic poet, remains “alienated [in] self-consciousness and isolation” (13) due to narrow, solipsistic perceptions (20).

The meditations that Coleridge initiates in “This Lime-Tree
Bower” and “Frost at Midnight” serve a subsequent purpose that follows the diminishment of his agitation and his removal from isolation: the speaker’s use of the imagination reveals his progression toward establishing meaningful dialogues with the addressees of the two conversation poems. By exercising the creative mind, Coleridge illustrates that the expansion of his cerebral borders permits him to concentrate on other people, rather than remaining entrapped in his own circumstances; as a result, he increases his proclivity to feel compassion for others. According to Engell, “sympathy relies completely on the imagination” (143); furthermore, Engell contends that “sympathy [...] becomes that special power of the imagination which permits the self to escape its own confines, to identify with other people, to perceive things in a new way, and to develop an aesthetic appreciation of the world” (143-44). By applying Engell’s pronouncements to Coleridge’s two conversation poems, the poet demonstrates that his sympathy for others increases after he participates in meditation; as a result, the speaker begins to engage in direct dialogue with the addressees of the poems. In “This Lime-Tree Bower,” for example, after visualizing his friends on their nature walk and reflecting, with joy, on the familiar sights he imagines they visit, Coleridge begins speaking directly to Charles Lamb, revealing an outpouring of affection and compassion:

In gladness all; but thou, methinks, most glad,
My gentle-hearted Charles! for thou hast pined
And hungered after Nature, many a year,
In the great City pent, winning thy way
With sad yet patient soul. (27-31)

After using his creative mind as a facilitator to focus on others, Coleridge is able to gain sympathy for Charles, who lives in London and has few opportunities to commune with and enjoy nature; furthermore, the compassion that the speaker perceives for his friend...
elicits feelings of tenderness in the speaker, allowing him to initiate a dialogue with Charles. In this conversation poem, Coleridge aptly illustrates Engell’s point that “sympathy relies completely on the imagination” (143), which ultimately allows him to converse and connect with his good friend.

Similarly, in “Frost at Midnight,” after Coleridge successfully forms a cerebral connection with his sister by reflecting on a childhood memory, he engages in a heartfelt conversation with his infant son Hartley:

Dear Babe, that sleepest cradled by my side,
Whose gentle breathings, heard in this deep calm,
Fill up the interspersed vacancies
And momentary pauses of the thought!
My babe so beautiful! it thrills my heart
With tender gladness, thus to look at thee,
And think that thou shalt learn far other lore
And in far other scenes! (44-51)

After Coleridge shifts his focus away from himself during his meditation, he acquires a compassionate consideration for those who do not have opportunities to experience the pleasures of nature firsthand. In addition, by visualizing the bond with his sister and cerebrally reestablishing his relationship with her, the speaker strengthens his capacity for showing interest in others and experiencing sympathy; consequently, Coleridge, reminded that Hartley sleeps by his side, is filled with love and compassion for his son and initiates a dialogue, expressing his desire for Hartley to experience the world and enjoy nature throughout his life. The sympathy that the poet gains by redirecting his focus to others allows him to establish a bond with his son by engaging in direct conversation with the infant.

Both “This Lime-Tree Bower” and “Frost at Midnight” conclude with Coleridge offering a benediction to each of the poem’s addressees.
In the former poem, the speaker blesses the crow that he observes in flight, knowing that Charles witnessed the same bird a few minutes before during his nature walk:

My gentle-hearted Charles! when the last rook
Beat its straight path along the dusky air
Homewards, I blessed it! deeming its black wing
(Now a dim speck, now vanishing in light)
Had crossed the mighty orb’s dilated glory,
While thou stood’st gazing. (68-73)

Coleridge realizes that he and Charles experience a shared moment in nature, even though they are not in each other’s physical presence; consequently, the moment, for Coleridge, becomes an opportunity to intensify the bond that he establishes with his friend—a bond that transcends physical limitations. Because the speaker blesses the crow, and the shared moment with Charles, the link with Charles becomes spiritual, demonstrating that their relationship has strengthened since the inception of the poem; furthermore, by offering a prayer, Coleridge illustrates that the conversation with his friend becomes deeply intimate, a final indication that his bond with Charles is enduring.

Similarly, in “Frost at Midnight,” Coleridge’s prayer for Hartley is his desire for his son to cherish nature in all seasons and forms:

Therefore all seasons shall be sweet to thee,
Whether the summer clothe the general earth
With greenness, or the redbreast sit and sing
Betwixt the tufts of snow on the bare branch
Of mossy apple-tree, while the nigh thatch
Smokes in the sun-thaw; whether the eave-drops fall
Heard only in the trances of the blast,
Or if the secret ministry of frost
Shall hang them up in silent icicles,
Quietly shining to the quiet Moon. (65-74)
Magnuson observes that “[i]n this final prayerful hope for his son’s growth, Coleridge is able to forget his own disappointment, but only through thinking of someone else’s joy can he reach any of his own” (34). Magnuson’s claim demonstrates that, even though Coleridge endures a gloomy and cold winter night in discontent, the prayer he offers Hartley confirms the poet’s abandonment of his own misery in favor of a lifetime of happiness in nature that he wishes for his son. Like his bond with Charles in “This Lime-Tree Bower,” the blessing that he gives to Hartley elevates their relationship into the spiritual realm, transcending the present moment and establishing an enduring bond between father and son.

A thorough analysis of Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s “This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison” and “Frost at Midnight” reveals that the poet values intimacy in his interpersonal relationships, illustrated by his ability to connect meaningfully with others. Using nature as his springboard in the two conversation poems, he overcomes anxiety and alienation by enlisting his imagination to redirect his focus from himself to others; as a result, the compassion he acquires by engaging the creative mind allows him to form and strengthen intimate connections with family and friends. Although some, like Mellor, believe that Coleridge’s introspective manner equates to self-pity and egotism, Coleridge directly addresses his weaknesses in the two poems, demonstrating courage and growth as an individual; consequently, as with loved ones, we look past the poet’s flaws and choose instead to admire his strengths.
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Within feminist discourse, the symbolism of the wallpaper in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s “The Yellow Wallpaper” has been heavily discussed. Although some scholars, such as Paula A. Treichler, suggest that the wallpaper represents women’s discourse, the wallpaper actually represents the male discourse propelling patriarchal oppression, whereas the wall underneath the paper and a woman the narrator sees from her window stand for women’s discourse—the women’s discourse being the body of utterances uninhibited by masculine literary trends, allowing for decidedly feminine forms of expression. The dominance of the protagonist’s husband, John, and other male figures mentioned in the story, as well as the characters’ generic names, suggest that the narrator’s psychosis is not only that of the individual, but representative of women in general. Her ‘nervousness’ is not an inherent problem with her female biology, but
rather a problem with the patriarchal society in which she is trapped.

In her article, “Escaping the Sentence: Diagnosis and Discourse in “The Yellow Wallpaper,” Paula A. Treichler argues that the diagnosis given to the narrator by her husband is a “verbal formula” that causes her to “[develop] an artificial feminine self who reinforces the terms of her husband’s expert diagnosis” (61). Treichler also explains that, although the narrator’s outward self reinforces her husband’s diagnosis, her true self is engaged in a “confrontation with language,” and that the wallpaper is a metaphor for women’s discourse as it embodies the contradictions conventionally attributed to women’s discourse (61). Treichler says, the wallpaper “embodies patterns that the patriarchal order ignores, suppresses, fears as grotesque, or fails to perceive at all” (62), asserting that “an emphasis on discourse” reveals the “central issue” of the story: the complex relationship between women and language. While the female confrontation with language, and the wallpaper as a metaphor for discourse are central to understanding “The Yellow Wallpaper,” such a reading does not necessarily mean the wallpaper represents women’s discourse. Rather, the wallpaper is a representation of male discourse. This then allows for a revealing examination of the wall behind the paper and the “woman way out in the country” (Gilman 31) as representative of women’s discourse. In fact, reading the wallpaper as patriarchal discourse provides an extension, rather than a negation of many of Treichler’s points about “the complicated and charged relationship between women and language” (62).

Karen Ford reveals one problematic aspect of Treichler’s reading when she asks, “if the wallpaper stands for a new vision of women, why is the narrator tearing it down?” (Ford 310). Additionally, why would the narrator refer to it as “a bad dream” (25)? Treichler explains this resistance to the wallpaper by arguing that the narrator is initially viewing the paper through “male eyes” (66). Yet, even at the end
of the story, the narrator is pleased to announce her escape from the wallpaper (Gilman 36). Throughout “The Yellow Wallpaper,” the narrator longs to leave the house and the “vicious influence” of the wallpaper (16). While she struggles with the idea of not doing her womanly duty as defined by society, she gradually recognizes the convolutions of the discourse outlining that duty for her. She says, “It does weigh on me so not to do my duty in any way!” but then remarks that the pattern reminds her of a “fungus” with “endless convolutions” (14, 25). Also significant about this description is that fungus often subsists on decaying matter, suggesting that the patriarchy feeds on withering women. Once free from this abusive discourse that “slaps you in the face, knocks you down, and tramples upon you” (25), she triumphantly exclaims “I’ve got out at last” (36).

Contrary to Treichler’s assertions, the characteristics of the wallpaper are in many ways similar to the characteristics of patriarchal discourse, both of which are “pointless pattern[s]” (Gilman 19) in “full chase” of women (20). However, Treichler’s reading of these characteristics as stereotypically feminine, and Karen Ford’s assertion that the wallpaper “resemble[s] all-too-familiar assessments of women’s language” (311), reveal a poignant irony in Gilman’s descriptions of the paper. Gilman takes stereotypical descriptions of women and applies them to the pattern of male discourse, counter-deploying common criticisms of women. The fact that male discourse embodies some of the same qualities as female discourse it attempts to strangle is one of the many “unheard of contradictions” in male discourse that “The Yellow Wallpaper” illuminates (Gilman 13).

Additionally, what Jeanette King calls the “anarchic and lawless” (29) pattern of the paper, is reflective of the aggressiveness with which patriarchy unreasonably limits women, ironically contradicting the facade of rationality characteristic of male discourse. As King says, the pattern is “lawless” (29), but lawless in what sense?
The lawlessness is not referring to the stereotypical woman who resists oppression. Rather, it symbolizes the criminal nature of needlessly subjugating women. Thus, “lawless” does not refer to breaking the laws of the land, but to the unjust nature of the androcentricity of the laws themselves. The protagonist, describes the pattern as being “dull enough to confuse,” “pronounced enough to constantly irritate,” and having “unheard of contradictions” (13). These descriptions are not unlike patriarchal oppression, which elevates women only to demean them, and confuses them into thinking they are “unreasonabl[e]” for being “angry” when they are confined and infantilized by their husbands (11).

Another indicator that the wallpaper represents patriarchal discourse is that there is not simply one woman trapped within, but multiple women. In the beginning, the protagonist marvels at the destruction in the room in which she is confined, including: marks of gnawing on the furniture, torn wallpaper, and a faded ring around the room. She observes that, “the floor is scratched and gouged and splintered, the plaster itself is dug out here and there, and this great heavy bed which is all we found in the room, looks as if it had been through the wars” (Gilman 17). Eventually, she begins tearing down the wallpaper herself, gnawing on the furniture, and “creeping” in circles around the room, rubbing the color off the wallpaper, and intensifying the ring. As Conrad Shumaker asserts, it is possible that she has been destroying the room herself all along and has forgotten (595). What is more likely, however, is that there have been others confined in the room before who lapsed into the same behavior. Throughout the story, the narrator’s writing becomes increasingly fragmented and frenzied as her mental state deteriorates. For example, in the first entry, there are over twenty sentences consisting of two lines or more and six exclamation marks, whereas in the last entry (of approximately the same length) there are only about twelve sentences of two lines or more and almost
thirty exclamation marks. Visually the writing is increasingly choppy, and the narrator’s voice builds into a staccato. This mental decline indicates that in the beginning, when she wonders about the state of the room, she has had nothing to do with its destruction so far. In other words, she is not insane at the beginning of the story, but loses her mind by the end of it. Thus, others must have torn up the room before her.

Additionally, there is important imagery indicating that there is more than one woman trapped in the pattern. At first, the narrator senses “something queer” about the house (Gilman 9). Later, she begins to have visions of one woman “stooping down and creeping about behind that pattern” (22) and says, “there is a recurrent spot where the pattern lolls like a broken neck and two bulbous eyes stare at you upside down [...] up and down and sideways they crawl, and those absurd, unblinking eyes are everywhere” (Gilman 16, emphasis mine). Multiple sets of “bulbous eyes” denote multiple women, and the protagonist says explicitly, “there are so many of those creeping women” (35). Thus, the woman trapped in the wallpaper is not merely an extension of the narrator. Rather, it is women in general who are being strangled by the patriarchy. These images also negate the narrator’s idea that the room was torn up by children, for it is “women” behind the paper, not girls or children.

Before her descent into madness, the narrator notes the gnawing on the bedpost, which Shumaker misleadingly calls “new” (595). The protagonist’s experiences in these “ancestral halls” (Gilman 9) are not new, nor are they unique; she is victim of the same nonsensical pattern that has trapped countless women before her. While the protagonist certainly ends up adding to the destruction of the room, it is destruction (or rather deconstruction) that was initiated by other women before her. Thus, the “pointless pattern” (19) in the wallpaper parallels the repeated pattern of mental and domestic abuse that
women have undergone in this room, and the patriarchal discourse that imposes such abuse.

The generic names of all the characters in “The Yellow Wallpaper” also indicate their representative nature. As Ford notes, “the primer-like names of the husband and sister-in-law—John and Mary—suggest they are merely representatives for Husbands and In-laws” (309). That said, several things in Gilman’s story demonstrate that the pattern in the wallpaper is not just a problem for the narrator, but a problem for her husband, and therefore all men. The narrator notices this and says that she does not like “the look in his eyes,” and that he only pretends “to be very loving and kind” (Gilman 32). However, she is not surprised that “he acts so, sleeping under this paper”(32), or rather unconsciously living in the midst of patriarchal discourse. As Shelley Fisher Fishkin puts it, “these issues [are] human issues—not women’s issues” (209). Particularly striking is the moment when John finds his wife creeping around the room. In shock, he faints, a reaction more commonly attributed to women (Gilman 36). On the one hand John is understandably troubled by the deterioration of his wife’s mental state, but he is also emasculated by his inability to cure his wife. Throughout, John has tried to nurse her back to health, but cannot, so out of desperation he asserts that there is actually nothing wrong with her. If there were, he could fix it because he is “a physician of high standing” (Gilman 10), and as Ford remarks, “the physician is the quintessential man, and his talk, therefore, is the epitome of male discourse” (310). Hence, his devastation when such denial is no longer possible. Other men, such as the narrator’s brother, support John with this belief because they cannot make her well again either (Gilman 10). The most prominent of these men is the historical figure, Dr. Weir Mitchell.

Dr. Weir Mitchell was the famous neurologist who established and endorsed the rest cure for ‘nervous,’ depressed, or ‘hysterical’ women
Gilman was one of his many female patients. She noted the following prescription from him in her journal: “Live as domestic a life as possible [...] Lie down an hour after every meal. Have but two hours intellectual life a day. And never touch pen, brush or pencil as long as you live” (qtd. in Treichler 68). Fortunately, after trying Mitchell’s rest cure for several months, Gilman recognized that the treatment was not working and left her husband to become a feminist activist (Treichler 68). While Gilman mentions that her goal was to influence Mitchell to change his treatment plan, which incapacitated numerous women, she also shed light on a broader trend within the patriarchy. Rather than accepting that they cannot control her or her mental state, despite their dominant roles in society, the men in the story blame the narrator by asserting that there is no physiological explanation for her state, but that she simply has a “slight hysterical tendency,” and a “nervous weakness” (Gilman 10, 21). They redefine their inability as her infirmity. John’s sense of manhood is rooted in his ability to fix his wife. Thus, he denies his inability to do so, locks her up, isolates her from friends and family, and then loses consciousness when the reality of his impotency can no longer be denied. Dr. Weir Mitchell, then, is exemplifies the of prominent men who, out of desperation to legitimize their dominance, victimize women.

This desperation to assert dominance, as an essential aspect of patriarchal masculinity, explains why male discourse attempts to smother women’s discourse. Biographically, the smothering of women’s discourse is reflected by the facts that Gilman had difficulty publishing “The Yellow Wallpaper,” (Hedges 40) and was asked not to write. Additionally, Gilman’s other writings blatantly argued for the uplift of women outside just herself. For example, she helped edit the Impress Magazine of the Pacific Coast Women’s Press Association (Allen 41), wrote an enormous amount of socialist-feminist fiction (Allen 41,
116), and helped found the National Household Economics Association (Allen 41). Gilman also committed suicide, and was not the only female author to do so; others include Sylvia Plath and Virginia Woolf. These authors’ “selfdestruction” in the face of patriarchal discourse (Plath and Woolf more so than Gilman, who killed herself to avoid the final ravages of breast cancer, Allen 54) parallels the narrator’s self destruction as she loses her mind trying to tear down the yellow wallpaper (Hedges 39). Also noteworthy, is that the narrator wants to write, but is dissuaded from doing so, just as Gilman and other female writers were throughout history. The narrator writes, “There comes John, and I must put this away,—he hates to have me write a word” (Gilman 13). Her text immediately drops off until she is alone again. In the context of Gilman’s socioeconomic efforts, and her personal experiences with confinement, the political nature of “The Yellow Wallpaper” cannot be denied. Thus, Gilman’s resistance to physical and ideological confinement in the home is consistent with my interpretation of symbolism in “The Yellow Wallpaper.”

The story itself is replete with images of suicide, strangulation, and entrapment, which are analogous to patriarchal society in general, in which either psychosis or suicide, however morbid, are the most liberating options for countless women. The narrator remarks, “nobody could climb through that pattern—it strangles so; I think that is why it has so many heads” (Gilman 30), implying that she is running out of the energy to resist. Toward the end, she briefly considers jumping out of the window, and then attempts to hang herself (34). She gets “a rope [...] that even Jennie [John’s sister] did not find” and talks about tying up a woman if she gets out of the paper (34). She then tries to move the bed, but cannot (34). Unable to hang herself, she simply wraps herself in the rope and continues creeping until John breaks into the room (35). Yet, within the drama of this scene is imbedded one key detail; the bed was nailed down from the beginning (19) as if someone anticipated she
might try to hang herself, suggesting that, previously, someone else attempted to hang themselves in the room. The image of “strangled heads and bulbous eyes” then becomes all the more haunting (34).

Despite the narrator’s mental collapse, she has managed to expose parts of the wall beneath the wallpaper, and on her last night in the house she manages to pull off “yards of that paper” (Gilman 32). When John enters, she says “you can’t put me back!” because she has torn down the hideous pattern. Although this reading ultimately diverges from Treichler’s interpretation of the symbolism of the wallpaper, her explanation of how the narrator "develops an artificial feminine self who reinforces" patriarchal expectations (61), bolsters my argument that the narrator’s identity is confined by patriarchal demands. As Treichler notes, the narrator focuses on “‘self-control’ and avoid[s] expressing negative thoughts and fears” (61). She also hides her writing and speaks softly. Thus, when the narrator tears down the wallpaper it symbolizes tearing down both the “male-controlled discourse” (Ford 312) presiding over literature, and male-dominated language controlling every aspect of her life, including what she can eat and where she must sleep. It is no stretch of the imagination then to represent this language with smothering wallpaper, barred windows, and locked doors.

Also symbolic of the overarching authority of patriarchal discourse is the symbolism of the house and grounds. The house is made up of “ancestral halls” speaking to the legacy of male dominated language (Gilman 9). Although it seems picturesque, the property has “hedges and walls and gates that lock” (11). The house is its own prison with a special cell at the top in which women are elevated, but isolated as John “assures friends and relatives that there is really nothing the matter” (10). Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar remark that, although men often describe associations between women and houses in a positive light, female critics often note “the transformation of womb
into tomb” and that “these ancient associations of house and self seem mainly to have strengthened the anxiety about enclosure” (88) apparent in works such as “The Yellow Wallpaper.”

Exemplary of the narrator’s imprisonment is when she begs John to change the wallpaper. He says that if he does so, she will then want him to change “the heavy bedstead, and then the barred windows, and then that gate at the head of the stairs, and so on” (Gilman 14). In other words, if he assents to change the discourse for her, she will then want him to change all of the other things in place to control her, which would be unacceptable. Treichler says “the yellow wallpaper stands for a new vision of women—one which is constructed differently from the representation of women in patriarchal language,” and thus “about the clash between two modes of discourse: one powerful, ‘ancestral,’ and dominant; the other new, ‘impermanent,’ and visionary” (64). Yet, how does the paper represent a “new vision of women” when the paper is on walls in these “ancestral halls” (9)? It also “sticketh closer than a brother,” yet another male figure with controlling potential (17). To exacerbate the issue, the prison-house is a “hereditary estate” having been established years ago and remaining as “censorious and overwhelming as her physician husband” (Gilbert 90).

Moreover, the narrator’s ‘cell’ is papered in yellow—a color often associated with cowardice. While yellow is also related to friendship and happiness, the narrator clarifies that the wallpaper is not that sort of yellow. She says it makes her think of yellow things, “not beautiful ones like buttercups, but old foul, bad yellow things” (Gilman 28). She also says it is “repellent, almost revolting,” “unclean,” “sickly sulfur,” “infuriating,” and “torturing” (13, 25). The yellowness of the wallpaper then speaks to the cowardly nature of patriarchal discourse. It is as if patriarchy feels threatened by femininity, and must therefore take precautions to restrict and incapacitate it. Seeing that one is oppressed because of a dominant group’s reluctance to share power, or fear of
sharing as their success is defined by their ability to dominate, is indeed “infuriating” (25).

Through the effort of tearing down patriarchal discourse, the narrator is left psychotic, emphasizing the fact that women often sacrifice their own sanity to liberate themselves and others from patriarchal oppression. These women are then left with a blank wall to fill in, but their struggle leaves them unable to do so as they are no longer functioning members of society. The deconstruction they have accomplished is a start, but the blank wall is still housed in a patriarchal structure. The location of this wall in the oppressive structure of “ancestral halls,” (Gilman 9) emphasizes the lack of purely female language, as women have relied on male-defined literary conventions to develop their language. The wall beneath the paper, and thus the women’s discourse, is still under the “vicious influence” of male discourse.

The narrator’s psychosis, however, negates her husband’s diagnosis, which downplays the seriousness of her illness. Treichler’s assertions about the characteristics of the diagnosis John gives the narrator, are poignant. The diagnosis is indeed a “powerful and public” part of establishing “institutional authority” (Treichler 65). However, it is not “a metaphor for the voice of medicine or science” (Treichler 65). Rather, it is an actual example of that male voice, as opposed to a representation of it. The representation, in some ways more revealing than the actual discourse itself, is the wallpaper. When it is torn down, so is John’s source of power—his diagnosis. None of this refutes Treichler’s point that escaping patriarchal discourse requires “change in what is said and change in the conditions of speaking” (74). In other words, even if the wallpaper represents the strangling power of male discourse, instead of women’s discourse, it is not enough to simply change the discourse, or change the socioeconomic reality (Treichler 75). Rather, both help shape one another. One woman’s escape from the
yellow wallpaper, from male discourse, does not bring down the entire house. Women’s discourse is still on blank walls confined by and supporting the “ancestral halls” (Gilman 9) of the patriarchy.

Yet, Gilman leaves us with one image of hope and inspiration, as well as an acknowledgment of those who have more fully escaped the “ancestral halls” (Gilman 9). One woman is outside the house, “away off in the open country” (Gilman 31). The narrator says, “she is always creeping, and most women do not creep by daylight” (30), but remarks that she would be embarrassed to creep outside like the woman she is looking at. Mainstream society considers things that go against the heteronormative social order to be ‘creepy.’ Thus, to one who condones patriarchal society, the creeping is uncouth in and of itself, but what is even more so is the fact that the woman is doing it in broad daylight, outside the house. The protagonist cannot imagine publicly creeping because, while she succumbs to the urge to do ‘creepy’ things (such as write against her husbands will) she is still indoctrinated enough to be ashamed to do so openly. Until the end of the story, she is still inculcated with the idea that the woman’s appropriate place is within the home. Throughout the story she wants to please her husband, care for her baby, and perform her female duties. It will not be until she, and therefore all women, learn that they do not need to remain within the confines of domesticity that they will be able to creep publicly.

This explains Gilman’s desire to eradicate compulsory domesticity. The one woman off in the country has not only broken free from the wallpaper, but she has also escaped the domestic sphere represented by the “ancestral halls” (Gilman 9) in which the narrator is imprisoned. At the end of “The Yellow Wallpaper,” the narrator has made her first step toward joining the woman who creeps freely and publicly. Nonetheless, she remains within the “hereditary estate” as a reminder that our male-dominated, socioeconomic structure has not yet been demolished. Since the first publication of “the Yellow Wallpaper” over
a century ago, more and more authors have begun to ‘creep,’ or rather craft a less androcentric language more freely. While now exposed and vulnerable to criticism of their own, the patterns in which these authors publicly ‘creep’ are, nonetheless, drastic improvements from the “pointless pattern” (Gilman 19) of patriarchal dominance and oppression.
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“In talking with the A-bomb victims…I have come to realize that they, one and all, possess unique powers of observation and expression concerning what it means to be human” — Kenzaburo Oe

After a tragedy occurs, people expect the initial grief that follows. However, what is often overlooked is the high presence of hope; it strangely follows despair. Perhaps the English proverb, “It is human nature to always find fresh cause for optimism” is correct. Sometimes the only form of comfort can be found in looking towards the future. The presence of art, both literary and visual, can capture the grief and sadness of the tragedy, but also offer a fresh reality—a clean slate.

After the bombing of Hiroshima, many Japanese lives were destroyed, and those who were left had to rebuild the foundation of their culture. In some cases, people wrote about their tragedy, but rather than lamenting what they lost, they explored the delicate new life they were granted. The survivors didn’t want to be known as survivors, but as hibakusha, literally translating to “explosion-affected
persons” (Hersey 92). The word “survivor” had the connotation that “might suggest some slight to the sacred dead” (ibid). However, as much as hibakusha wanted to avoid being deemed survivors, they were in fact just that. They not only endured the bombing, but many horrors of the A-bomb aftermath.

Part of the way hibakusha healed was by offering an insight into their experiences. They felt compelled to tell their stories as a way to prevent anything like Hiroshima from happening again. When Yoshitaka Matsusaka wrote an article about surviving Hiroshima, he said he was “not sure whether it [was] better for a doomed A-bomb victim to endure to the end in order to preserve one’s human dignity or to end one’s life boldly” (Oe 23). This type of questioning was common among survivors; Kiyoko Imori wondered “Why she [alone] survived out of her entire family and class of 620 students” (White Light 2007). She came to the conclusion that part of the reason was to “tell people what happened, so they [would] understand” (ibid). The job of this type of literature and art seems to have a dual purpose—to illustrate the pain of the bombing, and to highlight the optimism of the survivors.

One struggle many Japanese hibakusha authors had was determining what to include in their literature because “atomic-bomb literature [...] [depended] to an uncommon degree on implication and insinuation” (Treat 28). There were factual accounts of what happened and there was the individual’s perspective. Reading stories about Hiroshima (or any historical event) makes readers question if the story is an accurate, non-biased account, or a version altered by personal involvement. However, these questions didn’t detract from the true intent of the stories. They tended to “have two themes—the violence itself, and the act of writing about that violence” (35). When hibakusha told their stories, it provided others with an awareness of their experience.

Literature from the A-bomb experience did not achieve the
“acknowledged status as ‘literature’” as did literature regarding The Holocaust (86). Part of the reason that A-bomb literature was so highly disregarded was that Japanese texts tended to avoid “narratives of violence”; in fact, “[there was] the specific refusal of much so-called Japanese literature to confront war at all” (ibid). This created a struggle for hibakusha; they wanted to express their feelings, but not be categorized as victims. Hibakusha returned “to the site of their Suffering [...] as a recuperative means for collecting, organizing, and passing on the lessons” before their memories became altered and their sense of reality distorted (29). Non-hibakusha writer, Kenzaburo Oe, felt that writers of the bombing “[commenced] with the question whether their [experiences] of yesterday’s evil, their tragic, unredeemable [experiences could] be converted into something of value” (ibid). He believed that through writing, a catharsis happened for the survivors; they expressed and recalled their stories. Hibakusha allowed others to see inside their personal tragedy to show how they were able to overcome adversity.

Fictional stories about Hiroshima may be overlooked and dismissed by some as an attempt to write “relevant” literature. A-bomb literature relies on symbolism to enhance the connection the reader feels to the story. Many fiction stories are often short, concise narratives that reflect hope even in war-torn Hiroshima. One example is “The Crazy Iris” by Masuji Ibuse. In this story nature is seen as providing inspiration to the Japanese because it begins to thrive again. Masu, the narrator of the story, returns home a year after the bombing and finds that while houses and buildings are slowly being rebuilt, nature is growing rapidly. The trees “had withstood the tremendous temperature of [the] year before and were now putting forth buds” (Ibuse 27). He even notices one small iris flower growing next to a body floating in the water. The juxtaposition—trees growing in a ruined city and a single flower blooming next to a dead body—
symbolizes the rebirth of Hiroshima. The story explores the possibility that even though the destruction from the A-bomb left a scar on Japan, it was possible for new life to emerge.

Similarly, in “The Land of Heart’s Desire” by Tamiki Hara nature becomes a source of inspiration. The nameless protagonist in Hara’s story yearns to be free after experiencing the horrors of Hiroshima. The story unfolds like a journal entry where the narrator wants to be “reborn as a bird and [. . .] to visit the land of the birds” (55). The natural elements, like stars in the sky, “stand thereundaunted, brimming over with something that knows no end” (56). The narrator wonders, since “the horror of Hiroshima did not affect [him] mentally”, perhaps “the shock of [...] time has been constantly eyeing [him] [...] [and] awaiting its chance to drive [him] mad” (57). He sees nature as a form of escape; it allows him a break from the constant agony of living amongst destruction. This type of literature allows non-hibakusha to understand more of the human side of the bombing, since it is told through the narrator’s point of view.

Another account of literature relating to the A-bomb emerged when “Hiroshima” was originally published in The New Yorker in 1946. This article (which was later published in book form) includes six victims of the Hiroshima bombing recalling their stories. This raised questions whether the portrayals of the six survivors was accurate enough to be called “non-fiction” since the author was non-hibakusha. Some critics argue that John Hersey may have altered the language for a more dramatic effect to increase readership. Further concern was expressed because the book focused on just six survivors, when there were countless other victims. Questioning the authenticity of Hiroshima, one critic pointed out that in order for Hersey to write a definitive book on the atomic bomb, he “would have had to interview the dead” (Treat 55).

Despite the criticism, Hersey challenged accepted genre standards
and wrote a “documentary” about the Hiroshima bombing that provided an outlet for new voices to be heard. His representations of the six people vary; their perspectives are as different as the dynamics of their lives. Two survivors are particularly interesting because of their positions as spiritual leaders. Father Wilhelm Kleinsorge and Reverend Mr. Kiyoshi Tanimoto felt that the morning the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, chance intervened. Each man was able to survive the initial bombing and help injured victims. Father Kleinsorge, a German Jesuit priest, witnessed the bombing as a non-indigenous person. Even before the bombing, some Japanese felt hostility toward Westerners; ironically, years later, when strangers offered Father Kleinsorge some tea leaves, he finally felt accepted. In fact, he met the requirements to become a Japanese citizen, and had his name changed to Father Makoto Takakura.

Like Father Kleinsorge, Reverend Tanimoto relied on his faith to get him through the devastation he faced after the bombing. Reverend Tanimoto, a native resident of Hiroshima, received his religious education in the United States. Before the attack, an old acquaintance of Reverend Tanimoto started rumors that he was not trustworthy. However, in the aftermath of the bombing, Reverend Tanimoto was able to prove himself a loyal person. Despite the hostility of others, Reverend Tanimoto and Father Kleinsorge continued to aid the victims of the bombing.

The aftermath proved to be far worse than the initial bombing. Dr. Shuntaro Hida described his account of the bombing as “a huge pillar of fire. Everyone [called] it a mushroom cloud. But it wasn’t a cloud. It was a pillar of fire” (White Light 2007). Another eyewitness, Shigeko Sasamori, said that “all Hiroshima was burning. There was no escape except to the river” (ibid). Reverend Tanimoto recalled “that all the houses had been crushed and many were afire [...] the trees were bare and their trunks were charred” (Hersey 29). While the fires blazed
all around, rain started to fall. He said the drops were “condensed moisture falling from [...] dust, heat, and fission fragments” (18). The horror was so widespread that the clergymen—in spite of their dedication to helping others—barely knew where to begin. Too many were injured or trapped under collapsed buildings. Father Kleinsorge tried to find the other priests from his parish, but had trouble locating them. As great a role as religion played in his everyday life, it appeared that now trying to survive became his priority. Reverend Tanimoto also struggled with this; finding his way to safety was challenging because of the number of injured. He recalled that “every one of them seemed to be hurt in some way [...] some were vomiting as they walked [...] almost all had their heads bowed, looked straight ahead, were silent, and showed no expression whatever” (Hersey 29). Amidst the devastation, people were trapped under their houses, but no one could help them. Survivors were too busy helping their family members. Seeing this, Reverend Tanimoto states that “as a Christian he was filled with compassion [...] and as a Japanese, he was overwhelmed by the shame of being unhurt” (29-30). Most likely the injured would die, but he was unharmed.

Even nature reflected the feelings of both despair and hope in the wake of the A-bomb. Along with many other survivors, Father Kleinsorge and Reverend Tanimoto found shelter in Asano Park, which seemed like a place of safety because its trees were relatively unscathed by the bombing. They felt that “if the Americans came back, they would bomb only buildings” and the trees would help camouflage them (35). But the trees served as little protection; instead they spread the fire further around. Father Kleinsorge saw “twenty men [...] all in exactly the same nightmarish state: their faces were wholly burned, their eye sockets were hollow, [and] the fluid from their melted eyes had run down their cheeks” (51). The black rain falling over Hiroshima created a panic; survivors feared that it was actually gasoline intended
to set them on fire. The dirty rainwater was contaminated from the rampant fires. Drinkable water was scarce. Reverend Tanimoto had to find a basin and fill it with water from a broken pipeline, since the river water was polluted. Hunger and thirst triggered nausea, but even with all the suffering, the survivors endured it quietly. As a Westerner, Father Kleinsorge was amazed by the survivors’ reaction to the tragedy. He said that “the silence in the grove [...] where hundreds of gruesomely wounded suffered together, was one of the most dreadful [...] phenomena of his whole experience. The hurt ones were quiet; no one wept, much less screamed in pain; no one complained; none of the many who died did so noisily [...] very few people even spoke” (36).

After the initial attack, the death toll kept rising. Although the morale of the survivors was low, they kept moving forward. Religion helped some, including Father Kleinsorge and Reverend Tanimoto, to make sense out of what had happened. To Father Kleinsorge it seemed that “man [was] not now in the condition God intended. He [fell] from grace through sin” (83). However, not everyone felt like they could understand the bombing in terms of religion. Others saw the bombing as a horrible event that inflicted mass destruction on their city. The accounts of Father Kleinsorge and Reverend Tanimoto suggest it was commonplace for the survivors to wonder why God could have allowed the bombing to occur; for many it was cause to abandon their religious beliefs. This resentment lasted for years after the bombing. Had Hiroshima, a place that once had a plethora of religious buildings, become the home of religious rubble? Reverend Tanimoto struggled to rebuild his parish and believed that if “people . . . [repented] their sinful past and [relied] on God . . . His righteousness . . . and all these things shall be added unto [them]” (135). Moving past the destruction, Reverend Tanimoto restored his parish church with his own hands.

Many Japanese found it difficult to see the A-bomb in terms of the metaphysical and looked elsewhere to lay blame. At first, they aimed
their anger at the Americans for dropping the bomb. Yet, fictional accounts demonstrated that this was not necessarily a consistent viewpoint. When characters in Yoko Oto’s “Fireflies” discuss the ethics of the bombing, there are various opinions. One believes that “the bombing of Hiroshima couldn’t have been helped if it was necessary to end the war. But since [the Americans] must have been able to see the terrible damage from the sky, it was absolutely wrong to drop the second bomb on Nagasaki” (100). Another felt there was no justification for either bomb. A third felt that America used the bomb to end the war, adding that “they used it in a hurry because they were afraid of losing their military balance of power with the Soviet Union” (100). However, slowly, there was a shift among some Japanese to redirect their condemnation to “their own government, for having involved [their] country in a rash and doomed aggression” (Hersey 135). According to Kenzaburo Oe, they began to believe that “Japan’s rapid modernization, with its many distortions, led to Japan’s wars in Asia, which in turn led to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: thus they [held] the Japanese state responsible for their sufferings” (9). Oe bases this conclusion on the fact that many victims of the A-bomb have tried to get compensation from the Japanese government for their injuries resulting from the attack.

Before the attack on Hiroshima, Japanese looked up to men fighting in the war. Many Japanese were originally eager to join the fighting because it was something they felt showed their pride. Twenty-year-old student Sunao Tsuboi, who survived Hiroshima, said that “as men it was our duty to go to war and to die; to fall like petals off a flower... was our destiny” (White Light 2007). Japanese men who went off to war were considered role models. When it appeared that the Japanese weren’t winning the war, public opinion started shifting. Survivor Dr. Shuntaro Hida, said that once “their sons began dying, one after another, mothers and wives began to feel an increasing
anxiety as the war continued. Though the government kept saying we were winning, the people realized Japan couldn’t win” (ibid). For the Japanese the reality set in that not only had they lost the war, but also, far too many lives.

As Japanese people accepted defeat, they “were deeply disappointed, but followed […] in calm spirit, making whole-hearted sacrifice for the everlasting peace of the world” (Hersey 65). This was a challenge to many Japanese who saw only the destruction of their homes, and the ruination of their lives. Some accounts taken after the bombing suggested that “no grass would grow in Hiroshima’s soil for seventy-five years” (Oe 126). But Oe states that when “late summer rains washed the wasted land,” plants and grass started growing rapidly (ibid). Analogous to nature, hibakusha were once in complete despair, but now, like the grass, they were able to flourish once again.

Because of literature and film depictions of the Hiroshima bombing, non-hibakusha have slowly become aware of the long lasting damage from the attack. Today, stories of Hiroshima are still being shared. An unusual account of the bombing, Town of Evening Calm, Country of Cherry Blossoms, shows the lingering effects of the A-bomb in a manga, or comic book, form. One story illustrates how long-term illnesses destroyed many lives, while another story shows how the history of Hiroshima still plays an integral role from generation to generation. Although the author, Fumiyo Kouno is not hibakusha, she says that she “could still draw on the words of a different time and place” to allow others the opportunity to know what happened after the Hiroshima bombing (102). The simple, visual artistry of the manga conveys a powerful message about Japanese history.

Another form of visual art that shows the devastation of Hiroshima is film. In the documentary White Light/Black Rain, filmmaker Steven Okazaki attempts to familiarize his viewers about the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The film attempts a non-biased
perspective by focusing not only on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but also on Americans involved in making the atomic bomb. One survivor, Shigeko Sasamori, was left disfigured from the bomb, but doesn’t dwell on her hardships or the countless surgeries she endured following the attack. Rather, she wonders what kind of life she would have had if Hiroshima hadn’t been bombed. She says that “her fantasy goes in different directions” (White Light 2007); sometimes she believes she’d be a housewife, or a mother or just have an ordinary life. The documentary brings the Hiroshima bombing experience into contemporary mainstream culture, and tries to find a balance between the horrific reality and the inspirational outlook many shared.

The accounts of postwar Japan are varied. Some stories are told through written accounts, some are captured on film, and others are portrayed through manga and other media. These diverse forms add to the canon of Hiroshima art, preserving a part of Japanese history. Their unexpected optimism can provide readers with a sense of hope and an opportunity to learn from the past.
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In her article “Silences and Ellipses in The God of Small Things,” Florence D’Souza reads the novel through the lens of Derrida’s theory on absences and ellipses within texts; Derrida claims “a text can only be read as an endeavour to give expression to and make some sense of events and feelings that exceed rational explanation” (111). In The God of Small Things (1997), Roy attempts to do just that. It is a story that is “a narrative of the impossible,” the story of a Keralan family haunted by its own transgressive desire for the English colonizer, a desire that haunts the ancestral home with unspeakable memories, making the home feel unhomely. This desire is created and regulated by the “Love Laws […] The Laws that lay down who should be loved, and how. And how much”; violators of these Laws are punished by being turned into monstrous versions of their former selves, or worse, they are transformed into ghosts (Roy 33). Ghosts like the Black Sahib, the Parvan carpenter, and the half-Indian half-English child, who is more
present in death than she ever was in life, are forced to preside over the story of the Ipe family, whose remaining members are trapped within “a form of history that [they] know to be a lie” (Punter 200). By utilizing the postcolonial gothic tropes of a haunted notion of history, unheimlich familial curses, and the unspeakable, Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* attempts to deal with the trauma of colonization by focusing on “the small things” of intimate and familial relationships.

In “Arundhati Roy and the House of History,” David Punter describes the specifically gothic view of history as “abandoning minutiae in favor of the grand gesture, the melodrama of rise and fall” (193). Stories of political revolution take precedence over smaller, seemingly insignificant, personal histories. However, Arundhati Roy’s postcolonial gothic work *The God of Small Things* (hereafter *Small Things*) “suggests that we view the ‘big’ historical narrative of colonial alienation on par with ‘smaller’ narratives of personal trauma, sentimental attachments, and the loss of love” (Azzam, “Haunted House” 134). However, before I delve into an exploration of the gothic presence of the past within *Small Things*, it is necessary to explain the characteristics of both the traditional British gothic mode and the postcolonial gothic mode.

*From the British Gothic to the Postcolonial Gothic*

It seems unusual that postcolonial writers would utilize an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary form that is marked by its “‘European-ness’” or “‘euromanticism’” (Punter 193). However, the gothic mode, “a dark counternarrative to the narrative progress of modernity” offers a means for the postcolonial writer to “attempt to solve the lingering historical problems of colonialism in terms of a European narrative mode” (Azzam, “Introduction” 1-2). As a form, the gothic is “chaotic,” “discontinuous, ambiguous, and open ended” (Azzam, “Introduction” 6). For a postcolonial author dealing with the repercussions of colonial
occupation, a literary form rooted in ambiguity, a form that does not require an answer to unanswerable questions, could be an attractive means through which to engage with the postcolonial state of being.

Perhaps more generally, most gothic plots include similar “preoccupations and trappings,” which include “houses haunted by the sins of the father; a pervasive mood of melancholy, guilt, and mystery; [...] doubles; [...] the possibility of incest or rape; sexual excess [...] and gender subversion; [...] and tyrannical relationships between a master and servant or father and daughter” (Azzam, “Introduction” 6). These aspects of the traditional Gothic are particularly relevant to this paper, because they are present in some form in Roy’s postcolonial gothic The God of Small Things.

Another aspect of the British gothic which lends itself particularly well to the postcolonial project “is that it is a distinctly historical mode of narrative inquiry” (Azzam, “Introduction” 6). In her dissertation “The Alien Within: Postcolonial Gothic and the Politics of Home,” Julie Hakim Azzam asserts that the gothic mode creates its own theory of history, “because it engages with ‘old’ modes of narrative (the romance), displaces its... historical concerns in a geographic locality elsewhere, dwells in the historical past, and identifies the presence of the past in the present” (7). She describes the gothic emphasis on the past and its uncanny ability to return in the present—for example, the recurrence of uncanny, cross-generational familial resemblances—as “a gothic historic sensibility” (Azzam, “Introduction” 7). Punter also explores the gothic form’s interesting connection with history. Indeed, he notes that the Gothic genre’s particular focus on the shifting of boundaries, feudalistic practices, and “the impossibility of the escape from history,” functions quite well within the project of postcolonial literature (193). Like Azzam, Punter further connects the Gothic mode with postcolonial writing by emphasizing the ever-presence of history within the Gothic genre, which, combined with the constant fear of
a return to the past, also clearly manifests in postcolonial anxiety regarding the phantoms of imperialism.

What is particularly salient to Azzam and Punter’s interpretation of the role of history within both the traditional and postcolonial gothic is the connection between historic sensibility and the family: [m]ost gothic fiction is shaped by a historic sensibility, so it is not surprising that a gothic historical sensibility should be one of the defining factors of the postcolonial gothic. In both, the family is the foundational structure by which historical sensibility manifests itself. For both, the family and familial relationships are the places in which political, historical, and social conflicts are staged and resolved. (Azzam, “Introduction” 7)

With its focus on family, historic sensibility also informs the gothic genre’s complicated discourse of blood and patrilineal (and patriarchal) inheritance. “The discourse of blood... functions to conceal and reveal social class and political legitimacy” (Azzam, “Introduction” 13). Within the context of familial relationships, the discourse of blood deals with the contentious concept of ancestry, because, mixed in with the same blood inheritance which privileges one group of people over another, comes the inheritance of the sins of the father. In Small Things, the contrariness of Kerala’s inheritance laws makes first Pappahci, then Chacko the legal owner of Paradise Pickles and Preserves and renders Mammachi the mere “Sleeping Partner” (Roy 55). However, the entire Ipe family inherits the sins of the father—Pappachi’s Anglophilia—which renders them incapable of accessing their history, and additionally, codes any desires that are not within the bounds of the Love Laws as transgressive.

The final gothic trope which is imperative to the understanding of the functioning of the gothic as a postcolonial narrative tool is the unheimlich, or uncanny. Though the term unheimlich originates from
Freudian psychoanalysis, I find Azzam’s definition of the rather slippery term the most accessible. She defines:

[the *unheimlich*, or uncanny, concerns itself with strangeness and alienation, the appearance of something familiar in the midst of the unfamiliar, or the unfamiliar in the midst of the familiar. A feeling of uncanniness can be the result of repetition, doubling, coincidence, or an eerie feeling of déjà vu.]

(Azzam, “Introduction” 15)

The term *heimlich*, which means home, and its opposite (*unheimlich*) which refers to something that is unhomely or foreign, is particularly relevant to the postcolonial gothic. This mode “is interested in the representation of the *unheimlich* nature of home as both dwelling and nation”, so “part of the postcolonial gothic’s agenda is unveiling that behind the construction of hominess […] lies something fundamentally unhomely” (Azzam, “Introduction” 35). This uncanny connection to the unhomliness of the familial home, as well as the postcolonial nation, is another type of history which is “emblemized, as in classic Gothic fiction, in the form of the house” (193). In other words, “[i]n the postcolonial gothic, the *unheimlich* becomes a way for a text to approach the topics of home and history; illegitimacy and contamination; gender, the body, and violence; and the vestigal and concealed of historical and political discourse” (Azzam, “Introduction” 19).

Though I have hinted at the ways in which the postcolonial gothic differs from the British gothic, I feel it is important to discuss specifically the key elements of the postcolonial gothic. Azzam describes postcolonial fiction as:

adapt[ing] a British narrative form that is highly attuned to the distinction and collapse between home and not home and the familiar and the foreign. The appearance of the gothic in postcolonial fiction seems a response to the failure of national […] politics that are riven by sectarian, gender, class, and caste
It is interesting to note that the politics and policies in question within the postcolonial gothic context are not directly connected to colonialism itself. Instead, this mode of fiction deals with the ramifications of colonization where, in former colonies like India, colonial apparatuses of hierarchy and discrimination are merely replaced by the complex structure of caste-, class-, and gender-based discrimination. This distressing irony haunts what Azzam identifies as the four specific aims of the postcolonial gothic. First, this mode deals with dystopic representations of postcolonial society, which emerge from the failure of national projects. For example, in *Small Things*, the arrival of Communism in Kerala cannot cancel out the deep roots of class and caste discrimination. Second, the postcolonial gothic addresses the representation of the uncanny nature of both the home and the nation. Third, this narrative form places an emphasis on the present-ness of the past, a concept which is explored through interpersonal relationships and “private structures of relation and kinship” which are vested with “historical and political sensibility” (Azzam, “Introduction” 36). Fourth, “the postcolonial gothic deploys the gothic as a mode of frightening itself with images of transgressive women who threaten to expose the dark underbelly of their own historical and political contexts” (Azzam, “Introduction” 37). The postcolonial gothic offers itself as the literary mode of a people haunted by history; it is a narrative style that allows an author to deal with the repercussions of the trauma of colonization and post-colonization without forcing her to provide answers for a situation that questions the necessity of decisive answers in the first place.

“A sense of Historical Perspective”?: The Specter of History and the Gothic of Small Things

*The God of Small Things* “frames its narrative within [an] ancestral...
family home. [T]he gothic is located in the familial house and the everyday interactions amongst family members. The uncanny sense of dread in each house has everything to do with the unresolved ‘sins of the father’ (or mother) and the haunting legacy of patriarchal inheritance” (Azzam, “Haunted House” 131). While I agree with Azzam’s general assessment of the gothic elements of the novel, I also perceive that the trauma that tears apart the Ipe family has its source in Chacko’s very specific definition of history as a house. This definition, which is connected to Pappachi’s patrilineal inheritance, doubly burdens the family with the inability to be part of their own history. First, because the nature of their positions as postcolonial subjects is precarious at best, and second, because the curse of Anglophilia imbibes the family members with a predisposition for transgressing “the Love Laws” (Cabaret 78). After the events which are eventually simply referred to as “the Terror” (Sophia Mol’s drowning, Velutha’s brutal death, the twin’s forced betrayal of their friend, Estha’s Return), the surviving members of the family—Estha, Rahel and Baby Kochamma—are left to deal with the consequences of familial transgressions (Roy 38). These consequences eventually lead to a dual entombment: the literal decline of the ancestral home into a decayed hermitage, which houses nothing but bitter old women and relics of an unspeakable past, and the psychological entombment within a history “that one knows to be a lie” (Punter 200).

In one of “his Oxford Moods,” Chacko, the rightful inheritor of his father’s Anglophilia, defines his concept of history to the twins: “[h]e explained to them that history was like an old house at night. With all the lamps lit. And ancestors whispering inside. ‘To understand history,’ Chacko said, ‘we have to go inside and listen to what they’re saying. And look at the books and the pictures on the wall. And smell the smells’” (Roy 51). Chacko conceptualizes history as an illuminated house. The twins also latch onto this idea of a house of history;
however, in their childish naïveté, they identify this house as “the house on the other side of the river, in the middle of the abandoned rubber estate where they had never been” (Roy 51). Both Chacko’s imagined history house and the twin-identified History House are places “they have never been.” As Chacko explains:

‘But we can’t go in,’… ‘because we’ve been locked out. And when we look in the windows, all we see are shadows. And when we try to listen, all we hear is a whispering. And we cannot understand whispering, because our minds have been invaded by a war. A war that captures dreams and re-dreams them. A war that has made us adore our conquerors and despise ourselves.’ (Roy 52)

It is significant that Chacko equates the enterprise of colonialism with a war; this connotes the physical and mental violence of this act. The war of colonialism obfuscates the position of the colonized people even within a postcolonial construct; their language, their history, and even their imaginations are colonized. In addition, (post)colonial people are denied an identity; they are frozen within the liminal space between similarity and difference, Indian-ness and British-ness:

‘We’re Prisoners of War,’ Chacko said. ‘Our dreams have doctored. We belong nowhere. We sail unanchored on troubled seas. We may never be ashore. Our sorrows will never be sad enough. Our joys never happy enough. Our dreams never big enough. Our lives never important enough. To matter.’ (Roy 52)

There is an element of the unheimlich in Chacko’s concept of the history house and the war of colonization. The brightly lit and seemingly welcoming home is, in fact, inaccessible; it cannot be entered, because the most intimate aspects of a person – his thoughts, dreams, and feelings – have been altered against his will. Colonization makes the personal impersonal, the homely unhomely. Most importantly, at its
roots, Chacko’s definition of history and martial colonialism is founded upon the familial curse of Anglophilia (Roy 52).

Azzam posits that “[b]y identifying Anglophilism as the main historical problem of concern, Chacko allows his seemingly objective rhetoric to be infiltrated by personal experience of his own family” (Azzam, “Haunted House” 149). Pappachi’s Anglophilism functions within the narrative as the gothic trope of sin[s] of the father and the uncannily repeated familial curse (Azzam, “Haunted House 132). His Anglophilia is emblemized by the phantom of the gray moth silently settling upon the hearts of his ancestors. “Its [the moth’s] pernicious ghost—gray, furry and with unusually dense dorsal tufts—haunted every house he ever lived in. It tormented him and his children. And his children’s children” (Roy 48).

The inheritance of Pappachi’s predisposition for English culture connects his family with Chacko’s idea of the locked-up house of history: “[he] told the twins that, though he hated to admit it, they were all Anglophiles. They were a family of Anglophiles. Pointed in the wrong direction, trapped outside their own history and unable to retrace their steps because their footprints had been swept away” (Roy 51). Just as Pappachi had been denied recognition for the discovery of his moth, his ancestors’ adherence to his passed-down Anglophilia has denied them the ability to participate in their own history.

Additionally, in his role as “an Imperial Entomologist,” Pappachi, and his curse, are associated with the colonizing desire to classify, a desire supported by “the Love Laws.” However, Pappachi ultimately fails in his endeavor to classify his moth: “[h]is life’s greatest setback was not having the moth that he had discovered named after him” (Roy 48). Perhaps, it is possible that Pappachi’s curse is not only a curse of Anglophilia, a curse that makes his family members “adore [their] conquerors,” but also a curse which dooms his family to fail at their attempts at classification (Roy 52).
In her article, “Classification in The God of Small Things,” Florence Cabaret identifies caste and class structures as the key to classification within the novel. She views the familial curse not as a curse of English desire, but as a predisposition for transgressing the Love Laws, “laws which are supposed to contain people within their own categories” (Cabaret 78). These categories of containment play out on a small scale within the context of the family business, Paradise Pickles and Preserves, and the issue of jam classification. In her article “Seeing the World through Red-Coloured Glasses: Desire and Death in Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things,” Catherine Lanone aligns the illegality of Mammachi’s category-defying banana jam (“too thin for jelly and too thick for jam”) with transgressive sexual desire (129, Roy 30-1). Both Cabaret and Lanone note that the issue of the banana jam, “an ambiguous, unclassifiable consistency,” is the penultimate example of the ways in which members of the Ipe family circumvent the laws of categorization:

Looking back now, to Rahel it seemed as though this difficulty that their family had with classification ran much deeper than the jam-jelly question. Perhaps Ammu, Estha and she were the worst transgressors. But it wasn’t just them. It was the others too. They all broke the rules. They all crossed into forbidden territory. They all tampered with the laws that lay down how should be loved and how. And how much. The laws that make grandmother grandmothers, uncles uncles, mothers mothers, cousins cousins, jam jam, and jelly jelly. It was a time when uncles became fathers, mothers lovers, and cousins died and had funerals. It was a time when the unthinkable became thinkable and the impossible really happened. (Roy 30-1)

Ammu, Rahel, and Estha are, in fact, the worst transgressors; they were all involved with the Untouchable Velutha. The twins loved him as a
friend and father-figure, their mother as a lover, and they were all implicated in the tragedy of his death by the unspeakable nature of this love. The family curse of Anglophilia results in a predilection for trespassing laws of categorization. This decidedly gothic trope of transgressive desire, and its traumatic repercussions, is mirrored in the Ayenmenem House’s gothic double, the Black Sahib’s house.

The house of the Black Sahib is the same house that the twins identify as the History House:

the house on the other side of the river, in the middle of an abandoned rubber estate where they had never been. Kari Saipu’s house. The Black Sahib. The Englishman who had ‘gone native.’ Who spoke Malayalam and wore mundus. Ayemenem’s own Kurtz. Ayemenem his own private Heart of Darkness. He had shot himself through the head ten years ago, when his young lover’s parents had taken the boy away from him and sent him to school [...]. The History House. (Roy 51)

Kari Saipu’s transgression of cultural and sexual boundaries acts as a gothic double for the cultural and sexual transgressions enacted by the inhabitants of the Ayemenem House across the river. The History House is not only haunted by its tragic past, but also it is actually haunted by the ghost of the Black Sahib. However, the ghost has been “pinned [...] to the trunk of a rubber tree, where, according to Vellya Paapen, it still remained. A sickled smell that bled clear, amber blood, and begged for cigars” (Roy 189). The Black Sahib’s punishment for his transgressions goes beyond death; even in the afterlife, he is punished by his inability to leave the site of his tragic past, a sad ghost who can never get what he wants.

While the rather pathetic history of the Black Sahib haunts the History House, this house is also haunted by the events of the Terror. It is on the back verandah of the History House that “a posse of Touchable policemen” unjustly beat Velutha within an inch of his life,
because he was (wrongly) indicted in the death of Sophie Mol and Ammu’s supposed rape (Roy 121). In a marked contrast to its tragic past, the History House is transformed into the sterilized and seemingly innocuous Heritage Hotel. The back verandah is transformed “into the airy hotel kitchen” (Roy 121). Like Rahel’s toy watch that lies buried in the grounds of the Heritage Hotel, “the Terror... would be buried in a shallow grave. Hidden under the happy humming of hotel cooks. The humbling of old Communists. The slow death of dancers. The toy histories that rich tourists came to play with” (Roy 290). The History House’s surface sterilization of Terror functions as a double for the slow entombment of the surviving members of the Ayemenem House within their increasingly crypt-like dwelling.

The other haunted house in Small Things, the ancestral home of the Ipe family, gradually decays as the surviving family members deal with the repercussions of their curse of transgressive desire; it becomes “a patriarchal crypt” (Lanone 127). When Rahel returns to Ayemenem, the once majestic house is now a crumbling, overwhelmed by dust, dirt, and an all-pervasive sorrow: “[f]ilth had layed siege to the Ayemenem House like a medieval army advancing on an enemy castle. It clotted every crevice and clung to the windowpanes. Midges whizzed in teapots. Dead insects lay in empty vases” (Roy 84). In addition to the house’s filth, there is the ever-presence of the unheimlich nature of the house. Estha’s room is described as a “room that had kept its secrets,” a room haunted by “the terrible ghosts of impossible-to-forget toys clustered on the blades of the ceiling fan” (Roy 87). The unhomeliness of the home, a home that keeps the secrets of its inhabitants, but also keeps secrets from its inhabitants, reveals the traumatic reality that Estha and Baby Kochamma (and now Rahel) are trapped within a “history that [they] know to be a lie” (Punter 200).

The Ayemenem House is now the locus of this false history, the
history of the events surrounding the deaths of Sophie Mol and Velutha—Baby Kochamma’s lies, Estha’s false recognition. However, the true markers of the destructiveness of this false history are the distorted gothic versions of Baby Kochamma and Estha that haunt their ancestral home. During the Terror, Baby Kochamma willingly lied to the twins to force one of them to identify the bloodied Velutha as Sophie Mol’s kidnapper. Her adherence to the false history that she created not only traps her within the decaying house but also makes her seem monstrous:

Her [Baby Kochamma] hair, dyed jetblack, was arranged across her scalp like unspooled thread. The dye had stained the skin of her forehead a pale gray, giving her a shadowy second hairline. Rahel noticed she had started wearing makeup [...] because the house was locked and dark, and because she only believed in forty-watt bulbs, her lipstick mouth had shifted slightly off her real mouth” (Roy 22).

With her shifting lips and double mouths, Baby Kochamma is punished for her destructive lies by appearing as a monster with two mouths: one real and one false. Conversely, Estha deals with his own false history by trying to atone for his one-word betrayal by lapsing into silence. His refusal to speak, as well as his seemingly insubstantial corporeal presence, positions him as a phantom haunting the Ayemenem House. A monster and a specter entombed together in an ancestral home cursed by the sins of an Anglophilic patriarch mark, perhaps, the crux of Roy’s postcolonial gothic work: “the impossibility of the escape from history” and the consequences that distort those who attempt to defy “the Love Laws [...] The laws that lay down who should be loved, and how. And how much” (Punter 193, Roy 33).

Notes

1. Notably, the family trait of “Pappachi’s nose” lurks inside the half-English Sophie Mol, not one of the twins: “And yes (oh yes!) she had Pappachi’s nose waiting inside hers. An
Imperial Entomologist’s nose-within-a-nose. A moth lover’s nose” (Roy 137). However, because of Sophie Mol’s untimely death, this trait is never allowed to develop fully.


---
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In early-modern literature, the world of art intrinsically stands in opposition to the physical reality of nature. Often appearing as two contrasting concepts, art and nature are the focus of much debate. These two realms represent diametrically opposing forces—one constructed entirely by man and one of unaltered nature. Early in the seventeenth century, Ben Jonson complicates this debate within two of his most widely popularized works: The Alchemist and “To Penshurst.” The Alchemist considers the legitimacy and motivation of alchemical doctrines as a means by which art strives to defeat nature. “To Penshurst,” a seemingly pastoral poem which considers an idyllic rural landscape, places artistic renderings in opposition to the natural environment by structurally developing a transformation from the wild to the constructed. Jonson utilizes the dichotomy between art and nature to advance his commentary upon London’s changing environment and call attention to the depleting social and urban
conditions which emerge from a mounting industrial atmosphere. In this way, Jonson constructs a proto-environmentalist perspective that expresses tenets of modern environmental concerns long before the term is appropriated in the 20th century (OED).

An ecocritical approach to early-modern literature may seem unprecedented. However, scholars such as Diane Kelsey McColley, William E. Rogers, and Raymond Williams have developed ecologically based interpretations of several seventeenth century writers, including Jonson. This article will build upon this previous scholarship in order to apply an ecocritical mode of interpretation specifically to Jonson’s work and to develop a link between two seemingly divergent facets of his writing – poetry and drama. Considering Jonson’s awareness of problems in the natural world will allow scientific approaches to his work, such as that of Katherine Eggert and Peggy A. Knapp, to adequately explain the dissatisfaction with the art of alchemy that is apparent in *The Alchemist*. In doing so, Jonson’s perspective on the binary of art and nature becomes apparent through his metaphorical discussion of human acts.

Jonson begins to investigate the boundaries of human influence upon nature in *The Alchemist*. Although it is not the intention of this article to thoroughly outline alchemical processes throughout this play, a brief discussion of Jonson’s symbolic use of alchemy will be useful in analyzing how his proto-environmentalism has developed and shaped “To Penshurst.” However, before considering how Jonson’s perspective upon the natural world is demonstrated in his poetry, we must consider the association between alchemy and nature in *The Alchemist*. This association is best expressed by Subtle, a trickster who is not truly an expert in alchemy but masquerades as an alchemist. In depicting alchemy as a trick, the poet undermines the validity of alchemical theory and alludes to the fallibility of such arts. Alvin Kernan argues that this deflation of the alchemist represents Jonson’s
preference for natural over artificial constructions (Eggert 204). As such, by depicting the alchemist as a false construction, Jonson reveals the artificiality of the arts and simultaneously legitimizes the power of nature. The interplay between these two realms is best demonstrated when Subtle explains the alchemical process:

Nature doth, first, beget th’ imperfect; then
Proceeds she to the perfect. Of that airy,
And oily water, mercury is engendered;
Sulphur o’ the fat, and earthy part: the one
(Which is the last) supplying the place of male,
The other of the female, in all metals.
Some do believe hermaphrodeity,
That both do act, and suffer. But, these two
Make the rest ductile, malleable, extensive.
And, even in gold, they are; for we do find
Seeds of them, by our fire, and gold in them:
And can produce the species of each metal
More perfect thence, than nature doth in earth. (Jonson II.iii.158-170)

Although this is only one of many passages that construct alchemy in this play, these lines access the core of alchemical theories. This begins as the speaker establishes that “Nature” begins in an “imperfect” state and only in time “proceeds” to a “perfect” form. In this sense, although nature is capable of achieving perfection, it is a process that occurs through the limitations of time.

However, the “seeds” of the materials that are necessary for this transformation are located within this “imperfect” object from the start. Thus, they are available for the human to “find” and transform into something “More perfect.” As the human is introduced (“we”), it is only through human processes (“by our fire”), that these base materials can be rapidly advanced to “gold.” Gold is, then, a symbol of
perfection. It exists in a natural state but can only be achieved in abundance through human acts. In “The Work of Alchemy,” Peggy A. Knapp considers how this desire to attain gold through alchemy represents a larger connection between the natural and human realms. She observes “that gold represents the perfect balance between the elements of earth, water, air, and fire toward which Nature is heading” (Knapp 575). In this sense, the alchemical production of “gold” appears as a balance between natural elements and human action. However, Subtle’s description of alchemy abandons this equilibrium and becomes problematic when the production of gold not only parallels but exceeds natural process. As he claims that alchemical methods “produce” materials that are “More perfect” than “nature doth [produce] in earth,” the human assumes dominance over nature. In this way, nature is subjugated to human constructions as “fire” becomes capable of improving upon nature itself.

Jonson’s investigation into alchemy as a process by which nature is made more perfect through human processes initiates a conspicuous parallel between art and nature. Previously in the play, such a relationship is clearly established by Subtle:

He will make
Nature ashamed of her long sleep: when art,
Who’s but a step-dame, shall do more, than she,
In her best love to mankind, ever could. (Jonson I.iv.25-28)

Here, “art” is presented directly as something that “shall do more” than nature “in her best” state “ever could.” Similarly to the depiction of alchemy later in the play, the human mode of “art” boasts the ability to create something better than “Nature.” In this sense, alchemy symbolizes the human attempt to dominate nature and thus make it “More perfect.” However, the implication that nature can be made more perfect through human action is, in itself, a contradiction. Katherine Eisamen Maus argues that once alchemy acts upon nature in
order to make it perfect, it alters it in such a way that it destroys the original object (Knapp 591). In this sense, once the natural object has been altered by the human, it becomes nothing more than a construction of human processes and thus unnatural. Paradoxically, as alchemy attempts to locate perfection in nature, it destroys the natural through human interference.

This problematic impact of the human directly correlates with social concerns in early-modern England. In *Poetry and Ecology in the Age of Milton and Marvell*, Diane Kelsey McColley considers the effects of human power over nature and how these effects are expressed in literature. She observes that “Seventeenth-century England had the same ‘environmental’ problems we have today, some age-old, others produced by new technology: deforestation, air pollution, confinement of rivers and streams, draining of wetlands, overbuilding, toxic mining, maltreatment of animals, uses of land that destroy habitats and dispossess the poor” (2). These social concerns are an undeniable influence upon Jonson’s construction of both his drama and poetry. As *The Alchemist* establishes an inconsistency between art and nature through its deflation of alchemy, it begins to express Jonson’s perspective upon human attempts to control and alter the natural world. In “*The Alchemist* and Science,” Katherine Eggert argues that for Jonson, “quick-change artifice... pales in comparison to the slower but authentic transformations brought about by nature” (204). In other words, his negative depiction of alchemy demonstrates his preference for nature over art. However, this partiality is not directly addressed until the appearance of “To Penshurst,” where human constructions are directly contrasted with nature.

In “To Penshurst,” the binary between the constructed and the natural is introduced when the speaker initiates his discussion of Penshurst, the Sidney family home, in the first line (Fn. 3, Jonson, “To Penshurst” 97). His description of the house begins by identifying it in
contrast to other estates: “Thou art not, Penshurst, built to envious show / Of touch, or marble; nor canst boast a row / Of polished pillars, or a roof of gold” (Jonson 97, ll. 1-3). It is clear that in these lines the speaker works to establish the artificiality of other estates which are “built” using lofty and structurally superfluous materials such as “marble” and “gold.” McColley points out that the use of such materials in these lesser estates demonstrates the “social costs of showy importations” (18). In this sense, the presence of these materials that appeal to human aesthetics and monetary desires acts as a negative force on other homes. The use of such materials, then, associates these estates with the futility of artistic productions. Thus, as other houses are identified as constructed (“built”), they become objects created by and for the human.

The association of the houses to their human construction is further demonstrated by the speaker’s mention of “polished pillars.” Similarly to the “marble” and “gold,” these edifices are not emphasized for their structural purpose but for their aesthetic (“polished”) appearance. Accordingly, they are identified as “polished” because they act only to improve the external appearance of the estate. In “Pastoral and Counter-Pastoral,” Raymond Williams argues that this negative depiction of other homes reminds us that Penshurst is unique and that the remainder of the country is infected with negative forces. Thus, Penshurst represents a rural ideal that escapes the widespread social corruption of a changing world (285). In other words, the juxtaposition of the Penshurst estate with the artificially “built” homes that surround it, emphasizes the imperfectability of other estates. As the speaker establishes that other homes strive to achieve nothing more than an “envious show,” they are coupled with the conditions of human embellishment and subjugated to the implied perfection of Penshurst. Although the house itself remains elusive, the speaker’s placement of it amid a host of deceptively “polished” constructions
alludes to the pure perfection embodied within the Penshurst estate.

Having established the disingenuousness of other homes, the speaker returns to his task of admiring Penshurst. He claims that the estate

stand’st an ancient pile,
And, these grudged at, art reverenced the while.
Thou joy’st in better marks, of soil, of air,
Of wood, of water: therein thou art fair. (Jonson 97, ll. 5-8)

Finally approaching the substantive qualities of Penshurst, the speaker begins to establish the dichotomous relationship between art and nature as he contrasts the fallacious appearances of other estates with an image of ecological harmony. Immediately, the juxtaposition is made apparent as Penshurst escapes the “envious show” of other estates and is instead “reverenced” for its modesty. In this way, he creates a sense of organic placement of the house in its natural environment. Unlike the constructed “pillars” of other homes, Penshurst is not “built” but arises from the purely natural and even disorderly form of a “pile.” As such, the “estate [...] fits into nature unarrogantly, like animals’ dens and nests and like the ‘sober frame’ of the house itself” (McColley 15). Not tainted by human constructions or artistic influences, the house arises organically from the earth. The speaker emphasizes this point as he associates the estate with the natural elements of “soil,” “air,” “wood,” and “water.” The house, then, appears as a form unlike any other, a human construction that has sustained or even perfected ecological integrity.

The rendering of the house as a natural rather than artistic form allows it to be integrated into the landscape in a way that makes it seem entirely disconnected from its human origins. This conflation of the human and the natural is contemplated by the speaker as he considers “The taller tree, which of a nut was set, / At his great birth” (Jonson 98,
ll. 13-14). In this way, the human becomes interrelated into the natural environment as Sir Philip Sidney is presented as the offspring of the “nut” of the tree. This interconnectedness is again considered as the speaker states: “And thence the ruddy satyrs oft provoke / The lighter fauns to reach thy Lady’s oak” (Jonson 98, ll. 17-18). As this line refers to the onset of Lady Leicester’s labor pains under an oak tree on the grounds of Penshurst, human origins are once again coupled with nature (Fn. 2, Jonson, “To Penshurst” 98). The human is, then, identified in conjunction with, rather than in opposition to the natural environment. Man emerges from nature just as Penshurst emerges organically from the landscape.

However, the symbiotic relationship between man and nature evolves as the speaker introduces human action. Specifically, the previous integration of the human into the natural environment is both validated and complicated when the speaker observes that “There in the writhèd bark are cut the names / Of many a sylvan” (Jonson 98, ll. 15-16). Although these lines portray the human becoming intertwined with the landscape through the placement of his name in the bark of the tree, the human impact on the environment begins to subtly emerge as the information is permanently “cut” into the tree. The duality of this line integrates the ideas of human impact into Penshurst; the physical branding (“cut the names”) of the tree as well as the previously discussed identification of other trees with Sir Philip Sidney and Lady Leicester, represent the classification of nature in human terms. In “Sacramental Dwelling With Nature: Jonson’s ‘To Penshurst’ and Heidegger’s ‘Building Dwelling Thinking’,” William E. Rogers investigates the domination of human beings over physical space. He observes that the association of the trees to the human landowners causes those natural objects to be identified for their relation to humans rather than their natural selves (Rogers 47). In this way, nature is not physically destroyed but instead subjugated to human needs.
McColley suggests that the human domination over nature is clearly established as the speaker describes a hunting scene (15). As the trees are previously identified in terms of their human associations, the animals are now subjugated to their subservience to man:

The painted partridge lies in every field,
And, for thy mess, is willing to be killed.
And if the high-swol’n Medway fail thy dish,
Thou hast thy ponds, that pay thee tribute fish,
Fat, agèd carps, that run into thy net,
Bright eels that emulate them, and leap on land
Before the fisher, or into his hand. (Jonson 98, ll. 29-38)

Here, the speaker presents the animals anthropocentrically. They are no longer represented as elements within the landscape, but as commodities that exist simply to sacrifice their lives to human needs (“willing to be killed”). Further idealizing the situation, the human speaker claims that the fish cheerfully “run into thy net,” “leap on land,” and jump “into [the fisher’s] hand.” Williams argues that this sacrificial act of the animals implies that the natural order of Penshurst is not natural at all; rather, it is based entirely upon the human. This becomes clear as the animals are referenced only for their role as food for humans and not for their position in an ecosystem (286). In this sense, nature is once again presented as a function of humanity rather than an independent entity.

As the poem progresses, this hyperbolized depiction of the animals is connected to their consumption by humans. The speaker proclaims:

And I not fain to sit, as some, this day,
At great men’s tables, and yet dine away.
Here no man tells my cups; nor, standing by,
A waiter doth my gluttony envy,
But gives me what I call and lets me eat (Jonson 99, ll. 65-69)
Here, the speaker identifies his own desires as “gluttony” and yet relishes in his excess. In this sense, the speaker’s gluttonous appetite must be considered in relation to the animals that are depicted as willfully sacrificing themselves to the human. This excess makes such a sacrifice appear undeserved and unnecessary. According to Williams, this act of dining and the human desire for complete satisfaction during this process represents the “insatiable exploitation of the land and its creatures—a prolonged delight in an organized and co-operative production and consumption—which is the basis of many early phases of intensive agriculture: the land is rich and will be made to provide” (286). As the animals are seen as nothing more than food, the depiction of Penshurst as an integrated part of nature becomes problematic. This anthropocentric mode of perception causes the human to sacrifice natural order to his desire to extract the riches from nature.

These lines parallel the desire for food put forth by Mammon in *The Alchemist*. Similarly, Mammon dreams of a meal composed of delicacies that are supplied in excess:

> The tongues of carps, dormice, and camels’ heels,
> Boiled I’ the spirit of Sol, and dissolved pearl,
> (Apicius’ diet, ‘gainst the epilepsy)
> And I will eat these broths, with spoons of amber,
> Headed with diamant, and carbuncle. (Jonson II.ii.75-79)

Each of these victuals is considered “costly,” common to royalty, or the food of emperors (Fn. 75, Jonson, *The Alchemist* 64). Thus, Mammon’s desire to consume such delicacies directly correlates to his desire for power. Although he seeks the “Philosopher’s Stone” in order to gain social, political, and monetary power, both this craving for food and his quest for the stone in itself establishes his desire to exert control over nature. By seeking the philosopher’s stone, Mammon partakes in a desire to alter natural processes in order to create gold. In this sense,
the stone represents control over nature. The desire for this control is made manifest in the treatment of food by both Mammon and the speaker of “To Penshurst.” Completely uninhibited in their desires, their lack of respect for the food that they consume represents a deficiency in their respect for nature itself.

This feigning respect for nature is represented in the structural evolution of “To Penshurst.” While beginning in the idyllic country setting, the poem evolves toward a “built” environment. It begins with the wild as it progresses from the elements of “soil” and “air” to the anthropocentrically constructed images of “orchard fruit” and “garden flowers” (Jonson 98, ll. 39). No longer natural, these pieces of the landscape are shaped, placed, and controlled by the human. As the speaker moves out of the natural setting and into the constructed world of the house, this structural progression begins to correspond to changing landscapes of early-modern England. During this time, rural environments constantly submit to industrial expansion, forcing society to participate in a similar progression from outside to in. The purpose for such a progression is made clear in the final lines:

Now, Penshurst, they that will proportion thee
With other edifices, when they see
Those proud, ambitious heaps, and nothing else,
May say, their lords have built, but thy lord dwells. (Jonson 100, ll. 99-102)

In this sense, as other homes are recognized as “proud” and “ambitious,” qualities which connote social, political, and monetary success for humans, they remain “nothing else.” As Heidegger observes, human beings create “built” environments in which to dwell but in the process destroy the dwelling (Rogers 49). Similarly to alterations of nature through alchemy, since the human individual has “built” these homes, the houses lose the ability for one to dwell within them. Penshurst only escapes this artificiality when it is removed from
the “built” world of humanity and left to exist as an organic place in which one successfully “dwells.” Harkening back to the “pile” from which the house arises in the fifth line of the poem, it is again associated with its organic form. Although the poem ends within the constructed environment, the speaker still works to establish a difference between Penshurst and other estates. As the concept of “built” space is contrasted with a space in which one can feel placed, the land becomes not only an aesthetic production but a dwelling.

The contrast between “built” and natural space in “To Penshurst” develops from the binary that is cultivated in The Alchemist. “Built” space is clearly related to the human but more importantly, it is the human act of construction. In this act, the human alters natural space in order to construct something based on his or her individual perception. In The Alchemist, alchemy claims a similar ability—the power to alter nature. However, as alchemy is depicted satirically, the theory of the art becomes more artificial and ultimately, nothing more than an illusion. In the end, it is clear that the human cannot improve on nature and thus, art is incapable of creating something “more perfect” than nature.

In this way, “To Penshurst” shows the reader both an organic ideal and the problems that humans represent in relation to that ideal. As the house only remains organic and pure before the imposition of human action, it becomes clear that humanity has a harmful impact upon the natural landscape. This confrontation of the human with the natural is viewed in relation to environmental concerns of early-modern London. Similarly to literature of later periods and today, both urban and rural life are constantly impeded by a growing industrial atmosphere. In this sense, while Jonson is rarely thought of in terms of his interest in the natural environment, he recognizes and addresses the problems with human interactions with nature in both The Alchemist and “To Penshurst.” Utilizing the pre-established debate between art
and nature, Jonson upholds the purity of nature as something not only inaccessible to, but inhibited by art.
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