The Core Journal

Volume II

The Core Journal II

Mental Reconstructions of the Core Curriculum

Spring 1993

"I strive always for erudition; I know a lot, it's true,
but I must know it all."
-Wagner in Goethe's *Faust*

Editors

Lyn Macgregor

Evan Caten

Andrew Abraham

Christopher McMullen

Johanna Kenney

Christopher Atkins

FOREWORD

Four semesters ago we began our examination of the hearts, minds, and history behind some of the greatest works ever written. Our Core Professors led the way and crafted a curriculum that encompassed works beginning with those originally written on stone tablets to the works of modernity, and much more in between. This compilation of scholarly papers is meant to reflect both the variety of works we studied and the breadth of the curriculum itself.

Unfortunately there is time to study only some of the most influential and important works in history, and likewise, because of time and fiscal constraints, not all of the papers submitted to the editors could be included. The editors regret having to exclude some of the many fine papers received, and wish this journal could have been a thicker publication.

The editors of this, the second volume of the Core Journal, are confident that the standards and quality established in the first volume have received full consideration in the crafting of this volume. The first volume of the Core Journal laid the groundwork for this publication, and it is the hope of the editors that publication of the Core Journal continues as a tradition here at Boston University.

Thanks go to all students who submitted papers and all the professors who encouraged them. Thanks also to Angie Lee, Adelaide Juguilon, Lori Brower and Marie Ziemer for their early help and suggestions. Special thanks to Professors Lindholm, Devlin, and Motzkin for their comments and time. And, extra special thanks go to Dean Jorgensen, Deirdre, and the staff in the Core office for putting us up, putting up with us, and all of the valuable work they did to help make this publication possible.

- The Editors, 1993

Contents

The Odyssey:

The Bounty of the Kyklopes

In the next land we found were Kyklopes,
giants, louts, without a law to bless them.
In ignorance leaving their fruitage of the earth in mystery
to the immortal gods, they neither plow
nor sow by hand, not till the ground, though grain --
wild wheat and barley -- grows untended, and
wine-grapes, in clusters, ripen in heaven's rain.
Kyklopes have no muster and no meeting,
no consultation or old tribal ways,
but each one dwells in his own mountain cave
dealing out rough justice to wife and child,
indifferent to what the others do.

-The Odyssey
Book IX lines 113-124

Through his epic poems, The Iliad and The Odyssey, Homer gave the Greeks a common history and identity. The hero Odysseus, especially, became a model citizen for his courage, honor, and faithfulness. One of the best ways to examine Greek ideals in The Odyssey, as defined by Homer, is to see what revolts them, what defies their standards. When Odysseus and his crew encounter the Kyklopes in Book IX, they are disgusted by the creatures' uncivilized life, a life without community or justice. Odysseus" description of the Kyklopes to Alkinoos clearly conveys this.

Odysseus describes the Kyklopes a "giants, louts." Physically, they are large, clumsy, and awkward, obviously less than man, and especially inferior to the gods. Gods, immortal and flawless, represent the physical perfection of the human form. Humans, then, have the same shape of the gods, unlike the Kyklopes. The idolization of the human

form can also be seen in Greek statuary. The Kyklopes lack this form, and consequently Odysseus sees them as imperfect and inferior.

The Kyklopes also lack community, the foundation of Greek civilization: "...each one dwells in his own mountain cave...indifferent to what the others do;" "they have no muster and no meeting, no consultation or old tribal ways." The community and polis are the units of Greek civilization, and without them there is only disorder, barbarism, and lack of culture.

First, law is seen as a "blessing;" it is order out of confusion just as Earth was born out of Chaos. It is law that allows prosperity and pleasure. It is law that allows men to enjoy leisure, wine and companionship. Peace and order are a time for arts, storytelling, and music, because there is no constant struggle to protect one's belongings. This freedom is cherished.

Second, civilization is marked by the congregation of citizens. Isolation of men from one another is, again, chaos, savage and primitive. The assembly for a "town meeting" and consolation is the birth of democracy and the reign of rationality. These meetings were the reason for the importance of eloquent speech, which shows thought and reason. Also important in the gathering of people were "old tribal ways." Tradition and ritual are a form of community order and the past generations represented honor and wisdom. The value placed ont he experience of elders shows an appreciation for that wisdom. Knowledge and history told in the tales of harpers was also respected and unified the community by forming a common thread for the people. The Kyklopes lack this unity and civility of a community.

One of the most unsettling aspects of the Kyklopes is their disregard for the gods. "We Kyklopes care not a whistle for your thundering Zeus or all the gods in bliss," Polyphemos boasts. While the gods are not unquestionable, they are still, in the Greeks' eyes, not to be trifled with. The Kyklopes do not sacrifice to the gods in any way. The Greeks also consider cultivating the soil a direct appreciation to the Earth and shows an

appreciation for bountiful food. But the Kyklopes have this bounty without the work: "grain -- wild wheat and barley -- grows untended, and wine grapes, in clusters, ripen in heaven's rain." Note it is heaven's rain that causes the ripening of food. The Kyklopes take this for granted, living in a mansion and not paying the mortgage. In Odysseus' eyes, their plenty is undeserved.

This relates to the Kyklopes violation of the Greek virtue of "sophrosyne:" moderation. Odysseus describes his and his crew's findings upon reaching the cave of Polyphemos:

> "...Kyklopes had gone afield, to pasture his fat
>
> sheep,
>
> so we looked round at everything inside:
>
> a drying rack that sagged with cheeses, pens
>
> crowded with lambs and kids, each in its class
>
> firstlings apart from middlings, and the "dewdrops,"
>
> or newborn lambkins, penned apart from both.
>
> And vessels full of whey were brimming there --
>
> bowls of earthenware and pails for milking.

This is not considered prosperity, for it is not god-given, not earned through sacrifice. It is gluttony.

Even the rams are makred by richness, described as "handsome, fat, with heavy fleeces, a dark violet." The color purple is associated several times in the Odyssey with plushness and decadence. When Odysseus stays in the house of King Alkinoos of the Phaiikins, the maids make for him a "kingly bed with purple rugs piled up." The Kyklopes are surrounded by this undeserving luxury.

The Kyklopes are not bad or evil, but are barbaric and distasteful to the Greeks. They are portrayed by Homer as the antithesis of Odysseus' ideals of community, gods,

knowledge, and justice. Odysseus' race valued civilization about all else, for its order and culture, passion and wisdom.

-Deirdre Westcott

Justin Lazzara

Serpent Child

The viper, an important metaphor in Aeschylus' Libation Bearers, represents Orestes, Clytamnestra, and the old form of justice (vendetta); this is realized through Orestes' understanding of his mother's vision:

> I pray to the Earth and father's grave to bring that dream
> to life in me. I'll play the seer - it all fits together,
> watch! If the serpent came from the same place as I,
> and slept in the bands that swaddled me, and its jaws
> spread wide for the breast that nursed me into life and
> clots stained the milk, mother's milk, and she cried in
> fear and agony - so be it. As she bred this sign, this
> violent prodigy so she dies by violence. I turn serpent,
> I kill her. so the vision says.
>
> - Orestes (202)

This section of text contains Orestes reply to the Leader, after the contents of Clytaemnestra's dream were made clear to her son. It seems Orestes quickly grasps his role in the vision; the serpent child who must kill his mother to fulfill the *old* form of justice prevailing at this time. On the first line of the text, Orestes reveals how the old form of justice is deeply rooted in his family and his impending actions. He begins by praying to the Earth and his father, representing Orestes' reliance on the ancient forces of the furies and family revenge to complete his task. The serpent, in the way it hugs the earth to exact conformity, is a fitting example of the furies support for the vendetta system of justice. Orestes sees the path fate molds for him and his mother, and wants to put the pieces in place when he says, "I'll play the seer- [the dream] it all fits together (line 528,

202)." Clytaemnestra, who is a serpent herself, dreams her serpent child will rise up and kill her, even though as an individual she treats Orestes with some motherly love and tenderness. It is apparent in the vision that her child will strike unexpectedly, and this is very much the case. Where Orestes discusses his relationship with the serpent, line 4-5, kindness and love do seem to perpetuate themselves, for example, Orestes will "sleep" and be "swaddled" by his mother. These words do not conjure up images of an ever existing rift between mother and child, but helps reveal the strength of the old justice, and how nothing, even the bond between mother and child, matters compared to retribution. Clytaemnestra feeds her own death by giving birth to Orestes and "nursing" him to life. The milk (line 533) with which she supplies her serpent son stresses how intermingled and unified she is with him, almost as if Orestes is one with the body of his mother. This point later explains why Orestes believes his mother is really killing herself instead of Orestes acting as a second body completing the murder.

The classic themes of the old justice and the fury's wrath reveal themselves in line 334 when the Leader proclaims, "The ruthless jaws of the fire[Earth], cries raised for the fathers, clear and just, will hunt their killers harried to the end." Orestes, taking the cast of the serpent, unleashes "fear" and "agony" into his mother and accepts these deeds as written law (line 534). On the next line of the text, the inter relatedness theme is once again revived. Orestes was "bred" to be the sign of the serpent to his mother, to be the violent killer of the original vision. Orestes did not kill his mother with any respect (if it is at all possible), but with viscous tenacity. In the dream he tore at his mother's nipples, and destroyed her with violence like any serpent would. During the last few lines of the text, the serpent child knows the death must be done using violence, and readily incorporates the role of the serpent into his personality.

There are many other attributes in this section of text that relate to similar aspects throughout the Libation Bearers. It can be deduced that Orestes unconditionally

understands the vision, and he realizes the slaying of his mother is actually her suicide. The suicide begins with the birth of Orestes, who is physically part of his mother, and this is why he feels Clytaemnestra will kill herself. This belief manifests itself when Orestes says just before killing his mother, "You are the murderer, not I- and you will kill yourself (218)." A short moment hereafter, Clytaemnestra sees her vision fulfilled when she places Orestes as the character of the sucking serpent. She says to Orestes, "Ai - you are the snake I bore - I gave you life (219)!

After destiny has taken its course, the metaphor of the serpent continues to thrive. The serpent, stirring above the Earth- home of the furies, precisely represents violence, family revenge, and the old form of justice. Orestes can see how his mother, father, Aegisthus, and himself are serpents, and the pain which is endlessly perpetuating in a home swarming with vipers. Just preceding the death of Aegisthus and his mother, Orestes looks about his surroundings, and feels as if he is being "swarmed" by serpents (224-225). Orestes realizes the faults and hardship of the present form of justice, and alludes to things to come when he says, "I cannot stay, I must move on (225)." He wants to stop the reign of the serpents and move to democratic justice.

The metaphor of the serpent is rich with meaning, and can be connected to many other motifs throughout the entire Oresteia. The animalistic nature of the *old* justice is rightly personified as serpentine, for the *new* justice, expressed in the Eumenides, civilized the last serpent, Orestes.

Credit to the Clouds

The message of the chorus of Clouds is finally understood by Strepsiades towards the end of Aristophanes' Clouds in the basic comedic structure: Strepsiades moves from ignorance to knowledge. The Clouds also appear to make a transition: they seem to move from support of Sokrates to support of the gods. However, the Clouds have always believed the gods to be superior and worth fearing, and have only been concealing this fact to let Strepsiades learn the truth for himself. They want him to discover that he only believed what they told him about Sokrates, because he desired advantage over his creditors through Sophistry; and that he is wrong in blaming them because he and Sokrates are truly the ones at fault. The Clouds' masked message is that the fault of the failings of humankind lie with the human, not a superior being in terms of Sophistry, or the divine; and it is through this knowledge that Strepsiades admits his guilt and is determined upon revenge against Sokrates and his teaching.

Provokes by his son Pheidippides' impudence after emerging from the Thinkery, Strepsiades blames the Clouds for letting him get involved in Sophistry in the first place. When he questions them "in god's name," this shows where his true beliefs lie. In fact, he never really accepts or converts to Sophistry. This is evidenced by his small exclamations and swearings by gods that can be found throughout the play.

When he does blame and question the Clouds, the tone of its leader, the Koryphaios, becomes more serious than it had been previously. She is honest and straightforward with Strepsiades in telling him that the blame did belong to him because of his original dishonesty with his creditors, and not to the Clouds, despite their appearance of dishonesty. The Koryphaios goes on to elaborate on the significance of the Cloud's presence not only before Strepsiades, but before Sokrates and everyone else in the play:

> {A}nd so we act, beckoning, alluring foolish men
> through their dishonest dreams of gain to overwhelming
> ruin (140).

This self-description shows how symbolically significant they are in the play. They are women, and they are clouds, the most ephemeral objects in the world. Being female, this description of the Clouds is very reminiscent of the Sirenes described in Homer's Odyssey, who "beckon" and "lure" sailors to their island with false promises, only to have them crash on the rocks of reality that surround the island. Being clouds, not only are they transient, they can also impair vision of reality by distorting the truth, "clouding" Strepsiades' sight. They are "formed by air," formed by mere words out of nothing.

Obviously, Strepsiades is not the only victim of the temptations of the Clouds. The Koryphaios' words seem to imply that men have gone through the same fate as well: "There, schooled by suffering, they learn at last to fear the gods" (140). This is the main reason why the Clouds chose for Strepsiades and have chosen for men to experience for themselves the disillusionment in attempting to believe in something other than the gods. It would be too easy just to tell them that Sophistry was a false approach to life. If men were just told of the duplicate of Sophistry, they might not necessarily believe this, because they may feel that they were being deceived themselves in being told this. Nothing would have been accomplished in this approach. Instead, the Clouds wisely let men learn through suffering.

A contrast between the speech of the Koryphaios of the Clouds and Strepsiades is very clear. The Koryphaios is much more abstract; using metaphor and poetic words. Strepsiades' words are only short and simply prose. Despite this difference, Strepsiades can comprehend the substance of what the Clouds are saying, but not completely, as shown by his very simple responses, showing no deep or real process of the Clouds' words in his brain: "Well, I can't say much for your methods, though I had it coming"

(140). His limits of character do not allow him to truly understand. If his character had completely understood the Clouds' words, he would have understood his situation a long time ago, and he would not have gotten into such a predicament.

It is ironic when Strepsiades addresses Pheidippides and says "Let's go and take revenge on Sokrates and Chairephon for swindling us." After all, it was Strepsiades who had swindled his creditors, Pasias and Amynias. He even admits that he was wrong in cheating them in the previous lines. Yet, Strepsiades seems to find himself more justified in seeking revenge against Sokrates because it was not really a matter of money, but of minds being altered, particularly his son's mind.

Pheidippides is present during this short dialogue between Strepsiades and the Koryphaios of the Clouds, but he did not seem to pay attention or take heed of the interactions. Even after hearing the testimony of the Clouds that did state that men had to learn to fear the Gods, Pheidippides remains faithful to his master Sokrates, because for the first time in his life, he is able to defy his father irrefutably in words; and he was not about to relinquish this power upon the words of Clouds. When Strepsiades asks Pheidippides to join him in taking revenge against Sokrates and Chairephon, he adds the question "Are you game?" This question can be interpreted as asking, "Are you up to it?" This question can also be interpreted with the game associated with hunting. Pheidippides is "game," like fox or deer, for the hunters of minds like Sokrates, and is thus a victim of their game of Sophistry, into which Strepsiades pushed him earlier in the play.

Ultimately, the absurdities of Strepsiades and Sokrates' words and actions help to create one of the main points of Aristophanes' comedy: their visions of the world are blurred by what they wanted to believe, as in the words of the Clouds:

> ...{T}his is what we are,
> the insubstantial Clouds men build their hopes upon,

shinning tempters formed of air, symbols of desire... (140).

Their faults lie within themselves, though they choose to see it otherwise. Sokrates tries to explain the world with a "Convection-Principle," and Strepsiades tries to evade his creditors by trying to believe in Sokrates' Sophistry to be able to accomplish this. This shows how they tried to "build their hopes," but are inevitably proven wrong. Strepsiades, being the main character of the comedy, is the only one to make the transition from ignorance to knowledge of his mistake to try to believe in Sophistry as an answer to his prayers. He only finds that he was to blame by letting himself be partly deluded by Sokrates' words, not the Clouds. He learns that what he had always known before was true, that the divine existed, and that he was wrong to find fault in anyone other than the human: himself and Sokrates' Sophistry.

-Shelia K. Espineli

Plato, Socrates, and Casey Stengel:
Allegory in The Republic

"The Soul? Nah, I don't like fish"
-Yogi Berra

In the twilight of the Golden Age of professional baseball, before the tyrannical owners took over with their love of money and desire to create empires out of their teams, there was a man who during the summer months was often found working, playing, and praying in the most majestic temple of the day - Yankee Stadium. He was named Casey Stengel, and people liked to call him "the Old Professor" - perhaps because of the wisdom that underlined his speech, perhaps because the opinion of the many had it that he was a nonsensical fool, or perhaps for both reasons. In any case, Casey was lucky enough to be the manger of a Yankee team filled with promising youngsters, some better than others, but all with a desire to improve themselves. And aside from the game itself, they enjoyed nothing more than sitting on the field or in the dugout listening to Casey as the warm glowing sun lit up their faces.

"What are you going to talk to us about today, Casey?"

"Glad to see you're so eager to listen, Scooter. I don't wanna get too involved in anything right now, seein' how I haven't gotten a chance yet to go do any betting at the track, but I do want to say one thing. I know a lot of you have a lot more talent than a lot of other guys in this league and on this team, and some of you are real popular when it comes to the public and press, but that don't mean nothing. It may seem to them or to yourself that you're a fine player, but "seem" don't mean nothing in my book. You can't

use your talent or your popularity for your own benefit at the expense of the other guys on this team, and you don't have license to go around and do whatever pleases you."

Rizzuto was confused. "I don't get it, Casey. What do you mean? What might we do that was wrong just because we had an advantage over other players?"

"Have any of you guys ever read Plato's Republic?"

Most everyone looked at each other, perplexed, but Whitey Ford, the star pitcher, a thinking man's position, chimed in. "Of course, Casey."

"Well Whitey, how about we look at how Plato explains what I'm trying to say, and then maybe I'll have made myself more clear and you'll all get what I'm saying."

"Sounds great, Casey!"

Mantle suddenly spoke up. "Wait, Casey, Plato's a Greek philosopher guy. How's he gonna know anything about baseball?"

"Because, Mickey, The Republic is all about allegories, just like baseball. Plato wasn't dry and dull like Kant or Hume, y'know? He had creativity and imagination."

"How is baseball an allegory, Casey?" asked Rizzuto.

"I think perhaps I'll return to that question later."

"What's so special about allegories? What's the point of them?" asked Mantle.

"Simply put, Mickey, I suppose you could say that allegories help us understand. They help us learn about things that maybe can't adequately be said literally, or maybe things that aren't really there but are ideas. You can't give a physical description to an idea - you have to describe it some other way."

"Holy Cow!" said Rizzuto. "Like Jesus' parables in the New Testament - those are allegories."

"Yep. Remember in Matthew 13.10-13 when his disciples ask Him why he speaks to the people in parables, He says 'To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given. For to him who has will more be given, and he will have abundance, but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away. This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand.' There's a knowledge and understanding that transcends the senses. This permeates Plato's philosophy. In fact, his ideal realm of intellection is something that can only be described through allegory, and each of the major issues of The Republic has an allegory to explain it. This ultimately points to the nature of the republic itself that Plato proposes to create."

"So how are you going to relate this to what you were saying initially?" asked Rizzuto.

"I'll try to explain. One of Plato's main concerns is the nature of justice, and of injustice, what exactly they are and whether it can ever be profitable. These sorts of questions are not easily answerable, and therefore an allegory is employed in order to approach the truth. To this end, Plato depicts Socrates recalling the story of the ring of Gyges. Whitey, I see you have a copy of The Republic with you here at the ball park!"

"Of course, Casey! Here, right on page 37, Socrates is describing the argument that when given an opportunity, even a just man will follow in the footsteps of the unjust and take advantage of those around him for his own personal gain. Socrates says "The license of which I speak would best be realized if they should come into possession of the sort of power that is said

the ancestor of Gyges, the Lydian, once got," wherein a gold ring gave him the power of invisibility and the freedom to do anything and take from anyone without suffering punishment."

"Yes," Casey said, "and Socrates does a good job proving that a truly just man would not take advantage of such a power. So what I'm trying to say to you guys is that if you really want to be virtuous ballplayers, you won't use your power and popularity as means towards indulging in excessive and unnecessary pleasures."

Suddenly Roger Maris spoke. "That doesn't mean we can't have a beer after the game, does it?"

"Of course not, Roger. But I think you all know what I'm talking about, since you're all this high up on the pro baseball chain. You know what's expected of you."

Maris spoke again. "Boy, I'm sure glad I'm where I am and not still in the minor leagues. The minors are like a different world from this place. There it always seemed gloomy and cloudy and dark, like it was gonna rain; but up here, it seems the sun shines all day long. I remember when I first got here. The light standards were so big and bright that I could barely open my eyes or I'd go blind. Tell you what though, after a few at bats against real pitchers in real ballparks, I got accustomed to those lights real quick. I know I'm never going back to the minors."

Casey looked thoughtful and concerned. "Hmmm...Roger, interesting that you would say such things. Roger, don't you think that you might ever go back to the minor leagues someday, say as a coach or manager?"

"What on Earth for?"

"Well, you're gaining some valuable skills up here, and you're one of the best hitters in the game right now - wouldn't you want to go back down

to the Minor Leagues and share what you've learned? Y'see, this is something that Plato talks about. He describes the ascent through the various levels of learning and understanding that men must go through if they are to achieve true knowledge, either in its entirety or of a single thing. Being one of his major points, Plato provides an allegory for it."

"Yes, Casey!" Whitey said eagerly. "It describes the climbing out of a cave where men are slaves to a world of shadows, knowing nothing but believing they know everything. As the man leaves the cave and enters daylight, he is blinded by things he has never seen before and scared of his new environment. But soon he is able to see, and he sees things as they really are. It is then his duty to go back down to the cave and tell the others of his experience, even though, as it says in 517 a, "it be said of him that he went up and came back with his eyes corrupted, and that it's not even worth trying to go up? And if they somehow are able to get their hands on and kill the man who attempts to release and lead up, wouldn't they kill him?"

"Some double-A kid is going to kill me if I go back down there?" asked Maris.

"No," said Casey, "but wouldn't that kid not believe you when you tell him that it is possible to make it to the major leagues and be successful, and that he wouldn't be stuck in the minors forever? I think he might laugh at you. Or, he might be so cocky and full of himself that he might not listen to the good batting advice that you had to offer. But despite this, you must try - where would you be if the good players of the past did not end up becoming your coaches and managers?"

"Nice self-promotion there, Casey," Rizzuto said.

"Can't hurt. Besides, it's true. I'm your philosopher-king right here. So now you understand what I am saying to you. That man who most fits

the job is the one who must take that job and perform to his full ability. Where would baseball as an institution be if this were not so? Where would the Yankees be if a baker or a cook were your manager? Not in first place, that's for sure. Everyone thinks they can manage a baseball team, and they try it from their couches, but it takes a specific type. And all those armchair managers out there resent me because I get paid to sit around and do what they think they can do just as well. I see your eyes gleaming, Whitey - yes, I know, this relates to Plato's point that those who are best suited to a certain task must fill only that job and no other if his republic is to be. And the man who tells everyone this, who says you are not good enough to rule but only to follow, and who then takes over that leadership role, is hated and wished dead. This is made dramatically clear by Plato's ship allegory, wherein each sailor fights over being the pilot, even though none on them know anything of piloting, even though they profess to it, and when someone say true piloting can be learned, and he says he has that knowledge, 'they claim it isn't even teachable and are ready to cut to pieces the man who says it is teachable,' as it says in 488b on Whitey's chewing-tobacco stained copy that I have here. Even players think that they're smarter than us managers. Don't you?"

All the players laughed, but they did not challenge Casey's assessment, for they knew it was true.

"But look, there's no shame in not being the skipper. You all fill your different roles beautifully. Mikey and Roger, you guys just keep hitting those balls out of the park; and Scooter, you are the best bunter I've ever seen. And you guys'll be remembered for it - most of us managers fade away into history. People who go on cruises to Bermuda remember the chef and the piano player in the lounge; nobody remember the captain. What I'm

rying to say to you guys is that you are all immortals. You'll live forever on film and photographs; the stories of your accomplishments will be told over and over. And long after you're all dead kids will be wishing they could've seen you play. It's up to you to choose the life you want to lead, but remember that you'll carry that life with you forever."

Whitey took over so Casey could catch his breath. "Yeah, what Casey's talking about is in this book also. Everyone's soul is immortal, and it's up to you to decide what nature your soul is going to take. You might be tempted by a life of indulgence without any temperance, but you'll be unhappy forever. The allegory of the myth of Er shows the endless horror that can occur if we do not seek to distinguish between what is bad and the Good. Out souls will wander between heaven and the earth for countless years, though that aimless wandering may indeed occur right here on Earth in our own lifetimes."

"Casey," said Mantle, "I think I see, without using my eyes. Plato was concerned with the meaning of justice, whether injustice is profitable, the necessity of a correct education, understanding one's place in the community, and the immortality of the soul. And each of these has an allegory which makes it easier to truly grasp what the concepts are about."

"But Casey," Whitey asked, "What about the republic itself? How are we to understand it? After all, it <u>is</u> called <u>The Republic</u>."

Casey grinned and then spoke. "A fine question, Whitey. Scooter, remember when you asked me earlier what baseball was an allegory for? Well, I dare to say that this wonderful game is an allegory for life. A man, alone, begins with the safety of home, and yet he feels the need to go out and face an opponent who is stronger and more powerful. And more often than not, he fails. Even Ted Williams, a hero I'm sure Plato would allow the poets

to write about, failed at least sixty percent of the time. And yet he went out and faced adversity again and again. Sometimes he would get on base, and begin his journey, a perilous trek going from base to base through dirt and grass with his adversaries all around him. And if he had the right balance of smarts, enthusiasm, and desire, he might make it all the way around, safely back Home. This sporty, this structure, this institution, is life itself. And the institution of Plato's called the Republic, his 'city in speech', is itself an allegory for the human soul, and what is true for one is true for the other. The balance between the logical, spirited, and desirous aspects of the soul are comprehended when writ large in the carefully conceived republic, just as the dynamics of living life are made clear on a mathematically designed baseball diamond. The soul, which belongs to the highest form of knowledge - intellection - can not be conceived of adequately until put in terms of an allegory. Perhaps after all we have said, the concept of the allegory is the key to fully understand this book."

"I think you are right, Casey. But I am wary of all this discussion..."

"Absolutely, Scooter. After all this talk of like and the soul, there is only one thing one can say - 'Let's play ball'."

-David Croghan

The Roots of the Tao and the Way

"To learn and at due times repeat what one has learnt is that not after all a Pleasure?" (Waley, 84) To practice what good we have learned from experience should be our greatest pleasure. We should religiously and habitually practice and teach what we have learned. It is, however, very difficult to express our thoughts adequately to others. Certainly, every attempt can be regarded as an art, art as an individual's representation of the truth. Confucius and Lao Tzu use words as their medium; they are eloquent, beautiful, and profound artists. However, their art reflects their own experiences and also their times. It is not necessary to distinguish between *The Analects* and the *Tao Te Ching* because one work is valid and the other is not; but it is necessary to distinguish between them because they are subtly, yet fundamentally different. The symbol of the tree, used in both works, serves to define the differences between them and to illustrate the foundations of their teaching. To benefit most from these classics, we must understand each work and then build or choose a foundation for ourselves; we must also teach and practice what we gain from each.

"By the time of Confucius (551-470 B.C.), the house of Chou had been in power for more than half a millennium. It now showed many cracks and its foundation was shaking." (Chan, 4) Each saying of The Analects was necessarily a product and reflection of this time and of the author's experience. The second analect of Book I is a representative lesson in restoring the ancient ways:

> Master Yu said, those who in private life
> behave well towards their parents and
> elder brothers, in public life seldom show
> a disposition to resist the authority of
> their superiors. And as for such men starting
> a revolution, no instance of it has ever oc-
> curred. It is upon the trunk that a gentleman
> works. When that is firmly set up the Way grows.
> And surely proper behavior towards parents and
> elder brothers is the trunk of Goodness.

The most important thing to notice in this analect is that the practitioner of the Way need not worry about the seed of the tree or the cultivation of the tree. The seed, it must be realized, has already sprouted. The rituals of the ancients are groves full of growing trees. The root of society has been planted and the starting place for each individual is the practice of filial piety and the carryover of filial respect and responsibility to public life.

"It was a common conviction in ancient China that the foundation of the empire lies in the state, that of the state in the family, and that of the family in the person." (Chan, 195) Obviously, Master Yu's instruction is aimed at the individual. Yet it is important to note that the proper place for and individual to start, according to *The Analcects*, is in the family. Confucian eduction rarely returns to focus only on the individual. Secular relations are more important than individual salvation. The individual has absolutely no creative power if he is to be a gentleman loyal to the state and ritual. The gentleman (*jen*) is defined from the beginning as one who follows the ways of the ancients beginning in his family life; the title of gentleman itself implies entrance into a good, and hopefully large "family" or grouping. The translation for *jen* as gentleman also specifically implies manners and etiquette beyond the broad meaning of Good assigned to *jen.* Etiquette and rituals are naturally derived from the ancients and have a universal meaning with a culture. They are not individual rules of behavior to be improvised upon: the gentleman "works" with the well established "trunk."

Although Lao Tzu concentrated on the individual in relation to society, he also concerned himself with individual salvation. "...Taoism arose in opposition the existing practices and system, on the one hand, and on the other, offered a new way of life that is as challenging as it is profound." (Chan, 4) Although the exact date the *Tao Te Ching* was written is not known, it was certainly written after the time of Confucius. Therefore Taoism opposed, at least in part, the Confucian system (rooted primarily in the ritual of the Chou dynasty). Lao Tzu proposed a new way of life that relied on establishing and grasping the strong root of nature, but which also allowed freedom for the individual.

The *Tao Te Ching* is the classic book of the Way. A classic is viewed as having great authority because it is ancient and yet still applicable in the modern world. The Tao is a "new" Chinese classic in that it is not of the Chow dynasty and it is not Confucian; it started its own tradition.

The only foundation Lao Tzu implants is the Tao or the Way. The natural beauty of the Tao Te Ching is in the way the Tao is as free as water flowing down a mountain. The only rules for water are the rules of nature: it must necessarily flow down the mountain and return as rain. Yet, the time it takes and its particular course is quite individual (although obviously influenced by other structures in nature). In the *Tao Te Ching* nature works by itself; this is completely different from the Confucian concept of the Will of Nature which describes nature as directed by Heaven.

Chapter 54 of the *Tao Te Ching* is a perfect example of the contrast between the differences in the foundations of Confucianism and Taoism:

> He who is well established in Tao cannot be pulled away.
> He who has a firm grasp cannot be separated from it.
> Thus from generation to generation his ancestral sacrifice
> will never be suspended.
> When one cultivates virtue in his person, it becomes genuine
> virtue.
> When one cultivates virtue in his family, it becomes overflowing
> virtue.
> When one cultivates virtue in his community, it becomes lasting
> virtue.
> When one cultivates virtue in his country, it becomes abundant
> virtue.
> When one cultivates virtue in the world, it becomes universal.
> Therefore, the person should be viewed as a person.
> The family should be viewed as a family.
> The community should be viewed as a community.
> The country should be viewed as a country.
> And the world should be viewed as the world.
> How do know this to be the case in the world?
> Through this.

The roots of Confucianism and Taoism are subtly different. In Taoism there remains the Chinese chain of foundations, yet the ultimate actor in the dependent links of the chain is the individual. It remains for the individual to act according to nature, but there

is a greater freedom in each individual's path or Way. Each individual must cultivate virtue and allow it to progress naturally. Instead of instruction in the universal meanings of ritual in a society, Lao Tzu teaches the individual to be a separate cultivator of virtue. it is also notable that he teaches that virtue is gained without effort beyond grasping the root. Yet it must be a virtuous root for in chapter 46 Lao Tzu describes greed as the root of evil. Lao Tzu also teaches that there is no need to learn virtue. It is acquired naturally by allowing oneself to become open and supple to its cultivation. In this way the family, the country, and the world benefit, while the individual is free from the bondage of empty ritual and from the stale and inapplicable knowledge of the past.

Water is the main symbol employed by Lao Tzu. The natural and habitual surrender of water to the flow of nature illustrates Taoism's concentration on moving with nature.

The peach tree is a symbol of immortality in Taoist art. The symbol is based specifically in legendary peach trees located in the mountains of Western China which blossom only every three-thousand years. Although it is a Taoist symbol, the Confucians would also undoubtedly attach a certain meaning to and have a certain paedogogical use for such trees.

Let us say that the Confucian peach tree would certainly be thousands of years old, and it would be found in an orderly grove of trees each of which was perfect in appearance. The tree would be carefully spaced from its neighbors, far enough away so as not to interfere with another yet close enough to allow a great number of trees to grow in the grove. The ancient tree would be diligently attended; the trunk would be trimmed and groomed. It is the trunk the Confucian farmer would work upon because the seed has long ago sprouted into a healthy and reliable bearer of fruit; new seeds are troublesome to raise and they often fail to sprout. In the autumn the wealth of the grove is ritualistically harvested and the peaches are prepared and sacrificed, along with the rest of the harvest, in the way that they have always been prepared and sacrificed. The son of the farmer learns

how to tend the grove by doing what his father does. Although Nature is the source of the trees, the trunks are carved and trimmed and the farmer is their governor.

The Taoist peach tree is not, and need not be cared for by man. Like the Confucian grove, it is thousands of years old; no one can remember the original peach tree. Quite often, new seeds are planted, not by man, but by nature. This is true cultivation; if Lao Tzu wanted a peach he would let nature provide it and he would not interfere with its production. The new trees sprout wherever the fruit lands or rolls on the ground. Sometimes the fruit rots. However, for each seed that rots there are seeds that sprout; some seeds produce stable roots and grow by nature. The wood is never carved, for it is allowed to grow in its particular way and they bear good fruit naturally if the roots are strong. Each peach is of a given tree, each individual tree is of a family of trees, when which is in turn part of a countryside; each countryside is an essential, albeit fractional, part of the cosmos. The source of ever peach is the same, and every peach is part of a delicate balance in the beginingless *yin-yang* cycle of the cosmos.

In both trees the Way that they grow is primarily by nature, and the end of each is the bearing of good (which is to say, virtuous) fruit. Confucius believes that in order to bear good fruit the tree must be cared for by man with ritual. He teaches that the trunk is the essential part of the whole. Lao Tzu would argue that good fruit will be produced by nature if the tree is not interfered with by man and that it is the root of each new tree that must be cultivated and the root of each old tree that must be grasped. In the end, both trees will benefit the individual country side, and the cosmos as a whole. The Taoist tree explains how virtue must be planted and allowed naturally to blossom. Taoism often uses uncarved wood as a symbol of simplicity, while the Confucian argues for working with the trunk. The Tao Te Ching and The Analects both teach a Way to live. The decision we make in choosing a path to follow is made at once easier and more difficult through exposure to these simple yet enormously challenging works of art.

– Sean Lake

Sources

Chan, Wing-tsit, *The Way of Lao Tzu.* Macmillian Publishing, New York, 1963.

Confucius, *The Analects*; tr. Waley, Arthur. Random House, New York, 1966.

Lao Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*; tr. Bynner. Perigee Books, Putnam Publishing Group, 1972.

Ataraxia and Tranquillity

Great philosophical and religious texts often advocate a withdrawal from the common world into a higher awareness contained in the self. They deny the importance of the possessions and interactions of humans for a higher moral and spiritual awareness that can only be attained through a denunciation of worldly goods and priorities. They offer different names for this "self", calling it a soul, a spirit or an atman, but the concept is constant. Two examples of such a withdrawal are found in The Enchiridion of Epictetus and in the Hindu religious text The Bhagavad-Gita. Both explore the retreat into the self through different methods, but with parallel themes.

Epictetus' Enchiridion offers an explicit means for withdrawal, but leaves the reason vague and unexplained:

"If you would improve, be content to be thought foolish and dull with regard to externals. Do not desire to be thought to know anything; and though you should appear to others to be somebody, distrust yourself. For be assured, it is not easy at once to keep your will in harmony with nature and to secure externals; but while you are absorbed in the one, you must of necessity neglect the other." (Epictetus. The Enchiridion., XIII).

With this teaching, Epictetus promotes the idea of a simple and categorical dismissal of all externals and a sort of anti-materialism as it relates to the will. You must "...be content to be thought foolish and dull with regard to externals." With this, he asserts that other's opinions with regard to your externals are of no importance. They seem to be of no importance based on two well defined criteria: that they are the opinions of others and therefore are of the things that are beyond your power, and that they are in regard to your externals and are therefore based on something that is not directly "yours" anyway.

Epictetus begins this teaching with the words: "If you would improve,...". With this, he sets the tone of his type of moral philosophy. It is one that directly and necessarily demands the active participation of the student and reader. If the reader has the wish to improve, then *this* is the way to do it: you must "be content to be thought foolish and dull with regard to externals." Mostly, you must be content to be thought foolish and dull. You must truly denounce the importance of the opinions of others, since they are themselves to be considered externals. To keep your will in harmony with nature, you must first divide everything into that which is truly yours (that which is within your power), and that which is not properly your own affair (that which is beyond your power). With this division made, the opinions of others fall with a weighty thud into the latter category. They represent your reputation, which is effectively beyond your power.

The most you can do is to live with your will in harmony with nature and be, therefore, beyond their criticism.

The second justification for this contented state is that the opinions of others are often formed with respect to your material possessions and to all that is not within your own realm of control. These by nature are not truly yours to begin with. So, just as you deny the opinions related to your externals, you deny the externals themselves. Taken to the extreme, it seems to go beyond the importance of saying that your favorite cup is only a cup and that if it breaks, it is nothing to you. Epictetus seems to urge you to say that the very existence of the favorite cup, or of cups at all for that matter, is nothing to you. Anything that is not part of the realm within your power, is to be ignored in favor of improvement through some higher principle.

Again Epictetus asserts that the favorable opinions of others should not be among your desires: "Do not desire to be thought to know anything..." He does not say that you should not desire to know anything, just that you should not desire to *be thought* to know anything. The knowledge that you hold is within your power, but the opinions of others about that knowledge is not. He advocates wisdom and knowledge for their own sake, and for the sake of a higher moral state.

The following line then turns slightly to show you a new angle on this theme. By saying, "..though you should appear to others to be somebody, distrust yourself." he shows that it is not the fear of an unfavorable opinion that should led to this denunciation of importance, but rather a fundamental distrust of yourself. Even if you appear great to others, do not believe it. For, with this recognition from others comes a direct temptation to relinquish your values concerning the externals. At this point it is therefore crucial that you distrust yourself. It becomes necessary to deny not only the recognition of others, but to deny yourself as well. Or, at least, it becomes necessary to deny the human urge to be honored and respected by others.

The implications of this attitude drastically separate the followers of Epictetus from the world around them, and even from themselves. This philosophy teaches that "if you would improve," it is best to dismiss the opinions of others as they regard your possessions. It doesn't state that you must deny the opinions of others in every respect, but only as they relate to your externals or possessions. And it implies a denial of the world around you that reaches further than just your possessions. I am sure that Epictetus would whole-heartedly support this rejection of opinion not only as it relates to externals but as it relates to the person's will and sense of self as well. So, a person must also deny that part of themselves that wishes to be honored and respected by their fellow humans. What results is not only a separation of the person from their society, but a separation of the self from the person. Persons must actually identify and rid themselves of attitudes that make up part of who they are.

At the next point in the passage, Epictetus seems to offer a justification for the teachings he has laid out. For those wondering at this point the reasons for this denial of externals he says: "For be assured, it is not easy at once to keep your will in harmony with nature and to secure externals." So, the aim of this teaching and the way in which you would improve is to keep your will in harmony with nature. This seems to be the ultimate goal of this discipline of denial. By denying externals, you free yourself to pursue a harmony that would be unachievable with the clutter of externals and their corresponding importance. Both are concentrated efforts, "..but while you are absorbed in the one, you must of necessity neglect the other." So, it is far better for the improvement of the self to pursue harmony.

This idea of simplicity as a paragon, and a withdrawal from the world in which we live into an extracted state of self is echoed continually in The Bhagavad-Gita. In the sixth teaching Krishna expands on his idea of the man of discipline.

> The higher self of a tranquil man
> whose self is mastered
> is perfectly poised in cold or heat,
> joy or suffering, honor or contempt. 7
>
> Self-contented in knowledge and judgment,
> his senses subdued, on the summit of existence,
> impartial to clay, stone, or gold,
> the man of discipline is disciplined. 8
>
> He is set apart by his disinterest
> toward comrades, allies, enemies,
> neutrals, nonpartisans, foes, friends,
> good and even evil men. 9
>
> A man of discipline should always
> discipline himself, remain in seclusion,
> isolated, his thought and self well controlled,
> without possessions or hope. 10

Krishna teaches in this passage that the man who has disciplined himself is a man who is "perfectly poised in cold or heat, joy or suffering, honor or contempt." This man has mastered his "self" or "atman", and is immune to the adverse extremes in life. He is a man who has found perfect balance and his self is not affected by weather, emotional states or his reputation among humans. Krishna's ideal human being withdraws from the sensory effects of the world and is contained in his "higher self". Such a person has attained a tranquillity that is untouchable.

The man of discipline is detached from the substances of the world and is independent in all aspects. He relies on no one but himself for knowledge and judgment. The information that he needs to make his decisions seems to be already contained in his being so he has no need for his senses. They lie "subdued" as he rests on the "summit of existence." He has no use for the very

things that allow most of us to exist. The same man who has even denied the things that are most human surely has no need for the material possessions of the world. In his tranquillity, he is "impartial to clay, stone, or gold."

As an effect of this detachment and withdrawal into the self, the disciplined man has denounced the importance of his fellow man. His "disinterest" towards them goes so far that he no longer distinguishes his comrades and allies from his enemies, his friends from his foes, and even the good men from the evil. Without distinguishing those around him, he is set apart from them, no longer able to relate to them on their level. He no longer concentrates on the good and the bad, the use and the disuse of his fellow humans, but rather focuses only on the self and the maintenance of his tranquillity.

The Bhagavad-Gita uses language that makes this separation from the common world quite explicit. It asserts that the disciplined man lives in a type of seclusion, an isolation undisturbed by the possessions, the people, or even the senses that give the atman a pathway to the outer world. The last passage from this particular section of the text states that he must "remain in seclusion, isolated, his thoughts and self well controlled." This could mean a literal separation from the world, like the guru that lives high atop a mountain, alone in his meditation and closer to spiritual guidance, or it could just be metaphorical language for a spiritual state, an imagistic description of the withdrawn state of self that Krishna teaches. The Hindu teachings don't advocate such literal separation because they still believe that the atman has a duty to perform on the earth; but this duty or dharma must be performed with a sense of detachment from the world because it is being done for the eternal self.

The people, possessions and distinctions that occur in a person's life are merely consequential and should be utterly ignored for a discipline of the self. Each person should live "without possessions or hope." They should ignore not only the material possessions of life, but an emotion that occurs in every human: hope. With the denial of this emotion, the person gives up any aims or purpose and exists in seclusion within themselves. In order for a person to give up hope they must cease to wish things to happen; they must give up any semblance of desire. As they do this, they must put their trust in something that will guide their lives. Krishna teaches that each person must guide their lives through discipline. The man of discipline is "tranquil", "self-contented in knowledge and judgment", and "controlled."

This discipline of self leads to guidance by a superior power that shapes life. The Sanskrit word for discipline (yoga) comes from the root *yuj*, "to yoke." The glossary asserts that discipline is "..the yoking of oneself to Krishna's divine purpose, the spiritual and physical discipline that integrates aspects of reality." The disciplined person is guided by Krishna's divine purpose, a force that the person surrenders himself to completely. Through detachment of the self from material

possessions, senses, and fellow humans, a man reaches a discipline that unites the physical reality of the common world and the spiritual reality of Krishna's will.

This yoking through discipline seems to lie at the base of the teachings in The Bhagavad-Gita. It is mirrored by a less complex, and less explicit, description in The Enchiridion. Epictetus uses a phrase that has been translated to say that you must "keep your will in harmony with nature." The discipline of the Gita is not far removed from this stoic idea; while they use different principles, they accomplish much the same end. Epictetus urges you to achieve a harmony that results from disregard for desires and a process that maintains your will with that of "nature." He does not specify the characteristics of this force called nature, but it is apparent that it is a higher force to which you must unite your will in order to improve. It is a kind of order that shapes the way that things occur and it is better to merge your will with it than to impose your will upon it. This thing called "nature" by Epictetus can easily be called Krishna's divine purpose. Without the religious nature of the Gita's teaching, the concept is very similar. They are both ideas of orders that guide you to a better existence; they both demand a harmony or discipline with their guiding principles, and they are both entirely consuming, leaving no room for the common world.

The most apparent difference between these two beliefs is the profound religious nature of the Hindu text. This excerpt is a tiny part of a huge system of beliefs whose purpose is to guide the eternal atman to a state of perfect devotion and finally an escape from transmigration. This is contrasted sharply with the more elusive end of The Enchiridion's teachings. Epictetus never makes his end explicit to the reader, preferring to focus on the way to the end. In the end, the ideas of the Gita impress you to act for Krishna, for God, but The Enchiridion impresses you to act for improvement only. As a result of this religious depth in the Gita, you get a much more complex system with very explicit teachings and a clear path. You also have a more satisfying doctrine because of its complexity. The Enchiridion reveals little of the nature of its higher order and so, reveals little to satisfy the questions that spawn from a belief in a higher order. The Gita establishes an involved system that mimics the complexity of the world around each person, so it offers more answers to their questions.

The means that the texts teach you to use to attain these ends are very similar. They both advocate an isolation of the self or atman through the denial of externals. They both specify that it is not only material possessions that are to be considered externals, but also the opinions and distinctions among humans and even parts of yourself. They both teach that a simple withdrawal from the outer world is insufficient and that there are emotions, urges or characteristics within each of us that are to be denied as well. The most prevalent of these demands is that you give up desires, hope, and any expectations for the future.

The approach that the two texts take in teaching their philosophies and how they lend themselves to daily practice is another slight difference. Epictetus lays down a simple guideline

that can be followed and applied to the everyday actions of life. This method directly affects day-to-day actions and, by so doing, changes the larger aspects of life. This teaching can be paralleled to the Confucian beliefs in ritualizing common actions so they take on a large significance. The Gita teaches a more devotional focus that encompasses not only day-to-day actions, but simultaneously the moral and spiritual ones. Krishna's approach is more direct, because of the religious nature of the teachings.

The teachings of The Enchiridion of Epictetus and the Hindu text called The Bhagavad-Gita both explore the concept of the withdrawal of self into a higher awareness in different ways. These two ancient texts from diverse backgrounds hold many similarities in their underlying philosophy and the means by which you are to attain them. The most striking similarities are the withdrawal from the common world of possession, reputation and distinctions into a world that unites your will and desires with that of a high order. They both call for a denial of the yourself: Epictetus telling you to "distrust yourself", and Krishna telling you to reach a tranquillity that isolates the inner self. But, the obvious religious nature of the Gita sets it apart from the more philosophical nature of Epictetus' work. One work elevates ideals toward a God and the other elevates them for their own sake and for the sake of improvement.

by Rob Carson

"The Triple Fool"

I am two fools, I know,
For loving, and for saying so
In whining poetry.
(But Where's that wise man that would not be I
If she would not deny?)
Then as the earth's inward, narrow, crooked lanes
Do purge sea water's fretful salt away,
I thought if I could draw my pains
Through rhyme's vexation, I should them allay.
Grief brought to numbers cannot be so fierce,
For he tames it that fetters it in verse.

But when I have done so,
Some man, his art and voice to show,
Doth set and sing my pain,
And by delighting many, frees again
Grief, which verse did restrain.
To love and grief tribute of verse belongs,
But not of such as please when 'tis read;
Both are increased by such songs,
For both their triumphs so are published;
And I, which was two fools, do so grow three.
What are a little wise, the best fools be.

-John Donne

On "The Triple Fool"

In his poem "The Triple Fool," Donne displays not only his talent as a poet, but also his skill as an ironist. Who but a master of irony could call himself a fool for writing poetry about the pain of his love, and do so within the bounds of a poem?

In our examination of this particular poem, we shall direct our attention to four areas : first, to Donne's realization of the foolishness of using poetry to rid himself of his pain; second, to the reasons he gives for assuming that his stratagem should work; third, to the way in which his purpose is undermined by the actions of others; and last, to the effect this has upon him and his estimate of himself.

Donne begins "I am two fools, I know, / For loving, and for saying so / In whining poetry. / (But where's that wise man that would not be I / If she would not deny?" The first three lines contain the narrator's basic understanding of his situation, that he is foolish for being in love, and even more so for writing poetry about his condition. It is not until the fourth line that Donne reveals that, were the object of his affections to reciprocate his feelings he would not be in his current foolish state.

The next six lines explain Donne's reason for putting into poems the pain of his unrequited love. "Then as the earth's inward, narrow, crooked lands / Do purge sea water's fretful salt away, / I though if I could draw my pains / Through rhyme's vexations, I should them allay. / Grief brought to numbers cannot be so fierce, / For he tames it that fetters it in verse."

The first two lines conjure up images of a filtration, of a removal of some undesirable quality, leaving behind a pure, unadulterated substance. That Donne should use sea water in this section is far from surprising, for the ocean has always been, in the poetic tradition, associated with tears. By speaking of purging "sea water's fretful salt away" Donne is speaking, metaphorically, of removing his grief (rendered by poetic

suggestion as tears) by having it "brought to numbers," that is, expressed in verse, and thus, conquered and understood, as we see in the next line's "fetters it to verse."

The passage in question, then, speaks of a conquering of his pain, through use of two images, the first alchemical (in which Donne's works are replete) and the second technical, describing the process of writing poetry as a "fettering" of grief, and thus controlling it.

Alchemically, we have two references, one implicit, the other explicit. The images of sea water's purification ("purging") is reminiscent of the process of filtration ("inwards, crooked ways"). When we remember that the alchemist's goal was to imitate Nature in its operations, it becomes manifestly clear why Donne should write "I thought if I could draw my pains / Through rhyme's vexation, I should them allay." The second, more subtle reference to the art of alchemy is in the final word of the section in question, "allay," which is, itself, a play on the double meaning of the term at the time. To "allay" a pain was to make it less felt, and to "allay" a metal was to combine it with some other substance in order to change its nature.

The technical references to the poet's craft are interesting, in that they describe the expression of emotion within poetry as a sort of binding up of sentiment and the creation of a more reliant alloy. Donne would seem to be saying that in being able to express his grief metrically, he shows himself to be its master, for he can bend and shape it as he chooses, he can "fetter(s) it in verse."

We come now to the third theme within this poem, that of the futility of his efforts, for he goes on : "But when I have done so, / Some man, his art and voice to show, / Doth set and sing my pain, / And by delighting many, frees again / Grief, which verse did restrain." From this, we can conclude that grief, when bound up in verse, remains inert until such time as the verse is read. That is to say, a sentiment expressed poetically, is trapped within the verse, line and meter of the poem, but is liberated when read. This

would seem to mean that a poem is a prison of sorts, and that reading of a poem is an opening of that prison, thus releasing that which is confined therein.

The final theme of the work is expressed as follows : "To love and grief tribute of verse belongs, / But none of such as pleases when 'tis read; / Both are increased by such songs, / For both their triumphs so are published, / And I, which was two fools, do so grow three. / Who are a little wise, the best fools be."

By stating that "To love and grief tribute of verse belongs," Donne asserts that, in the final analysis, all poetry is either an expression of the universal human emotion of love or suffering. We have here yet another insight to the poet's craft as practiced and understood by Donne. Perhaps unwittingly, perhaps deliberately, Donne provides the two great categories into which all poems fall, and thus fulfills a descriptive role in his work, a characterization of poetry in general, and of this poem in particular.

He goes on, "But not of such as pleases when 'tis read; / Both are increased by such songs, / For both their triumphs so are published." The first line of this section is best understood as a continuation of the previous line, serving to reinforce it, while the second and third clearly state that the recitation of such poems as are written out of love and grief represents a victory for such emotions, in that this "publishes" their success against the poet who felt them.

This sentiment is very much in the spirit of Kierkegaard, who in Either/Or writes, "What is a poet? An unhappy person who conceals profound anguish in his heart but whose lips are so formed that as sighs and cries pass over them they sound like beautiful music." This is nothing less than the expression in prose of Donne's complaint within his poem.

The terminal couplet, "And I, which was two fools, do so grow three. / Who are a little wise, the best fools by," expresses Donne's resignation to this state of affairs. He understand that he is foolish for loving, and foolish still more for writing poetry about his love, but he sees that conditions cannot be otherwise; it is only by confining the grief his

love brings him in poetry that he can even begin to rid himself of it : but this is, at best, merely delaying the inevitable triumph of his pain, for someone is bound to come along and liberate his pain, and, in so doing, permit it to triumph over him who has intended to defeat it. The edifice that Donne constructs for his grief is of such a nature that it invites others to open it, but it is only within the "walls" of such a structure as a poem that he can contain his pain. It is as if he is duty-bound to "fetter" his pain in such a way as to facilitate its release and triumph. As a crowning touch, Donne adds the delicious element of irony, that "hygiene of the mind," as it has been called, to his work by framing his complaint in the form of a poem, which is, according to his own text, liable to be read and have its "prisoner" freed.

We have, then, in these few lines, a wonderfully rich and complex work, drawing on such elements as the futility of poetry as a means of conquering pain, the poets' and alchemist's art (which are, it would seems, very much alike), and, finally, of the necessity of the futile undertaking that is the writing of poetry.

-Christopher M. Atkins

Bacon, Descartes, Science and God

Both Francis Bacon and Renee Descartes are writers who seek the truth in all things. Both draw heavily on rational thinking, rooted, in large part, in science and mathematics, to established the truth. From the beginning of the Renaissance, writers, such as Petrarch and Chaucer, had struggled to make the precepts of their religions coincide with their longing to understand and appreciate nature. Eventually, with the enlightenment, writers such as Bacon and Descartes establish new notions of how this struggle may be resolved. In general, while Bacon maintains that science and mathematics can allow humans to understand everything in nature, he believes the realm of God should be left to one's individual faith, and that science and mathematics cannot allow everyone to share the same beliefs in God based on the same proof. Descartes shares Bacon's idea of the personalization of religion, and lays out an ontological, or rational, proof of God's existence for himself. This is his personal rationalization of God's existence which was derived through the application of rational thinking. So, unlike Bacon, who separates faith from rational thinking, Descartes uses rational thinking to establish the basis for his faith.

Bacon writes:

> My first admonition (which was also my prayer) is that men confine the sense within the limits of duty in respect of things divine: for the sense is like the sun, which reveals the face of earth, but seals and shuts up the face of heaven. My next, that in flying from this evil they fall not into the opposite error, which they will surely do if they think that the inquisition of nature is in any part interdicted or forbidden.

In this passage taken from The Great Instauration, Francis Bacon is urging through these two admonitions (or warnings) that 1) men do not try to understand God through science and mathematics and 2) that they do not suspend their inquisition of nature simply because they think it is forbidden by religion. In The Great Instauration Bacon brings up the issue of the veracity and legitimacy of the ideas of the classic philosophers. He generally disregards their ideas because he considers them to be prejudiced by their experiences and other external factors. He writes that the doctrines of classic philosophy "stand like statues, worshipped and celebrated, but not moved or advanced." With this, he condemns modern philosophy on the basis that it follows the principles of the classic philosophers. He considers any modern philosophy to be an imitation of that which preceded it, and as that which preceded modern philosophy is biased and illegitimate, as a result, so too is modern philosophy. Bacon essentially discovered what Montaigne did; that people's perceptions of things are generally the products of past experiences or biases and therefore may not be considered necessarily true. With The Great Instauration, or new beginning, Bacon emphasizes the role that mathematics and science must play in making know the truth. With science and mathematics, no bias may be injected into deriving the final outcome, and therefore, if an experiment or theory may be performed or understood on mathematical or scientific basis, and be repeated, this outcome must be closer to the truth that anything that may not be substantiated scientifically. But, the application of science can only pertain to the understanding of those things on earth or that which is natural, not the supernatural.

Bacon would say that the religious doctrine a person holds true is inherently biased. One's religious beliefs are based on his past experiences and teachings since he was young and therefore, were formed in an unscientific way. One cannot use his sense to understand God, and the use of the senses is what allows one to apply science to the acquisition of truth about everyday things. Bacon, in the passage, warns that it is a person's "duty" to understand that the use of the "sense" (or senses) is confined to the

earthly and may not be applied to that which is divine. Except in things in nature, on cannot see God, smell God, taste God, etc., and, indeed, the things in nature are simply the products of God and not truly representative of God in the first place. Bacon believes that studying and experimenting to acquire the truth about as much of nature as possible will give us clues as to the true nature of God, but will never give us definite truth.

Along this line, Bacon uses the property of light to illustrate his point. With the line "for the sense is like the sun, which reveals the face of earth, but seals the shuts up the face of heave" Bacon reminds one that it is the sun that allows us to see things on earth, and where the sun does not shine down (heaven), we lose interest since we cannot see. We cannot look directly into the sun or else we are blinded. Sight is the sense through which humans acquire the greatest amount of knowledge and make the most observations, and if we are blinded by the sun, it is impossible to see, examine, and derive truth about what is above us in the heavens.

In consideration of Bacon's second admonition (warning), the "evil" that he is referring to is the notion of applying science to religion. And continuing along that line, the "opposite error" is the notion that one would abandon the study of nature through science as well, just because religion may not be substantiated through science. Man should know the truth about as many things as possible, despite that fact that he may not be substantiated through science. Man should know the truth about as many things as possible, despite the fact that he many never know the truth about God, except through his own convictions based on past experience or teachings.

With Descartes, we find a different view from that of Bacon. In his "Letter of Dedication" in the Discourse on Method in Meditation, Descartes writes of his aim in writing the work and in so doing also indicates his position on the issue of applying science and reason to the understanding of the true nature of God. He writes:

> It seems that we are being told that all that can be know of God can be demonstrated by reasons that we do not need to seek elsewhere than in ourselves, and that our minds alone are capable of furnishing us. That is why I have believed that it would not be inappropriate if I should here now that can be done, and by what means we can know God more easily and more certainly that we know the things of the world.

Descartes believes that one's religious beliefs are a person' individual consideration, but contrary to Bacon, he believes that one's religious beliefs may be substantiated by a rational proof. With the passage, Descartes is writing of the view held by Bacon and others who believe humans may know God only through faith. Descartes believes that only that which is clear and distinct in his mind can be truthful. He starts with the statement "I think, therefore I am", and in so doing provides the basis for the clear and distinct notion (and, subsequently the truth in the statement) that his mind does indeed exist. It is clear that his mind exists because it must do the thinking. Descartes maintains that the world is what it is because he perceives it as such.

Part of his method is to isolate himself in an effort to strip away any preconceived notions or biases that may affect his desired outcome of knowing the truth about more things. He also employs a rational set of guidelines which he will follow that constitutes what resembles the scientific method of today. During his isolation, Descartes works out a rational proof of God, free of any preconceived notions and based on the guidelines of his scientific method. Since his mind must exist, it must have had a creator. This creator is God. In establishing that a God does indeed exist, Descartes has defined something earthly, in clear and distinct terms, and applied the knowledge and truthfulness of that realization to rationally find truth in the existence of it creator.

Bacon clearly separates religion from nature, by writing that one can find the truth about natural things through science and reason, but that one's religious beliefs cannot be

derived thorough reason, only by past experience and teachings. Descartes, on the other hand proposes that one may define both the things on earth and nature in rational or scientific means, and that one's religious beliefs may be similarly substantiated. Despite the fact that these two approaches differ, each incorporates secular views, and does not, in the end, abandon the sacred to further the science and rational thinking of the individual.

-Christopher McMullen

Excerpt from Dialogue between three students: On Faith and Doubt, Truth, and How Free Will Sets Us in Comparison to God

If you've ever been in room 313 in the College of Liberal Arts building, you know it has the perfect setting for a conference. This is the reason why three Core students chose this room to openly review different themes they predicted will be on their final exam. But as always they had created a tangent and their discussion and thoughts had surpassed the point of their meeting....

"What makes you so sure God exists?" Petrarch, realizing what he had just asked, reiterated, "I'm not saying that He doesn't, but how do you always remain so convinced, Jean?"

"How can there by any doubt?" Calvin responded.

"Of course there can be doubt," Rene Descartes interrupted.

"There should be none," Calvin rebutted with a frank expression. "We only exist for God. Why do we live except to give God glory."

"So, you've never doubted the existence of God?" Petrarch asked.

"How can I?"

"Oh Jean, be serious," Descartes snapped.

"Why is this so hard to swallow? It cannot be any other way. We are the creation of the Lord and we depend on him. Our worship for Him cannot cease for one moment. We are nothing before God."

"My belief in God is true," Descartes interjected. "But my belief arouses from a point of skepticism. I am a man who questions everything in the hopes of obtaining fact. As I once wrote to my friend Buitendijck, there are two types of doubting: a doubt of faith, when one denies assent to the authority of God, and purely hypothetical doubt where the only goal is truth. My doubts are hypothetical and are morally justified. One

must dare to doubt absolutely so that he could eventually hope to possess the truth absolutely."

Petrarch agreed. "Good point. And in the world we live in everything is changing. Personally, I feel I can never know enough. And my soul seems to be the hardest thing to comprehend. I know what is good and I know what is ultimately good for me, but my actions sometimes sway towards what it wrong. Jean, you give me the impression that your actions never go astray from your sacred focus. How can this be? For I see myself as a very pious man, but many times I have dilemmas in my soul."

Calvin answered. "Well, personally I feel you have a disease." The two other men laughed. "You can laugh all you want." Calvin didn't seem to be joking. "Your disease is the desire for glory."

Descartes interrupted. "Is this bad?"

"Of course. Francesco, you must reduce your own glory in order not to deprive God of His Glory. Maybe the convenant you seek between you and the Lord was never meant to be."

"Now hold it right there, Jean." Petrarch seemed insulted. "What makes you so sure you know me so well? If you really knew who I was and what I stand for, you would know that glory has little to do with it. I am striving for truth. Truth is difficult to discover, and, being the most humble and feeble of all those who try to find it, I lose confidence in myself often enough. So much I fear to entangle in errors that I throw myself into the embrace of doubt instead of truth (34). No one knows my soul better than the Lord. I admit that I have sinned. I do not doubt this. But let me, without self-restraint, recall my sins now, in the hopes of leading a morally correct life in the time to come. If my memory serves me right, it was St. Augustine who once wrote: 'Let me remember my past mean acts and the carnal corruption of my soul, not that I love them, but that I may love Thee, my God' (40). When my actions are corrupt it shows that my will has momentarily swayed, my thoughts for the supremacy of one of the two men

within me is still at battle (43). This doesn't mean that my love for the Lord is gone or has less depth."

"I think you misunderstand my point. I am not judging you or condemning you. I am simply telling you that instead of looking for your truth you should be seeking God's truth. This truth requires the kind of knowledge that will strip us of all confidence in our own ability, deprive us of all occasion for boasting, and lead us to submission. We ought to keep this rule if we wish to reach the true goal of both wisdom and action (242)." He paused for any reactions and then continued. "As I said before gentlemen, our worship for the Lord can not cease for one moment. For it is not we who choose to worship Him, rather it is God who deems whether we are worthy enough to see the light. However, much the glory of God shines forth, scarcely one man in a hundred is a true spectator of it (61). Keeping this in mind, we who are chosen should show piety with all our hearts, constantly. True love of God is not spontaneous, warm and positive; instead, it is a matter of reverence, a mixture of honor and fear."

"But how can one remain so pious?" Petrarch asked.

"A chosen man realizes that God is his creator and he owes everything to Him. For guidance you seem to cling on to St. Augustine as a source, and I have total respect for his work mind you, but I always turn to the Bible."

Petrarch, still unconvinced, began "I understand your points, but they seem too unattainable and perfect..."

Calvin interrupted. "No man is perfect."

"Now let me finish, Jean," Petrarch continued. "Your prescriptions seem too idealistic, too Hobbesian. You talk of how humans should be, not as they actually are. Each day man I filled with temptations. And it is written, all men are sinners. Your goals seem unrealistic. Maybe my will and my mind are too feeble to comprehend. Maybe I should drop my studies in law." The group chuckled.

"Well, Petrarch, I am also studying law, but like you, I find it hard to relate to such an unmoved soul." Descartes turned away from Petrarch and spoke directly to Calvin. "My belief in the existence of God is true. The fact that I can conceive of a God in my mind makes me systematically deduct that he must exist. But Jean, you set man so low in respect of the Lord. You tell us we should fear Him. Yet, there is no true love in fear. There is no true understanding in fear. Our true foundation in understanding anything is 'the self'; it is the fulcrum. Find me a fulcrum and I can move the world."

"It is not possible to understand the ways of God through the 'self', Rene. This is illogical. Man does not have the faculties to comprehend the ways of the Lord."

"My point is not to understand God, possible or not. My goal is to help man gain such a mastery over his thoughts in order to direct them towards a perfect life for all mankind."

"But this is not possible," Calvin asserted. "Only God is perfect. What makes you think man is capable of perfection?"

Petrarch insisted "Man was created in the image of God. And perfection, just as a mountain top, is always in your view (36)".

"The parallel you make is irrelevant. When Adam slipped into sin, this image and likeliness of God was canceled and effaced (16)."

Descartes questioned Calvin. "But don't I have a right to derive my own philosophy to better understand God or to better understand myself?"

"Yes, but to what point?"

Petrarch seemed confused. "What do you mean to what point? We have a fundamental right to get to know ourselves, to any point. Why do you set self contemplation as being so wrong? You even wrote in one of your papers, Jean, that it is detestable to be ignorant of ourselves. So follow your own advice and don't make it seem so unethical that someone turns his inner eye towards himself."

"There is nothing wrong with knowledge of self, and in my paper I say this. But if you read further you see that I see a problem when man seeks self analysis and applies it perversely. This has happened to many philosophers, like you two, who, while urging man to know himself, propose the goal of recognizing his own worth and excellence. And you would have one contemplate in himself nothing but what swells him with empty assurance and puffs him up with pride. Genesis 1:27 talks of this. But knowledge of ourselves lies first in considering what we were given at creation and how generously God continues his favor towards us (242). This, my hearty theologians, is what you must contemplate."

"You make an orator of me, a historian, philosopher, and poet and finally even a theologian (34)," proclaimed Petrarch. "It would do you more justice by ceasing to put labels, such as philosopher, on everyone who looks to seek knowledge for the benifit of man, and himself. I am a fellow who never quit school, and me being here so late at night can profess to that." Descartes and Calvin chuckled at this. "I am a man who is curious. Curiosity helps mankind and hinders no one.'"

"Curiosity killed the cat," muttered Calvin.

Descartes spoke. "Jean, you're a man living in medieval times. Imagine if someone ever tried to hint that man was equal to God." Calvin was appalled at the mere suggestion.

Petrarch gave no look of support and tried to evade the topic. "Maybe we should get back to our studying."

"Oh, gentleman, just hear me out. The ability to act freely is the chief perfection of man. The freedom of man makes him, in a certain sense, equal to God. God gave away his greatest prerogative, in giving man freedom, for he put man in a position of being able to challenge the authority of God. Simply put, it is my free will that principally indicates to me that I am made in the image and likeness of God (113)." The men sat quietly trying to formulate their thoughts on a subject so delicate.

Petrarch interceded the silence. "I am a son of the Church and I translate the words you speak as bordering on blasphemy. I see our free will as a deterrence from perfection. The fact that our will is free is what gives us a chance to distance ourselves from the Lord. It is the natural disposition of man to chose evil. It is his uncurbed will that allows him to select a smoother way that leads through the meanest earthly pleasures, yet seems easier at first sight. I know what is good, but I do what is evil. In me is a perverted and malicious will, which has totally seized me and reigns in the court of my heart without opponent (42). Man's free will doesn't set him equal to God. It only allow him to be less like God. I'm sure for once you will agree with me on this point, Calvin."

"No."

"So you agree with Rene?"

"No. Neither of you are correct. Man has no free will. Further more, you error in transferring human categories of thought to describe a being that by definition is transcendent. But for the sake of conversation I will address what you two seem to be so puzzled about. As I just said, man has no free will, to suggest such a thing would be to attribute something to man that is the exclusive possession of God. The arguments you two pose are nothing more than sophistry at its best. You two have conjured up a God that suite your respective likings. One that is ever forgiving and accepting all, and another that is based on the derivation of man's mind and purely anthropomorphic. You both have created a God in the image of man, and do not realize that it was primordially the other way around. Current man is nothing like God. You forget we only know the second Adam, after the great sin. In order to be perfect, if at all possible, we must be like Christ. Francesco, the fact that you have committed sin after sin doesn't mean that you had a choice. The Lord seeks a disciplined soul. He knows that one of the forms of self-discipline is to resist temptation. He send us temptation everyday; they are used to test, to strengthen, and to insure the existence of our faith. And the same fault that Adam had

you seem to have. If ambition had not raised man higher than was meet and right, he could have remained in his original state (245).

"Well, after that long and hardy speech," proposed Descartes, "I think it's time we return to our studies."

"Good thought," Calvin responded. "I believe we got sidetracked with Milton."

"What of the existence of Satan?" questioned Petrarch, looking to continue the conversation. "Are you suggesting that the fault of Adam and the existence of the Devil were predestined? So in effect..."

This sparked the three to further debate and deliberation. The talk went on until the wee hours of the morning. Their continued conversation ranged through many topics. Their ideals of God, metaphysics, nature, the soul and other subjects influenced future thought and many lives. Although, at the time, nothing was solved or any conclusions made, the men left the room with a deeper understanding of themselves and God than when they had initiated their conference.

-Reginald Jean

John Calvin and John Milton
and
The Fall of Man

John Clavin and John Milton lived one hundred years apart, yet both dealt with similar topics in their writings. John Calvin, born in 1509, founded the Calvinist sect of Protestantism and helped instigate the religious wars that shook Europe throughout the sixteenth century. John Milton, born in 1608, belonged to the Puritan sect of Protestantism and helped reform England by working for Oliver Cromwell during the latter's short regime as ruler of England after the revolution of the 1640's. Both gained fame through their use of words. Calvin gave fiery speeches that convinced his followers that his way was the only way. Milton, after Cromwell's regime had failed, wrote the epic poem Paradise Lost, which explained in detail the fall of man from God glory.

The fall of man, its cause and its effects, obsessed both Calvin and Milton. Their views on the force behind the fall are quiet different. Calvin wrote "Adam slipped into sin."[1] For Calvin, the only cause of man's fall was man himself. Man went against God. Man's sin was not one of choice, however, for Calvin said that God had foreknowledge of all, so man must "consider his will the truly just cause of all things."[2] Calvin did not believe in free will. Calvin's God allowed the fall because that was the way things would be. According to Calvin, "all things always were, and perpetually remain, under (God's) eyes, so that to his knowledge there is nothing future

---

[1] John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, tr. Ford Lewis Battles, (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company) p.15
[2] Calvin, p.211

or past, but all things are present."[3] Anyone who questioned why God did not decide to prevent the fall was, in Calvin's eyes, a doubter of the greatness of God.

Milton believed in free will, and his belief was fundamental to the way in which he saw man fall from grace. Milton, like Calvin, believed that the Bible was the word of God and therefore told the truth. They both took the Biblical story of Adam and Eve in the Garden literally. But, where Calvin saw Satan's tempting of Eve with the apple as proof that man was destined to fall, Milton saw the entire situation as proof that man has free will. Milton believed that God created man with free will, and that free will cannot exist without a choice between good and evil, between paradise and damnation. God put the Tree of Knowledge in the Garden and forbid Adam and Eve to eat its fruit precisely to give them this choice. Milton believed that God had foreknowledge as well, but did not believe that this meant predestination of any kind. To explain this belief in man's free will, Milton gave the character of God the following speech in Paradise Lost:

> ...if I foreknew,
> Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault,
> Which had no less proved certain unforeknown.
> So without least impulse or shadow of fate,
> Or aught by me immutably foreseen,
> They trespass, Authors to themselves in all
> Both what they judge and what they choose; for so
> I form'd them free, and free they must remain,

---

[3]Calvin, p.926

Till they enthrall themselves...[4]

Calvin saw man as solely at fault for his own fall, and therefore damned forever. Milton, however, introduces the character of Satan, who seduces Eve into eating of the Tree of Knowledge. Before Satan spoke to her in her dream, Eve had never thought of going against God's world. When she awoke, she told Adam that she had dreamed "of offense and trouble, which my mind knew never till this irksome night."[5] Satan had told her in her sleep that if she ate of the tree she would be "henceforth among the Gods/ Thyself a Goddess."[6] These thoughts, in Milton's view, may never have occurred had Satan not come to the Garden.

When Eve finally ate the apple from the Tree, it was because Satan, in the form of a serpent, had convinced her that the knowledge of good and evil that she would gain would be beneficial to her. She would then have the knowledge of God. Adam, seeing that Eve had fallen, decided to fall with her because his love for her was greater than his desire to remain in paradise. Milton saw the fall as bad, but understood the reasons that the two chose to fall, and was sympathetic of them. Adam's internal speech upon first seeing the fallen Eve is so deeply honorable as to suggest that Milton, while condemning the fall itself, respected Adam's choice to eat the apple and join his wife. Milton wrote for Adam:

...for with thee

Certain my resolution is to Die;

---

[4]John Milton, Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained, ed. Christopher Richs, (USA: Penguin Group, 1982) p102-3

[5]Milton, p.150

[6]Milton, p.151

How can I live without thee, how forgo
Thy sweet converse and Love so dearly join'd,
To live again in these wild Woods forlorn?

Calvin's Adam would never have made such a speech, for his Adam was the father of all sin, and Calvin would not let him have such beautiful words.

Man, said Calvin, as a result of Adam's sinning, "was stripped and deprived of all wisdom, righteousness, power, life" and left only "ignorance, impotence, death, and judgment."[7] Man is so far removed from God that "if we outwardly display anything good, still the mind stays in its inner state of filth and crooked perversity."[8] This does not mean that man cannot commit any good acts, but any good acts are the workings of God and not of man. "The knowledge of all that is most excellent in human life is said to be communicated through the Spirit of God."[9]

Many sins that did not exist before the fall came into being after it. Calvin lists fornication as one of these "fruits of sin". Milton would have vehemently disagreed. Adam and Eve in the Garden in Paradise Lost had sex often. Milton wrote of their "youthful dalliance as besems/ fair couple, linkt in nuptial League."[10] Sex in the Garden was a celebration of marriage, love and God. It was pure and clean. The fall brought about the "guilty shame, dishonest shame/ Of nature's works, honour dishonorable,/ Sin-bred"[11] that makes sex the lustful act it is considered to be today. Calvin did not see that sex could ever have been good.

---

[7]Calvin, p.16
[8]Calvin, p.16
[9]Calvin, p.275
[10]Milton, p.130
[11]Milton, p.129

Calvin called man "ignorant and bereft of God, perverse, corrupt, and lacking every good."[12] Milton was not so hard on man. Immediately after the fall, God, though angry, thinks kindly of Adam and Eve, and tells the angel Michael to reveal the future of the world to Adam and then "send them forth, though sorrowing, yet in peace."[13] Calvin's God gave man no peace, but left them in torment over the fate of their souls.

Milton's God left Adam and Eve with a means to happiness in this world.

> ...add Faith,
> Add Virtue, Patience, Temperance, add Love,
> By name to come called Charity, the soul
> Of all the rest: then wilt thou not be loath
> To leave this Paradise, but shalt posses
> A Paradise within thee, happier far.[14]

Milton saw human sympathy and the ability to forgive, as Adam forgave Eve, as signs that man could do good and gain redemption.

Both he and Calvin believed that Christ took on human form and sacrificed his human life in order to take all of man's sins upon himself, thus allowing man to be redeemed. Milton said that God would forgive man and not the fallen angels because the angels

> ...by their own suggestion fell,

---

[12]Calvin, p.16
[13]Milton, p.301
[14]Milton, p.307

Self-tempted, self-depraved: Man falls deceived
By the other first: Man therefore shall find
grace,
The other none...[15]

While Milton believed that men could be saved by following the guidelines in the above excerpt, Calvin said that no man could do anything to save himself. "The way to the Kingdom of God is open only to him whose mind has been made new by the illumination of the Holy Spirit," he wrote. This illumination could only be gotten by intense Biblical study and supreme faith in God's almightiness, and it was nearly impossible to achieve, because of man's miserable post-fall state. Even if a man did find this illumination, it was no guarantee that he would get to heaven. Calvin believed in he predestination of man. God had already determined the fate of each man's soul and there was nothing anyone could do about this. One could not even know if one had been saved. "Election remain inviolable. although it's signs do not always appear."[16]

Of Milton's statement that man could find "a paradise within," Calvin would have replied, "man will find in himself only unhappiness, meekness, wickedness, death, in short, hell itself. Calvin's description of the post-fall man is strikingly similar to Milton's description of Satan. Milton wrote of Satan:

...horror and doubt distract
Hi troubl'd thoughts, and from the bottom stir

[15]Milton, p.103
[16]Calvin, p.929

The Hell within him, for within him Hell
He brings, and round about him, nor from Hell
One step no more than from himself can fly
By change of place...

Satan says "Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell." This sounds like Calvin's description of man as utterly damned, with hell inside as well as out.

Calvin said that man could do no good because he was so thoroughly rotten, and Satan admits that, were he to ask for and receive God's redemption, he would still possess a hatred of God that would "lead me to a worse relapses,/ and heavier fall." Calvin describes man as "swollen with arrogance and ambition and blinded by self-love." This is an accurate caricature of Satan in Paradise Lost. He was so ambitious as to try to take God's place, and it is pride and vanity that prevent him from asking for mercy. Satan is too proud to beg forgiveness and is too vain to admit to the other fallen angels that he might have been wrong or regrets his actions anyway.

Satan is different from Calvin's man in one way: Satan has free will. While Calvin's man was destined to fall, Satan chose his own doom. He said to himself

Hadst thous the same free Will and Power to stand?
Thou hadst...
...against his thy will

Chose freely what it now so justly rues.[17]

Calvin wrote "there is no middle ground"[18] when speaking of our feelings towards the world. He felt that we could only see the world as worthless or love it too much. The phrase "there is no middle ground" applies to all of Calvin's teachings, and explains why his man is so similar to Milton's Satan. Calvin sees everything in yes or no terms. Man is either saved or damned; man is rotten, so he is thoroughly rotten. There is no room for a man who can do some good in and of himself.

Milton did have a middle ground: man. God was the ultimate good, Satan, the ultimate evil. Man stood in between, capable of Godly actions like forgiveness and Satanic feelings like lust. Milton's man and Calvin's are completely different beings.

Calvin and Milton were both products of the Protestant faith, and so they both firmly believed that the Bible told the absolute truth. Yet Calvin took this truth to mean that man's existence was harsh and hopeless, without redemption, while Milton gave man the possibility for peace and hope. Milton even said that man was still in some way blessed, for it was through a human women that Christ, the redemption of mankind, would come into the world. Calvin was an orator whose words were persuasive, but he was not a poet. Perhaps the sightless Milton's poetic soul allowed him to see the good to which Calvin was blind.

-Marie Ziemer

---

[17]Milton, p.122
[18]Calvin, p.713

Civilizing Nature, Secularizing the Soul

Human existence strives towards understanding. The means which the human has used in order to grasp an understanding of this most elusive life has changed with each shift of sociological and historic values; the Greeks explained life through mythology, the Renaissance men through human accomplishment, the Enlightenment thinkers through science, and so on. Even when looking at just these examples one can see how the civilizing of man has moved the human perspective of his own existence farther and farther from a spiritual realm. The attitude which distanced the human being from a natural core, and which became most evident during the Enlightenment with the explosion of scientific knowledge, was met with resistance by many contemporary thinkers. Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope were two authors who were burdened by the crushing of the human spirit under the rising hand of science and incorporated the theme as a major part in their works. Both found solace in the ideal of the natural and noble savage, whose civilizing perfectly symbolized the move from natural and spiritual man to complex and scientific man.

The noble savage, of course, remains a sentimentalized idea of the human who, in pure and unadulterated form, lies close to nature and to an unquestioned faith in the divine. In man's attempt to understand nature and God, he pulled the divine essence from a spiritual realm into the secular realm of reason and science. And in grounding the stars, the human took them from their divine flight. The longing with which Swift and Pope reach out for this ideal is a need to return to a simplicity within the soul which has been raped by the ever-exploring and ever-questioning complexities of science. The term "ignorance is bliss' applies here; complex man, by trying to understand the ways of the divine through science, moved God and simple faith farther from the human heart.

"Lo, the poor Indian! whose untutored mind/ Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind;/ His soul, proud Science never taught to stray/ Far as the solar walk, or milky way/ Yet simply Nature to his hope has given,/ behind the cloud-topped hill, an humbler heaven;/ Some safer world in depth of woods embraced,/ Some happier island in the watery wastes,/ where slave once more their native land behold,/ No fiends torment, no Christian thirst for gold./ To Be, contents his natural desire..." (source 1, pg.132, Pope).

The discontentment Pope feels with the state of modern man vents itself in the words, 'whose untutored mind...proud Science never taught to stray'. These images confirm the idea that Pope believed science actually removed the eternal elements that are beyond explanation farther from the human soul. For science denies all which human reasoning can not explain. The myths and stories which, for example, the American Indian and Greek cultures told, can be considered a spiritual reasoning for the existence of man. When science overruled mythology as the prime means with which to explain life, mystical and spiritual wonder was reduced to numbers and graphs in hopes of tangible meaning. Pope recognizes that scientific reasoning defeats the divine by bringing it to human terms and thus alienates man from his spirit.

'Behind the cloud-topped hill, an humbler heaven; Some safer world in depth of woods embraced', is a cry for a retreat from the cold effect technology creates as it attempts to become a stability in man's understanding. Not only did the 'realness' which science requires create a wall between soul and spirit, but also between soul and nature. Again, the spiritual meaning which myth placed into the land and animals was refuted by biological explanations of organisms. Since everything around man became reduced to terminologies, man himself became an explainable and primarily physical creature. Joseph Campbell described how this change was evident even the novel Don Quixote; the hero needed to inflict his own spirituality because the outside world was purely technical. "...it was not a mechanistic world in which the hero moved but a world alive and

responsive to his spiritual readiness. Now it has become to such an extent a sheerly mechanistic world, as interpreted through our physical sciences, Marxist sociology, and behavioristic psychology, that we're nothing but a predictable pattern of wires responding to stimuli. This nineteenth-century interpretation has squeezed the freedom of the human will out of modern life." (source 2, pg.131).

Pope expresses the change of social values from the spiritual to physical with the phrase, 'where slaves once more their native land behold, No fiends torment, no Christians thirst for gold." This again imagines a higher ideal in which human spirituality and nature is valued above material objects. Black Elk, a holy man in the Oglala Sioux tribe, describes in the native's logic in regards to placing value in particular objects. "I learned too that Pahuska (General Custer) had found much of the yellow metal that makes the Wasichus (white man) crazy...Our people knew there was yellow metal in little chunks up there; but they did not bother with it, because it was not good for anything." (source 3, pg.79). The transference from mythology to reasoning shifted the basis social values from a mystical human experience to proven facts. In using the term Christian, Pope refers to the historical actuality of when the civilized European imposed his values on the native for the purpose of acquiring gold. In creating such a beautifully ideal picture of a human who remains unadulterated by civilization and technology, Pope expresses his concern and worry that man's value and means for understanding himself are leading him farther from a humanistic path. In the following excerpt, Pope emphasizes the effect of secularized values on the human community and on nature itself.

"Heaven's attribute was Universal Care, / And man's prerogative to rule, but spare. / Ah! how unlike the man of times to come! / Of half that live the butcher and the tomb; / Who, foe to Nature, hears the general groan, / Murders their species, and betrays his own. / But just disease to luxury succeeds, / And every death its own avenger breeds: / The

Fury-passions from that blood began, / And turned on Man a fiercer savage, Man." (source 1, pg. 151).

The brutality of the sentences used by the author show that Pope was disturbed by the effect modernity was having on the humans respects for fellow man, nature, and himself. Betrayal, murder, butchering, and disease, are all words which color a vivid picture of the relations between the conquerors and the conquered. Once again, Pope uses images of physical force between humans as a symbol to show how violently technology created complex barriers between human relations which were direct and honest in simple societies. But only did industry force people to work and relate to each other within the confines of a complicated society, it also enhanced individual needs due to the alienation which the human felt when he ceased to be in direct contact with himself and others. This shift towards individuality emphasized personal needs, creating greedy and selfish values, and de-emphasized the brotherly love which had been dominant in many myth-based cultures. Black Elk relates in the following paragraph how the native felt this coldness within the 'white man's' world; the same coldness which, according to Pope, was felt by civilized man as well.

"I felt dead and my people seemed lost and I though I might never find them again...I could see that the Wasichus did not care for each other the way our people did before the nation's hoop was broken. They would take everything from each other if they could, and so there were some who had more of everything they could use, while crowds had nothing at all and maybe starving. They had forgotten that the earth was their mother... Men pointed guns at the prisoners and made them move around like animals in a cage." (source 3, pg.217). The bars represent an important image; the physical removal from man to fellow man, and the shift from man-spirit to man-specimen.

The punch of Pope's message comes in the last line: 'The Fury-passions from that blood began, / And turned on Man a fiercer savage, Man.' The ruin of humanity stirs

from man himself, from his insatiable need to put the unexplainable into human terms. In using the words 'fiercer savage', Pope implies that the term savage is misplaced in regards to primitive man; the actual ferocity lies in the reasoned man's removal from his spirit source. Goethe's character Faust epitomizes the discontentment of modern man. Faust realizes the dead-end which science offers, and attempts to re-unit himself with his spirit through mysticism. "I've studies now Philosophy/ And Jurisprudence, Medicine - And even, alas! Theology...And here, poor fool! with all my lore / I stand, no wiser than before...Wherefore, from Magic I seek assistance, / That many a secret perchance I reach / Through spirit-power and spirit-speech, / That I man detect the inmost force / Which binds the world, and guides its course.." (source 4, pg. 41-2). Both authors write with heavy heart about the snaring of the soul in Enlightenment's scientific net.

Jonathan Swift dedicated his entire Gulliver's Travels to symbolize the changing perspective man had in regards to his place on earth, as he journeyed into places of the mind where he had never visited. Near the end of all four books, Swift places the following passage which, under its satirical coating, uses the civilizing of the primitive man in a manner similar to Pope's in order to show the expulsion of nature from modern man.

"Ships are sent with the first opportunity; the natives driven out or destroyed, their princes tortured to discover their gold; a free license given to all acts of inhumanity and lust; the earth reeking with the blood of its inhabitants; and this execrable crew of butchers employed in so pious an expedition, is a modern colony sent to convert and civilize and idolatrous and barbarous people." (source 5, pg.289).

The passage gives an overall impression of destruction and death; in essence, the death of the human spirit portrayed as a battle between civilization and nature. As civilization inflicts its values on nature, the reverence, fear, awe, and respect found in

nature's nobility is overpowered by the base physicalities of man's desire. Swift's satire emphasizes the fact that modern value systems are perverted by science, placing meaning on material acquisition and individual gain rather than nature and brotherhood. When Swift writes 'this execrable crew of butchers employed in so pious an expedition,' he asks the question which both Pope and Goethe entertain: Is the life of a completely primitive and uneducated man the proper one? All three authors use the image of the 'noble savage' as a passionate and longing glance backwards to an ideal state of existence in which the human heat and spirit reigned. But they also realize that humanity moves each second farther from this primitive state of man. The cry which sentimentalizes the savage and portrays civilized man in wiched terms in nonetheless a cry for something lost in the gaining of knowledge; a need for simple roots in the vast matrix of scientific non-proofs.

When one receives a city sky-scape in an eye full, one sees that man has surely created something stable for himself. Solid and sturdy stand the massive walls; well-planned and intricately connected wind the stone streets. And yet the whole affair seems oddly like some facade at times. These authors, caught in a world whose objectives raced towards such cities, wrote works in attempts to inject human spirit into the life of the mind. In a technological machine which had ground form the spirit all wonder, and reduced the sweet mystery of the soul into accountable formulas, these men still fought for something quite divine.

"His soul stretched tight across the skies
That fade behind a city block,
Or trampled by insistent feet
At four and five and six o'clock;
And short square fingers stuffing pipes,
And evening newspapers, and eyes
Assured of certain certainties,
The conscience of a blackened street
Impatient to assume the world.

I am moved by fancies that are curled
Around these images and cling:
The notion of some infinitely gentle
Infinitely suffering thing."

-from T.S. Eliot's Preludes

-Satu Hummasti

The Perversion of Spiritual Love

In Goethe's *Faust*, the protagonist, Faust suffers a quenchless desire to absorb all existing knowledge universal, divine, and particular. In essence, Faust lacks contentment with the place of servitude that God has assigned him. He wrestles with his desire to place himself above his earthly sphere, and the contrasting desire to find satisfaction, even utter bliss, within that same sphere, earth. He calls upon the devil, Mephistopheles, to divulge the divine secrets that are tormenting reminders of his inferiority as a man. In response, the devil reveals to Faust the image of a woman. Shortly after, the devil deludes Faust's perception with a potion brewed by the witches. Henceforth, the first woman that Faust sees will become the metaphoric veil that conceals the mysteries of nature and divinity. Faust captures this woman, Gretchen, in his sight, thus she becomes the means to reveal the knowledge and essence of truth. Through the penetration of her physical body, Faust hopes to remove the veil, thus gaining the knowledge. On a psychological level, Gretchen is representative of the mother figure to which every man, including Faust longs to return. Faust's scientific mind yearns for divine knowledge, but his soul lacks completion, that can only be attained through the woman. Unfortunately, just as Faust abandons science when it no longer furthered his quest for superhuman knowledge, Gretchen, who only provided temporary satisfaction, is also forsaken and finally, degraded and destroyed by Faust.

Faust questions why he is not a divine creature for he feels that he has the power to command the spiritual word and thus, he deserves to be a part of it. Yet, he realizes he possesses the limited power of science, which is inadequate to aid him in his quest for divine truth. If he is not divine, then he wonders where he does belong. He says:

> Not your equal?
> Then whom do I resemble?
> I, the image of the godhead!
> And not your equal?
>
> (Goethe, 35)

Faust yearns to find hes place in the cosmos. In this passage, he confronts a spirit in search of an answer. Faust claims that he too must be a spirit. But, in spite of Faust's bold assertion, the spirit refuses to acknowledge Faust as any higher being; he is a mortal man. Thus, Faust falls into despair, for he knows the only way to elevate himself above the terrestrial world, is through spiritual guidance that cannot be found in any of his scientific books. He realizes his attempts to use his scientific tools to decode the mysteries of nature, have been in vain.

> Nature keeps her veil in tact;
> Whatever she refuses to reveal
> You cannot wrench from her with screws and levers.
> (Goethe, 43)

As a result, Faust is frustrated, for even as a scientist, his tools and his knowledge are too primitive to make man privy to divine mystery. Here, Goethe is beginning to place emphasis on Nature as a female figure, for it is always referred to as "her" especially when Faust cries out for answers; it is nature in female form that he calls:

> Where shall I clasp you, infinity of Nature?
> You breasts, where? You wellsprings of life?
> Heaven and earth depend on you--
> Toward you my parched soul is straining. You flow, you nourish, yet I crave in vain.
> (Goethe, 31)

Here, Nature is being depicted as a woman with reference to her breasts and "wellsprings of life." The image of a female is repeated in the use of the flowing water image. In fact, in Greek mythology, Achilles; mother Thetis was a goddess of the stream, thus strengthening the connection between water and the female. Faust compares his desire for divine knowledge to a man whose soul is "parched" because he lacks the life force of water; to Faust this knowledge is a crucial need for his survival. He says that Nature :flows" and "nourishes," but he cannot locate its source with his primitive knowledge of science. In this passage Faust's desire to master nature and bring it under his control is

emphasized by the word "clasp." He wants to embrace nature, and hold on to it tightly, so that its mysteries will also lie within his grasp. in actuality, it will be the figure of a woman that Faust will clasp with his arms, but the woman will not be an adequate substitute for Nature as Faust will realize later.

After Faust has identified the component that he lacks, namely the essence enclose by nature's veil, he summons the devil himself, Mephistopheles, to help him learn the mystery beneath the veil Mephistopheles takes Faust to the witch's kitchen, where this devil promises him eternal youth and, the answer to Faust's burning questions about divinity which will be revealed to him in the glass. Faust stands up in front of the mirror , within which the devil conjures up the image of a female.

> Oh, highest vision of a woman!
> Can it be? Can this woman be so fair?
> Do I see in her recumbent shape
> The form and essence of the heavens?
> Can this epitome be found on earth?
>
> (Goethe, 159)

Looking into the mirror, Faust gazes at the most perfect female form; "the highest vision of a woman." He continually asks the devil if this creature of perfection could be found on earth. Faust desires to grasp the form and essence of the powerful moment, Faust drinks a magic potion which is brewed by the witch. The witch is a perversion of the most perfect female form. Goethe contrasts the witch with the next female character that Faust encounters: Gretchen. The witch's potion causes Faust to desire the physical body of Gretchen, thus perverting the pure essence of the virgin, or Jung's "kore." Gretchen is symbolic of the divine truth and nature's mysterious beauty, but the witch inflames Faust with lust for the virgin body, thus his connection with Gretchen will never reach a spiritual level. He ruins her by penetrating her hymen, instead of the spiritual veil that she embodies.

In Dante's *Paradiso*, Dante pilgrim seeks his spiritual essence through a woman, Beatrice. She his veil and his guide to the heavens. Through her alone, Dante pilgrim is

transformed into a man, who is ready to receive the divine knowledge of God in the heavenly circles. In fact, Dante says that while he watched Beatrice, who was staring at the eternal circles, he was changed. Dante the author writes:

> I turned aside; I set my eyes on her [Beatrice]
> In watching her, within me I was changed,
> As Glaucus changed, tasting the herb that made
> Him a companion of the other sea gods.
>
> (Dante, 15)

This passage suggests that Beatrice was Dante's veil, that he had to pass through to reach divine revelation. Dante loved Beatrice, but their relationship was a spiritual connection; never a consummation of their physical bodies. Faust destroys Gretchen because he uses her physical body, instead of her soul, to penetrate the veil of Nature and of God. Consequently, he fails to gain the knowledge, because his relationship with Gretchen is confined to the physical union of flesh; not the spiritual union of their souls as in Dante's relationship with Beatrice.

On a psychological level, Faust's need for Gretchen can be explained in Carl Jung's theory of the Kore, or virgin. He says that the Kore in a woman is both the mother figure and the maiden figure; at certain times the woman plays both roles. Jung uses the example of the myth of Demeter, Persephone, and Hades to illustrate his point. Here, the male figure seduces and conquers the Kore, taking her virginity and her pure essence. Man is not a complete whole without this feminine quality in his possession. The woman is the only human creature that can produce another life; she embodies a "life-stream that is to flow through her." (Jung, 162) The man desires to complete his self, and this can only be attained through the woman who is already a complete whole.

In relation to Faust and Gretchen, Jung's theory certainly encompasses their relationship. First, Gretchen is a kore, and then, as a result of being sexually conquered by Faust, she becomes a mother. Faust is definitely lacking this female quality. Of course, he has not abandoned his primary goal, which is to comprehend the earth and the heavens, the

mystery of nature and science. But, the first step is to feel complete as a man, which he achieves briefly through Gretchen.

> When in her arms, I need no joys of Heaven.
> The warmth I seek is burning in her breast.
>
> (Goethe, 235)

Instead of Faust embracing Nature's secrets, he is being held by a female, who represents a mother figure for Faust, as well as the virgin. For a few brief moments the beatific feeling is found in her breast. Faust is almost ready to abandon his quest for the joys and mysteries of heaven. He has found satisfaction on earth, even utter bliss, but it is not enough to extinguish his desire to know it all. Even though, it appears that Faust is satisfied with his terrestrial love, he leaves Gretchen to follow the devil to another rendez-vous with the spirit world.

Faust's passion for the high mysteries of celestial secrets is never abandoned, as is pure science and his lover, Gretchen. Undoubtedly, Gretchen provided satisfaction for Faust, but it was based on a physical bond, through their sexual relationship. Maybe, if Faust had loved Gretchen as Dante loved Beatrice, she might have been able to keep Faust within his earthly sphere as a content and fulfilled man. Ultimately, Faust leaves her without her honor, as an unwed mother, and finally as a woman who loses her sanity and murders their child. When Faust does learn of Gretchen's horrible fate, he is determined to rescue her. Tragically, he is too late. Gretchen is too mentally disturbed to leave with him, this Faust flees with the devil to yet another spiritual orgy.

– Tina Vegliante

Sources

Alighieri, Dante; *Paradiso.* Bantam Books, New York, 1984.

Goethe, Johann; *Faust;* tr. by Peter Salm. Bantam Books, New York, 1985.

Jung, C. G. and Kerenyi, C.; *Essay on a Science of Mythology.* W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1979.

A Dialogue Between Equals

The Ficticious Correspondence Between Emily Dickinson and Walt Whitman

June 15, 1862

Mr. Whitman,

The advice of a dear friend lead me to your book of verse. I was at first skeptical, having been told by another that it was "disgraceful," but weighing both their words and finding heavier his who I believe understands me better and holds my interests closer to his heart, I procured a copy, and spent the next two days and nights in my room, enwrapped in its Leaves.

At first I did find it disgraceful. I put it down several times, but the late spring winds rustled the curtains and they pointed to the place where the book lay on my pillow, as if to tell me to resume my reading.

Perhaps it was the the same winds, that whisked away the built-up stodginess winter left in the room, and that it left in me. You see, sir, I too am a poet - an American poet, a woman poet - a product of my era, though in many ways a stranger from it. The first-felt disgrace is the stain from my steeping in this era which prefers that any nakedness be clothed in foot, meter, and metaphor.

You say that "the greatest poet knows no pettiness or triviality." I believe that poets, even the greatest poet must deal mostly in trivialities. Look at us, me, hidden in white, and you in your beard. We self-consciously choose each word, each sound, each image, in our trivial attempts to capture the ineffable. We pretend to write in shady solitude, but do so only hopeful that light eyes will find it.

If one were to lay our verses next to each other, how greatly different they would first appear to be! Most agree that your poetry is wild and wants form, but I see that you have it already. I felt in your book the life that I desire in my poems, the now that leaps upon one.

Those who cite "lack of form" as their first objection to your poetry should reread Mr. Shelley's "Defense of Poetry," the part in which he writes of "the youth of the world [who] dance and sing and imitate natural objects, observing in these actions, ... a certain rhythm of the same order. And, although all men observe a similar, they observe not the same order, in the motions of the dance, in the melody of the song, in the combinations of the language..." We observe different rhythms, and yet each is a natural part of what we observe. You, I think, have captured one of the rhythms which the American finds in his nature. It is the free, repeating river rhythm of the eagle and the opening West. It drags one in the currents of its thought and its irresistible power is awful, euphoric, and frightening.

You will see by the few poems I have enclosed that I have found a different rhythm, more like the steady and reverent East that I know. You write in a rhythm that would seem to come most easily to the human mind, free from constraint of syllable counting and rhyme scheme. The rhythm that I feel, I believe, is equally felt, but less recognized, except when it appears in the expected places on Sunday morning- in between each Scripture reading, and again after the sermon. In and out, under the hems that the women are sewing, under the feet of the men walking to work in the town are the hymns that they have heard since before they can remember. They hear them in church and they sing them at Grace, and hum them as they work, whistle them as they walk, sing them to their children at night when the small ones can't sleep. I have seen people be caught in these hymns as one can be caught up in the flood of free thought, though hymns have never inspired this in me. I choose them because they seem part of the natural rhythm known to many.

When my verses become more known, I hope that people will recognize the meters and feel the tunes that they are so familiar with. I would be very pleased if readers would sing my poems, if children should put my words to their school-yard tunes, and sing them as they jump rope and hopscotch.

We both can feel the dance, the song. Let others feel it too. I should very much like to know what you think of the enclosed. I want to learn, in order that I might become more skilled in my art.

Emily Dickinson

July 1, 1862

Ms. Dickinson,

Your letter was a surprise... What should a greying poet make of a stranger, a woman poet stranger writing and letters and expecting replies?

Of the verses you sent, I liked the one best that begins "Title divine - is mine!" My verse has been accused of being selfish, egotistical, but most times, I am not speaking of myself alone, but of all Americans. When I do speak of myself, it is not in an effort to raise myself above others, but to bring them all to me as equals.

You asked me what I think of the verses which you sent, so that you can learn, "in order that you might become more skilled in this art." I do not know what I can offer you, except to say that I enjoy surprises. You have found new ways to use words- my favorite was "plashless." But what about poetry can be taught? Very little it seems, for sometimes I do not even feel that I know what poetry is, or who writes it.

What are we, Ms. Dickinson? Poets? What are they? The old Greek, feigning fear of our music, says implicitly that a poet should rule. In America we have this already; a country that is essentially a great poem must have poets for its leaders... but they make poetry with action rather than word. Your Mr. Shelley has determined that we are already "institutors of laws... the unacknowledged legislators of the world." In us the characters of "legislators and prophets" unite. Mr. Shelley understands, as you did not, what I meant by my comment about the poet and the trivial. He says "A Poet participates in the eternal, the infinite, and the one; as far as relates to his conceptions, time and place and number are not." Your point about the trivial, however is well taken. "The peculiarity of poetry appears to us to lie in the poet's utter unconsciousness of a listener," according to John Mill. Perhaps the unskilled reader is unconscious of the devices we use specifically for him, but these must be the only the most uneducated. You and I, we are image.

I enjoyed your comments about rhythm and order. Perhaps this is what makes us poets... the ability to discern these rhythms... we are conscious of them when most Americans are not. We are their translators of a language that most do not realize exists, let alone speak. They are aware of it only liminally and rarely let it penetrate... You and I, Ms. Dickinson, we are no longer near the precipitous border where most remain on the high land and feel the rhythm blowing off the sea only when the wind picks up... we left this border long ago, dropping off the cliffs and falling, soaring... one with the wind. *The rhyme and uniformity of perfect poems show the free growth of metrical laws and bud from them as unerringly and loosely as lilacs or roses on a bush, and take shapes as compact as the shapes of chestnuts and oranges and mellons and pears, and shed the perfume impalpable to form.* But you knew this.

I would like to discuss this more with you, and to read a few more of your verses. Please tell me, is Ms. your proper title?

Walt Whitman

July 11, 1862

Mr. Whitman,

I thank you for your reply. Summer has worn the Spring away quickly. And the children playing games in the street below the window have passed from the exuberance of the first freedom of the summer, into the slower, sometimes lethargic boredom that creeps up on them as they begin to long for Fall.

Your words are direct. Often I have shared a verse or two of my own with my sister, Lavinia, who tells me just as often that they are lovely, but cannot precisely find their meaning. Yours she found completely accessible. Vinnie says sometimes I find too many ways to hide my meaning in strange words.

Like our different rhythms we have found different ways of using words, both ways, I believe, equally familiar to the mind. Yours are the familiar words, which all speak and know easily, placed in the rhythm few will speak except in the solitude and darkness, usually not even aloud. Mine are the familiar and easy rhythms, but the words are those that have since long been set aside. My nephew, when he was about three heard a knock at the door. Not knowing who it was, but knowing that somebody was there he asked his mother, "Whobody at the door?" Most grown people forget the power they had to make a new language according to the associations of their own mind, or at least give up creating in public, but I have never forgotten. It is the sounds that attract me as much as the rhythms. Vinnie asked me what "plashless" meant, and I told her she would know if she listened.

I do not want to legislate, except to keep the sound and sense. My only goal as a poet is to free the sounds and rhythms felt and never admitted. Perhaps this in itself is a kind of "unacknowledged" legislation, as you draw from Mr. Shelley. Even if he is wrong

about the poet's "unconsciousness of a listener," I like what Mr. Mill says, that "the truth of poetry is to paint the human soul truly." Poetry , he says, is "*over*heard." Readers believe that what they see on the page they overhear from our souls, I would like to teach them to hear the poetry in their own souls.

Mrs. Browning says through Aurora Leigh that though "The critics say that epics have died out/ With Agamemnon and the goat-nursed gods;/ I'll not believe it." I agree with her. In her writing I find what I believe is closest to a definition of a poet.

> But poets should
> Exert a double vision; should have eyes
> To see near things as comprehensively
> As if afar they look their point of sight,
> And distant things a intimately deep
> As if they touched them. Let us strive for this.
> I do distrust the poet who discerns
> No character or glory in his time,
> And trundles back his soul five hundred years,
> Past moat and drawbridge, into a castle-court,

Perhaps this is what attracts me most to your verse- the immediate glory in it, the belief that "a leaf of grass is no less than the journey work of the stars."

Mr. Carlyle says that our age is in need of a revival of the heroic. "All men are possible heroes," says Mrs. Browning. I think if Mr. Carlyle were to look about him, he would find no shortage of heroes. You are one, so am I, so is Mrs. Browning.

I enclose a few more verses. You did not believe that you could teach me much about poetry, but you have and will teach me much. As for a title, I am married only to my art. *Is this sir, what you asked me to tell you?*

Miss Emily Dickinson

p.s. You should know how much I appreciate lines like these "The wife - and she is not one jot less than the husband,/ The daughter- and she is just as good as the son,/ The mother- and she is every bit as much as the father." Mrs. Browning thanks you also.

August 15, 1862

Miss Dickinson,

I saw your bird on my walk today. Unfortunately, he knew I saw and flew away quickly in his red brown sheen... like the rabbit darting into its hole with her children.... like a squirrel crossing the road when it hears the wheels of a carriage... like a soldier in his caked red brown uniform, dreaming nightly of escaping the battlefield...

One of the poems you sent me in your last letter has been haunting me:

A word is dead
When it is said,
Some say.

I say it just
Begins to live
That day.

It made me think of what you have said before, about using words in ways that most men will not allow themselves to... they restrict themselves to conventional words. Even those words, when said, are not dead, but they are not alive as they could be though. I think here we are closer still to discovering exactly what poetry is... rhythm, creation, surprise, order, sound...

Soft wind! Space! My Soul! Now I know it is true what I guessed
at;
What I guessed when I loafed on the grass,
What I guessed while I lay alone in my bed.... and again as I
walked the beach under the paling stars of the morning.

I was right.

All truths wait in all things,
They neither hasten their own delivery nor resist it,
They do not need the obstetric forceps of the surgeon,

The insignificant is as big to me as any,

What is less or more than a touch?

What else is there? ...Heroism? After receiving your last letter, I read some of the verse of your Mrs. Browning, and I like what she says about heroes in "Aurora Leigh," that "All actual heroes are essential men,/ And all men possible heroes." It seems to be part of our nature as American poets to be *hungry for equals*. We are the American bards, and encourage each other....

If you see a good deal remarkable in me, I see just as much remarkable in you.

Thank you, Miss Dickinson, for teaching me.

Walt Whitman

- Lyn Christine Macgregor
April 8, 1993

Sources

Browning, Elizabeth Barrett, "Aurora Leigh," *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Fifth Edition, Volume 2. W. W. Norton and Co., 1986.

Dickinson, Emily, poems and letters reprinted in Core Sourcebook.

Mill, John Stuart, "What is Poetry?" *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Fifth Edition, Volume 2. W. W. Norton and Co., 1986.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, "A Defence of Poetry," *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Fifth Edition, Volume 2. W. W. Norton and Co., 1986.

Whitman, Walt, *Leaves of Grass*, 1855 Edition. Penguin Classics, 1986.

Italicized passages indicate places where the poet has "quoted" his or her own work.

Under the Weather

The Correlation Between Environment and Events in *Crime and Punishment*

> Towards the end of a sultry afternoon early in July a young man came out of his little room in Stolyarny Lane and turned slowly and somewhat irresolutely in the direction of Kamenny Bridge.[1]

From the very first sentence of *Crime and Punishment*, we are given a great deal of information. A set of conditions, a character, a setting, and an action are all established here. However, one aspect of this sentence is often overlooked or is paid little attention: the set of conditions. Although they may be describing events outside Raskolnikov's train of thought, they are not extraneous by any means. In fact, the role of the environment, and more specifically that of the weather, is not to be taken lightly in this work. If examined carefully, the weather can be seen to match the mood of the story quite closely, and changes in the weather parallel changes in the story. In virtually every case, the oppressive weather goes hand in hand with the rest of the oppressive surroundings that Raskolnikov is facing. The sun is an especially important example; its movements in the sky mirror moods in the story. This is not coincidence. Dostoevsky seems to be purposefully sculpting every aspect of Raskolnikov's life to fit his mood, and external influences are no exception. The very fact that a description of the weather appears before anything else in the work signifies that more than a minor symbolic role is being played here.

Our first encounter with the weather is, as mentioned before, at the beginning of the work, where we are given two descriptive words to describe the afternoon that Raskolnikov sets out in: "sultry" and "July." In this way Dostoevsky immediately familiarizes us with the environment and puts us on an equal level with Raskolnikov. Virtually everyone has experienced sultriness, and so we begin to get a feel for the oppressiveness right away. The word "July" serves to emphasize this point, as July is generally known as the beginning of the most torrid part of the year. The fact that it is "early in July" foreshadows that things are to get worse before they get better. So too with Raskolnikov's condition; it is one of decline throughout the work. Already we can see the parallel.

More than just a passing concern, however, the weather permeates into Raskolnikov's psyche and becomes a fixed, inescapable element. This idea is illustrated in his dream dealing with

---

[1] Pg. 1

N.B. - All Quotations are taken from the Coulson translation of *Crime and Punishment.*

the beaten horse, in which the afternoon is described as "grey and sultry."[2] Through the use of these two words, the mood is set for the actions that follow, namely the beating of the horse. "Grey" carries a certain amount of weight with it, as it is automatically associated with gloom and death. Also, a grey overcast sky will trap heat in like a blanket - but in this case, the effect is one of suffocation rather than comfort. This leads to the use of "sultry" again.

As Raskolnikov walks through the streets, we see more evidence of the great oppression of the weather:

> The heat in the streets was stifling. The stuffiness... and that peculiar summer stench so familiar to everyone who cannot get away from St. Petersburg into the country... combined to aggravate the disturbance of the young man's nerves.[3]

At this point the weather turns, from a element which at the beginning of the work quietly and almost unnoticeably affected Raskolnikov, into an open aggressor, hampering his thoughts and exciting his aggravations. The key to this observation is the fact that the descriptions of the weather change from static adjectives to verbs and adverbs connoting action. Where before the afternoon is described as "sultry", a simple state of condition, here the heat is "stifling"; i.e., possessing the ability to stifle. This is a much more powerful grammatical structure than in the first situation, and makes for a much more vivid mental picture. Dostoevsky gives the different facets of the heat almost personal characteristics by showing how they behave gregariously, joining forces to actively "aggravate" Raskolnikov's nerves. This adds to his overwhelming desire to change the situation that he is in. We see that he has a desire to "get away from St. Petersburg into the country," but his poverty prohibits him and hems him in. Raskolnikov at this point can be compared to a trapped animal, easily pushed to the point of frenzy by any of a number of elements. The oppressive heat can be counted among these. The weather, then, is an open abettor to his murder. It encourages him by paralleling his thoughts and pushing him towards their conclusion.

Along with the weather, however, the actual position of the sun in the sky parallels the situation in the book. As the story opens, it is "towards the end" of the day; the sun is declining in the sky. From this we get the impression that Raskolnikov has been declining for some time now, and evidence further on in the story corroborates this. We find that he has been contemplating the murder for some time, and has already written his article in the *Periodical Discourses.* He is in fact

[2] Pg. 52

[3] Pg. 2

"locked into" his beliefs by the time we are introduced to him; and since he has completely withdrawn from society, there is no one to take issue with his views. This isolation is reminiscent of the sun's separation from all else, as is his attitude. We see in his article that he believes in a higher race of "extraordinary" people, and that he outwardly believes that he is one of these people. According to these thoughts, then, he is at the center of his model of society. He has the power to overstep the bounds as he pleases; society revolves around him. This set of beliefs helps to explain his isolationist attitude.

One of the the most convincing proofs of the sun's connection to Raskolnikov's condition comes later in the work. At this point, Raskolnikov has told Sonya of his crime. The realization of his wrongdoing is beginning to work its way deeper into his thoughts, throwing him into even deeper turmoil. It is evident that this stage in his life is coming to a close. Closely following these events are the references to the position of the sun in the sky, and the two sets of events are tied together when Raskolnikov himself realizes the parallel. The first foreshadowing comes directly after his confession: "Cooler air blew through the window. The light outside was no longer so bright."[4] The arrival of a breeze of "cooler air" comes as somewhat of a surprise after so much oppressive heat. Yet this change is not unprecedented. Raskolnikov has, unknowingly, started on his journey towards peace with his confession. It is a turning point in the story, because he has recanted his earlier doctrine of isolation and confided his trust and his love in another human being. The breeze can be seen as a herald to this event. The decreasing light is a result of the setting sun, which itself heralds the end of this period in Raskolnikov's life. Clearly, the events are connected, and he acknowledges this:

> He wandered aimlessly. The sun was going down. A particular sort of dejection had recently begun to show itself in him. There was nothing violent or poignant about it, but it carried with it a premonition of perpetuity, weary, endless years of cold deadening depression, a presage of an eternity on 'a hand's-breadth of ground'. This feeling usually began to distress him even more towards evening.
>
> 'With such stupid, purely physical, infirmities, that seem to depend on the sunset or something, how can one help doing stupid things?...'[5]

The inclusion of "He wandered aimlessly" is in reference to his turmoil, a side effect of the closing epoch. The most compelling recognition is that of the feeling's increased effect in the evening. The setting sun and the absence of light result in his depression and turmoil. In this state, he

[4] Pg. 409

[5] Ibid.

considers the actions that bring him closer to truth "stupid things."

The weather, however, affects not only Raskolnikov but all those around him as well. In one instance (when he faints in the office), it actually seems as though the constant, oppressive conditions work in his favor when he is attempting to hide his crime. In this case, his fainting has nothing to do with the heat or the humidity. It is the initial realization of the discussion of his crime that shocks him. However, the occupants of the small office are under the impression that the paint fumes, etc. have caused him to faint. Only Porfiry Petrovich realizes what has really caused Raskolnikov to faint, and he uses this against him: "It is illness, we will suppose, and rooms are sometimes stuffy, besides, but all the same!"[6]

The real demonstration of the power of the weather in the work, however, is the climactic stormy night in which Svidrigaylov wanders after his confrontation with Dunya. Here, there is a perfect match between the weather and his emotions: there is a complete absence of light, and as he wanders, it begins to rain:

> The evening had been sultry and overcast. Towards ten o'clock heavy clouds began to pile up overhead, there was a clap of thunder, and rain swept down in a deluge. It fell not in drops but in streams that beat upon the ground like a waterfall. The lightning flashed incessantly, and the flashes lasted while one might count five.[7]

The focus in these lines is on the anger and the frustration that Svidrigaylov feels at his unreturned love for Dunya. Again "sultry" appears, but it is in conjunction with "had," suggesting that a change is imminent. The complete absence of light is also fitting for him; the sun has set on this section of his life completely. His final hours of rage are spent in delusion after delusion while the storm rages on and the darkness continues. There is one final period of light for him, and true to the symbolism of the story, it signifies a new period of Svidrigaylov's life, albeit short-lived. It is not refreshing or renewing light, however. The day is clouded in mist, signifying the clouded nearsightedness of his decision to commit suicide: "There was a thick mist outside, and nothing could be seen through it."[8]

There is one notable exception in the story where the weather is not oppressive, but is on the contrary liberating. This occurrence is not a contradiction when we look at the situation which accompanies it. The sun has come up in Raskolnikov's new life. Although he is in prison, he is

[6] Pg. 328

[7] Pg. 479

[8] Ibid.

on the road to understanding and worth. This mood, then, would not be matched by the sultry, grey conditions that predominated earlier. The descriptions at the end of the work are true to this. The day is described as "again bright and warm,"[9] where "again" suggests that these conditions have been present for some time; this is consistent with his new attitude. The sun also conforms to this new attitude, as the action in this section takes place "early in the morning."[10] The steppe across the river is "flooded with sunlight,"[11] the air is clean, and Raskolnikov is entering upon a new era of his life with Sonya which is even referred to by him as "the dawn of their happiness."[12]

We have seen, then, how the effects of the weather play a crucial part in the determination of mood, character, and motivation of Raskolnikov and the other characters in *Crime and Punishment*. Dostoevsky has interwoven the characters and their surroundings to create a parallel between them. In this way, the weather plays an influential role in Raskolnikov's thoughts by its constant oppression. The changes in the weather mirror changes in the lives of the characters, and the sun is especially important in this aspect. In example after example, the action of the story and the environment surrounding it are intertwined.

-Christopher Wagner

[9] Pg. 525

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Pg. 527

The Grand Socio/Economic Unification Theory by Smith, Malthus, and Darwin or "Mommy, if Population Growth is Geometrically Proportional to That of Food Production, How Much Does Barbie Cost?"

In his attempt to codify the vast complexities of the physical universe, Sir Isaac Newton unleashed a concept whose power surged over the bounds of its own branch of science. By attributing the actions and reactions of bodies and forces to a set of readily observable natural laws, Newton freed the scientist from a state of suspension within an unsolvable tangle of seemingly unrelated forces. He allowed science to hold a firm footing from which all things might be viewed, examined and derived. Little did Newton foresee that his notion of the guiding principle would also be grafted onto other scientific bodies.

Newton's template for the construct of intricate systems would not be lost on the social thinkers of the Enlightenment within the fields of social science, they found ample room to develop their own fundamental laws of nature from which they then derived various social outlets such as the advance and decline of societies, economic development, and even moral behavior. Starting with the socio/economic structures of Adam Smith, a pattern of natural development forms. From Smith, Thomas Malthus develops a proto-notion of natural selection which eventually culminates in the work of the Victorian thinker Charles Darwin.

For Adam Smith, the central motivation for human activities, the natural law that powered the engines of industry, was the almost instinctive quality about man that causes him to barter and trade. Much in the same way Hobbes' society was born of man's need for self-preservation, Smith sees trade as a result of the need to gain what man needs. As a consequence of this "propensity," other human constructs were spun off. Mankind, as

Smith puts it, "...stands at all times in need of the cooperation and assistance of great multitudes..." (Smith, Wealth 26). This mutual reliance of one man for another is the foundation for both social structure and, as a side product, moral virtue.

From mutual reliance comes the need for division of labor, a pre-natural selection where an individual who retains the greatest skill at a certain trade will remain in that trade for utility's sake. He will become specialized in his particular craft to the point where he (or she for that matter) can do only that one task. While this has, Smith adds, a degrading effect upon the man as an individual, the efficiency and net value of this distribution of labor upon the whole of society is great. On an individual level, division of labor allows a man to have more time and more power to acquire those things which he has occasion for. When division of labor grows into full fledged commerce and industry, it affects entire regions. Order and affluence spreads form towns to country and from landlords to tenants in a sort of residual or trickle down moral economics. This is the odd realm of the "invisible hand," the ghostly force that impels the rich to make "nearly the same distribution of the necessities of life, which would have been made, had the earth been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants..." (Smith, Theory 185). The necessity of every man for everyman, the utility of the neighbor causes a kind of collective interest. The wealthy need laborers to cultivate land and support their lifestyles. Thus, they tend to sustain their retainers for their own benefit. Utility because of its beauty leads to a quasi-group morality, a noblesse oblige that must be maintained not for purely moralistic reasons but for the maintenance of a way of life.

Thomas Malthus, British parson and professor of political economics, clearly demonstrates the idea of fixed natural laws acting within the realm of social science in his work "An Essay on the Principle of Population." For him, there is one engine that drives the bulk of society -- the availability of subsistence. On this principle rests the size and the strength of a society. The difficulty in this is that population invariably outstrips the growth of food production. Population growth occurs geometrically while production

grows only arithmetically; thus the vast difference between the two. How is this discrepancy resolved? Through the intervention of certain checks that curb population. Here Malthus presents his very dark, "realistic" view of society. Unlike Smith, whose natural law brings a general happiness, or perhaps it is better stated as expansive prosperity, comes only at the immediate expense of society through natural checks that "are only resolvable into moral restraint, vice, and misery" (Malthus 14).

Of his two forms of population restraint, only what he refers to as "preventative checks" come as a result of human intervention. When the ability to provide a comfortable level of existence for a person becomes difficult due to scarcity of food, human intellect will prevent the increase of the species through its own means. Any kind of human consideration that will stop procreation, such as moral restraint (ie. "restraint not followed by irregular gratifications" -- enter Malthus the parson) or the introduction of vice (the slavish insistence upon "promiscuous intercourse" to relieve passion resulting in debilitating disease) will decrease the natural progression of population growth (Malthus 14).

Malthus' other check comes from nature itself. Positive checks are those natural calamities and conditions that cull the burgeoning flocks of humanity when the need arises. Famine, plague, even war work to trim population down to levels where growth will naturally reinstate itself. Once competition for food is relieved by a mass kill, ugly as that event might be, it will not stop the survivors from rebuilding and even expanding their stock. For once resources become plentiful, population growth can again advance and prosperity reign supreme.

Thus Malthus introduces the idea of natural competition. While Smith insisted that economic competition leads to technological advance and by proxy a sort of utilitarian morality, Malthus sees progress and growth trapped between certain natural boundaries. When these limits are breached, natural release valves are thrown and the whole system shifts -- to the advantage of some, disadvantage of others -- and returns to a

ground state. Society here is continuously in a state of flux between the two poles of over and under population. The catalyst that supports the movement, however, is not a positive change but rather the actions of misery and vice, sometime premeditated other times uncontrollable.

Finally we reach the great social thinker Darwin. Charles Darwin appears in this chain of theorists as the culmination of the lot. He takes the group utility and necessity of division of labor of Smith and combines it with the extraordinarily pragmatic views of Malthus and fuses them, forming a theory in which natural competition becomes the brutal norm but results in the benefit of mankind as a whole. Darwin allows for what Malthus might consider the replacement of the weak by the more able-bodied through a natural process of selection which follows a "rapid rate of increase" (Darwin 161). Yet those who do survive prosper and advance the society as a whole. Technology, and perhaps more importantly, virtue and sympathy progress through imitation of those who succeed, much in the same way these necessary characteristics develop out of utility in Smith's theoretical universe. This does not guarantee the "unlimited growth potential," the Amway-esque promises of unrestricted progress that it might seem to occasion. "Progress is no invariable rule," Darwin advises but depends "on an increase in the actual number of the population, on the number of the men endowed with high intellectual and moral faculties, as well as on their standard of excellence" (Darwin 159). But in Darwin's view there still is an implied notion of progress and selection as natural, good, and attainable.

-Ivan Bernier

Freud on Civilization

To relate the human mind to the vast workings of civilization, Sigmund Freud looked to the individual before tackling any question of the group. He knew that by concentrating on the individual, the nature of civilization in general could be better understood. This is obvious when society is taken as the sum total of numerous, independent individuals, or egos.

Illustrating the fact that civilization is not solely the result of a binding tendency, know as eros, requires a thorough explanation of Freud's conception of the mind. With this representation at hand, then the reality about civilization, that it is governed not only by eros, but by thatatos (destructive drive) as well, becomes resolute. We can then see why it is that the whole of mankind has never, nor ever will, achieve the utopia of brotherhood and peaceful coexistence.

At the base of Freud's mental construct is the irrational. He sees that in human conduct, the real drives at work are eros, or the drive to bind, and thanatos, or the drive to destroy. This is the grounding of the analytic "map" we shall use. The Id, the home of eros and thanatos, is the origin of the raw instincts, both of sexual gratification, and of uninhibited destruction. The vibrant nature of the id is powered by libido, which, when expended, satisfies the id's yearning. This is termed pleasure, or satisfaction.

In terms of the human individual, the period of time when id is not suppressed and irrationality governs is in infancy. At this time the sole aim is gratification, which can easily be understood by the baby's sole desire for food, or pleasure. When the desire is not met, the baby cries until comfort is given by the mother's calm touch and gentling assurances. A main concern of Freud's is that at this stage, which necessarily cannot exist throughout the life-cycle because of the potentiality for chaos, the repression of the id's libido causes all of life's discontents. Thus, from this point in life, humans are destined to be dissatisfied through the inability to properly serve their most primal instincts.

The governance of the id is taken over by the reason-based ego, which dictates to the id what is acceptable, and more importantly, what it cannot do in its quest for pleasure or release. The ego, as Freud says in Civilization and its Discontents, seems to maintain "clear and sharp lines of demarcation" (p13), thus limiting the libidinal force within the boundaries of the acceptable. Here the ego is faced with a tension concerning the pleasure principle, for to impose restrictions on the primal urges means to deny the activities that are truly satisfying. To ease this, the ego sublimates the desires to the pursuits which are "acceptable."

The development of the ego begins during the Oedipal stage. The child, in conflict with the parental figure of the same sex, realizes that the desire for the other parent, sexually, is unacceptable, and through the fear of punishment, or loss of love, represses the desire. This realization that certain ends cannot be attained and will be accompanied by the loss of pleasure equates with the genesis of the ego. The ego formation also comes from casting away the selfish notion that the id is to be served at all cost. The decentralization of the self, by the mother's breast, or the father's constant presence, is the source of this.

The highest stage in Freud's "map" of the mind is to be found in the realm of imperatives, the super-ego. Here, the cardinal commandments reside to govern over the ego, and the concept of morality comes into play the form of firmly accepted ideas. The super-ego has the final say in the suppression of the id, in that, when the ego cannot suffice, the directive of "thou shall not" do something is issued.

What is manifested in the super-ego comes directly from the family and society. The values imposed on the child in the familial setting, often by the patriarchal figure (father), are inculcated early on through the antagonism with the father in the oedipal phase. Here, the development of the mind is complete. The child learns what is accepted and adheres to this through his desire for pleasure; violation of what the child is expected equate with punishment or the withdrawal of love. Later in life, these mandates may

come from society in much the same manner as they do during the development phase. The basis for social relationship and for civilization, thus has much bearing in the realm of the super-ego.

The problem with civilization's not leading to a "unity of mankind" thus comes from the mind existing as a combined calculus of the pleasure principle and the death drive. Also, the strong desire to satiate these drives, or the impossibility of total libidinal satisfaction, ultimately denies this goal. Society, as Freud describes, is a union serving utility. "Human life in common is only made possible when a majority comes together which is stronger than any separate individual and which remains united against all separate individuals" (p.49). Thus, from the outset of civilization, the desires of the individual are suppressed for the greater good. The utilitarian model, by binding the individual, causes dissatisfaction with life in that the expenditure of libido in accordance with will is often forbidden. In the face of society, Freud writes of the individual that:

> "No doubt he will always defend his claim
> to individual liberty against the will of the group.
> A good part of the struggles of mankind center
> round the single task of finding an expedient
> accommodation - one, that is, that will bring
> happiness - between this claim of the individual
> and the cultural claims of the group; and one
> of the problems that touches the fate of humanity
> is whether such an accommodation can be reached
> by means of some particular form of civilization
> or whether this conflict is irreconcilable."
>
> (Civilization and its Discontents, p.50)

Thus, the individual's rebellion against society causes wars, and his rebellion against his super-ego results in internalized cycles of guilt and subsequent remorse. The strife of Man's existence is thus presented with a paradox which obviously excludes not only the "great unity", but also seems to prevent civilization in general. If war and conflict are to happen all the time, dictated by the individual mind, then some process or medium must exist to ease the tension in society, otherwise the net result would be nothing better than the Hobbesian state of Nature. The medium Freud presents is that the libidinal energy which so desperately needs to be expended is cathexed, or channeled, into the upper reaches of the psyche and attached to other, non-sexual or non-destructive, activities. The ego becomes satisfied with this, and the problem of libidinal overload is solved. The buffer is provided, but conflict still exists and the source of the antithesis against society lives forever in the dark continent of the id.

Freud's discourse on civilization has been called pessimistic. The arguments he presents can lead to no other conclusion, and were reinforced by the *zeitgeist* of his day. With the main contribution of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud seemed to have found a viable method for alleviating the sickness of the mind know as neurosis. The improper cathexis of libido, the motivating force of discontent, could thus be remedied by "talking cures" or through the use of free-association, each in its own way ending the repression of desire and allowing the mind dynamic to function properly. Even with this, the prevailing ethos toward war and destruction were too great to allow any optimism and at the close of Civilization and its Discontents, Freud can only question the possibility of any hope at all for civilization's improvement.

-Andrew Abraham

BIBLIOGRAPHY
In alphabetical order by title

THE AENEID of Vergil, tr. Robert Fitzgerald

THE ANALECTS OF CONFUCIUS, tr. Arthur Waley

THE ASCENT OF MOUNT VENTOUX, by Francesco Petrarca, ed. Ernst Cassirer at al.

CIVILIZATION AND ITS DISCONTENTS, by Sigmund Freud, tr. James Strachey

THE CLOUDS, by Aristophanes, tr. William Arrowsmith

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, by Feodor Dostoyevsky, tr. Constance Garnett

DISCOURSE ON METHOD, by Rene Descartes, tr. Laurence Lafleur

THE DIVINE COMEDY, by Dante Alighieri, tr. Allen Mandelbaum

DON QUIXOTE, by Miguel de Cervantes, tr. Joel Cohen

THE ENCHIRIDION, by Epictetus, tr. Nicholas White

FAUST, PART I, by Johann Wolgang von Goethe, tr. Peter Salm

THE GREAT INSTAURATION, by Sir Francis Bacon

GULLIVER'S TRAVELS, by Jonathan Swift

LEAVES OF GRASS, 1885 Edition, by Walt Whitman

THE ODYSSEY of Homer, tr. Robert Fitzgerald

THE ORESTEIA, by Aeschylus, tr. Robert Fagles

PARADISE LOST, by John Milton, ed. Christoper Ricks

THE REPUBLIC of Plato, tr. Allan Bloom

THE WAY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO LAO TZU, tr. Witter Bynner

The poems of John Donne, Alexander Pope, and Emily Dickinson, selections from Thomas Malthus, Adam Smith, John Calvin, and Percy Bysshe Shelley were included in a course packet distributed for the Core Curriculum.

"...and from so little sleeping and so much
reading, his brain dried up
and he went completely
out of his mind..."
- Cervantes

Biographies

Andrew G. P. Abraham is currently studying political science in the College of Liberal Arts and is a sophomore. Future plans include entering the legal profession. When asked what he thinks people say when asked "Why do they bury lawyers twelve feet under instead of six?" he is wont to reply: "Because way down deep, lawyers are good people too."

Christopher M. Atkins, a sophomore in the College of Liberal Arts, is currently studying philosophy, with a view to pursuing his doctorate. When asked what was the greatest work of Western literature, he replied: "I believe that all literature is a footnote to Faust. I have no idea what that means."

Ivan Bernier is supposedly a film major with leanings toward the English Department. He hopes sometime to teach English, write screenplays, maybe direct a movie. His big aspiration is to have a section in the Norton Anthology with a little picture. "Oh yeah, and here's to the Birth Goo of the Universe."

Rob Carson is a freshman in the Core Curriculum.

David Croghan is a freshman considering a major in history. He is from Brooklyn, New York, and attended Hunter College High School in Manhattan. David enjoys movies, music, books, and baseball. Clint Eastwood, Robert De Niro, Yung Hee Kim, and Dwight Gooden are some of the important people in his life. He is a N.Y. Mets fan, but is not very optimistic about their prospects this year.

Sheila K. Espineli has just completed her first year of Core Curriculum and is continuing to double major in English and French in CLA, having a preference for the Romantic literature of both languages. Other than books, she also confesses to having love affairs with the piano, theatre, and museums.

Satu Hummasti is a philosophy and photojournalism major who grew up in Oregon. "I've been in love for long/With what I cannot tell,/And will contrive a song/For the intangible/That has no mould or shape,/From which there's no escape" (from Edwin Muir's "In Love for Long").

Reginald Jean is a sophomore majoring in sociology. He enjoys playing basketball, not to mention other sports. His ambition is to become a lawyer and a teacher. He wants to wish everyone luck outside of Core, and to tell them he will not forget them when he turns big.

Sean Lake is a freshman in the Core Curriculum.

Justin Lazzara is a freshman in the Core Curriculum.

Lyn Christine Macgregor is a CLA sophomore majoring in English and Philosophy with the eventual goal of teaching English and possibly writing on the side. Besides being a good teacher, her greatest aspirations include publishing some stories, growing up to be Michelle Shock and being a charter member of the International Wranglers Society.

Christopher McMullen is a sophomore Political Science major in CLA who is looking toward a public service career or self-employment. Included in his vast list of other published papers is one containing his ontological proof of Ross Perot's existence. Despite his fondness for Bacon and Descartes though, he is foremost a lover of Homer, and in his spare time intends to write his own epic erotic poem someday.

Tina Vegliante is a sophomore English major in CLA. She plans to become a follower of Lao Tzu and dedicate her life to locating The Way, or to found the first James Devlin fan club and live off the initiation fees.

Chris Wagner hails from the highly philosophical burgh of Buffalo, New York. When not attempting to be a pseudo-intellectual, Chris enjoys acting and pursuing his career in medicine. He suggests drinking a bottle of cheap wine in order to counteract the dryness of his paper.

Deirdre Westcott is a freshman probably majoring in political science in hopes of someday writing brilliant political treatises (slim though the chances may be). She enjoys sleeping, going barefoot, musk, and inflicting stress and lack of sleep upon herself by putting off her Core papers until the last minute.

Marie Ziemer poked her head out of her shell, blinked at the light, grabbed her Kant and her Spinoza, her Tao Te Ching and her teddy bear, and wandered off by the river. Turtles love sunny days.