

“The Interpreters”: A Handbook to AE and the Irish Revival

JOHN WILSON FOSTER

ALTHOUGH it is sometimes seen as monolithic, the Irish Literary Revival was in fact a complex of attitudes and achievements, some of them sharing no more than a family resemblance, others engaged in downright contradiction. At its least nationalistic, the Revival was an island chapter of mainland intellectual radicalism, the most graphic and succinct evidence of this that I am acquainted with being the joint autobiography of James Cousins, the Ulster poet, and his wife, the Roscommon champion of women's rights, Margaret Cousins.¹ *We Two Together* (1950) makes it clear how wide were the radical interests of the more advanced Revivalists; the Cousinses were involved in astrology, theosophy and psychicism, in vegetarianism, agricultural cooperatives, mythology, Gaelic language revival, dramatic revival, the suffragette movement, poetry, anti-imperialist agitation, physical regenerationism and anti-vivisectionism. But the book also unwittingly makes it clear that it was only the Dublin of a certain set (and a certain set apart, we might add) that wove this veritable nest of heterodoxies, and that the social and intellectual base of the movement was extremely narrow; the same names drop again and again when the supporters of this plurality of interests are mentioned. Moreover, to the advanced thinkers of the Revival, the interests were by no means *incurably* plural, and they set as their supreme goal realization of the ultimate and essential unity of the cosmos and of self-transcending existence. Little wonder, then, given the nature of the final objective and the comparatively small repertory company the Revival

represented, that the movement has seemed to succeeding generations a monolithic one, despite the fact that variousness is its chief immediate characteristic.

Indeed, not even the Cousinses in their kaleidoscopic enthusiasm exhausted the total range of available Revival attitudes, literary or social. Should further proof be required of the variety and experimentalism of cultural opinion abroad during the Revival, I would direct readers to AE's *The Interpreters* (1922), itself a curious recruit to the ranks of fictional experiment. Here are displayed the splintering philosophies of the Revival and the simultaneous drive for philosophical unity, the whole stimulated by AE's meditation on the movement's key military event, turned emblem.

I

AE calls his work a "symposium," and it has some affinity with that classical form and with such a modern version of it as Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668). There is, however, greater narrative and descriptive content in *The Interpreters* than in Dryden's work, and we may speak of it as something very close to a novel. It is set some centuries in the future, "so that," according to AE in the Preface, "ideals over which there is conflict today might be discussed divested of passion and apart from transient circumstance."² This was a forlorn hope, deliberately so or otherwise. It is true that although the discussion takes place in a gaol cell in the aftermath of an abortive insurrection, there is little that is clear in the reader's mind in the way of material events. What is said early on about these events as they strike the chief character, the poet-rebel Lavelle, extends to the novel's welter of ideas as they at first strike the reader: "Of the physical conflict in the arsenal the poet remembered little. It was blurred to the eye by excess of light" (p. 8). However, it could only have escaped the most sheltered of readers that AE had re-created in his own peculiar way the Easter Rebellion: "A world empire was in trouble. A nation long restless under its rule had resurrected ancient hopes, and this young man with many others was bent on a violent assertion of

its right to freedom" (p. 2). The times are reproduced in detail — despite the poetic blur of AE's prose — down to the theosophical adventuring in which AE himself had been involved: "It was an era of arcane speculation, for science and philosophy had become esoteric after the visible universe had been ransacked and the secret of its being had eluded the thinkers" (p. 70). And, thinking no doubt of 1916 and subsequent events in Ireland that so angered Yeats, AE has one of his characters remark: "You will find . . . that every great conflict has been followed by an era of materialism in which the ideals for which the conflict ostensibly was waged were submerged. The gain if any was material. The loss was spiritual" (p. 136). The spiritual is AE's professed concern: "Those who take part in the symposium," he tells us in the Preface, "suppose of the universe that it is a spiritual being and they inquire what relation the politics of Time may have to the politics of Eternity" (p. vii). Equally might it be said that the symposiasts inquire into the role of the self in the spiritual and political systems of the universe.

Since the speakers as well as the setting can be fairly readily identified, *The Interpreters* can be called a *roman à clef*. However, it is the ideas associated with or suggested to AE by the historical figures, and not the figures themselves (more than one of whom can in the novel inhabit the same fictional body), that are important. The plot too is mere scaffolding for the discussion. Lavelle's band of rebels commandeer a city arsenal, only to find that the unguarded gates were a trap. The band is captured and gaoled. During the night, other rebel-leaders are ushered into the gaol cell. Over the city, air-ships, "winged shapes of dusk and glitter," manoeuvre to quell the insurrection, and we recognize in them not only futuristic aeroplanes but also the extra-terrestrial winged beings that swarmed through AE's visions and paintings. Meanwhile the captives argue, each speaker being given by AE and the others the opportunity of outlining without interruption his philosophy.

For most of the novel, Lavelle is recognizable as Patrick Pearse. He holds a spiritual theory of nationality which according to the sceptic rebel, Leroy, would lead to theocracy if implemented. This theory Lavelle has derived from the history of

his nation "which began among the gods"; and from history (really mythology) he turned to literature and thence politics and insurrection. The "unity of character" and "national culture" of his country are traceable, almost uniquely among nations, back to the divine origin of things and today are vested especially in the peasant. Beside his country and his race he professes to account himself of little importance, except as a self-sacrificial helper in the national cause: "He was one of those who suffer on behalf of their nation that agony which others feel over personal misfortunes" (p. 33). It cheers Lavelle to think of the rebels dying for country, and he denies that the moment of death is the moment of self-extinction: "No, no . . . The self had already perished, for they had abandoned themselves to the genius of their race and it was captain of their souls. The last of life they knew was the rapture of sacrifice" (p. 102). The Ancestral Self is all.

At times Lavelle would seem to shade into Yeats. Like Yeats Lavelle believes that his country is unusual in not having to turn to other ancient cultures, such as those of the Greek and Jew, for its cosmogony, mythology and culture. For the inhabitants of most countries "distant lands are made sacred, but not the air they breathe"; Milton's "Heaven-world," for example, "is rootless and unreal and not very noble phantasy" (p. 62), remarks that echo Yeats's sentiments and AE's own conviction that Christianity had robbed Ireland of a pantheon of native divinities and removed the sacred realm to an exotic afterlife from the earth underfoot where it resided in pagan times.³ The Revivalists considered themselves to be engaged in the task of repatriating Irish culture and spirituality after centuries of 'exile' and of being displaced by foreign faiths and systems. And like Yeats Lavelle is sadly aware of "how little high traditions move the people" (p. 13). Certainly AE had Yeats rather than Pearse in mind when it is told how the work of one of the captives, an imaginative historian, "had been followed by creative writers like Lavelle, in whom the submerged river of nationality again welled up shining and life-giving" (p. 41). Brehon the imaginative historian is of course Standish James O'Grady. (Brehon, Irish *breathamh*: an ancient Irish judge;

Brehon law is the code of law which prevailed in Ireland before its occupation by the English. The ancient Irish connection between judge and bard is also implied in the name.)⁴ Lavelle has come to believe that "The heroic is the deep reality in you and all of us," as he tells a fellow captive, and is implanted and reawakened through "the ennobling influence of heroic story" and of "the dream of the ancestors" that Brehon first made available to the poet's generation. Brehon is in gaol because the authorities consider it better he be out of the way while the trouble continues (putting all the rebel luminaries together in one cell would seem to be an odd way of going about quelling the revolution), but, in fact, like O'Grady, "after his history had appeared, the historian seemed to take no interest in the great movement he had inspired. He became absorbed in more abstruse studies, the nature of which was known to but few among his countrymen" (pp. 41-2). Brehon's participation in the symposium is not only AE's salute to O'Grady, but also AE's reminder to the aloof historian that he bears some considerable responsibility for the events of 1916 and after.

As he is meant to do, the figure of Leroy blows a breeze of scepticism and cynicism through the proceedings. He is perhaps in part Oliver St John Gogarty, but because he is a "fantastical humorist", he may also be in part James Stephens, as Henry Summerfield suggests,⁵ and because an individualist, perhaps too John Eglinton (W. K. Magee). And being the greatest shape-changer in the novel, despite or because of his theory of individualism, he might also be in part James Joyce. Leroy has Joyce's self-possession, believing his vision to be as valid as the next man's, whatever institutional weight or theory of divinity lies behind the next man's, and he shares Joyce's parallax and relativistic perspective. "You, if you dreamed," he tells Lavelle, "would see a vision so beautiful that you would imagine it was a vision of Paradise, but it would be no less of yourself than my fantasy" (p. 25). Leroy has taken part in the revolution despite himself, and this reminds us of the surprising militancy of Gogarty and Stephens, as well perhaps as of that residual patriotism that made Joyce fiercely and proudly Irish. In the aftermath of insurrection Leroy prefers reason to heroic passion and,

Stephen Dedalus-like, considers it absurd to exchange the shackles of colonialism for the shackles of socialism or theocratic nationalism offered him by his fellow captives. "The cosmic consciousness I conceive to be an autocracy gradually resolving itself into a democracy of free spirits" (p. 69). His belief in freedom sustains his cynicism; in a prediction fulfilled by the fate of Yeats's poetry if not O'Grady's history, he tells Lavelle: "Your poetry and Brehon's History will be favourite studies in imperial circles in a few years" (p. 33). It also sustains an arrogance reminiscent of Stephen Dedalus: "You may think of me as a rebel angel . . . I am in revolt against Heaven" (p. 110). Leroy is the only interpreter who believes in the unadorned and free-standing self, and he entertains the notion of dying in the insurrection so that in the moments before death all his ideas and feelings would return to him "and I could be my entire self if but for a few seconds" (p. 103), a fate enjoyed symbolically and under different circumstances by Gabriel Conroy in Joyce's long story, "The Dead."

Very much in contrast to this hope, the somewhat sentimental socialist impulses of another captive, Culain, came into being when an old woman in the tenement where he was raised "wept a quarter of an hour or so before she died being unable to rise and give help to another. That self-forgetfulness when the self was passing from life seemed to me to be wonderful" (p. 86). He elaborates: "Whatever makes us clutch at the personal, whatever strengthens the illusion of separateness, whether it be the possession of wealth, or power over the weak, or fear of the strong, all delay the awakening from this pitiful dream of life by fostering a false egoism" (p. 89), an illusion shared outside the novel by O'Grady in his homage to strong heroes as well as by Culain's more evident opponents within the novel. Like Lavelle, Culain — James Connolly and Jim Larkin in thin disguise — believes in an Ancestral Self, but it is that of humanity and not just that of the individual race or nation. Culain is opposed to nationalism ("We would not be in this struggle merely to exchange world master for nation masters," p. 37), but makes common cause with Lavelle as Connolly made common cause with Pearse at Easter 1916. His name has been chosen

well. Cúlain is of course the smith whose watchdog young Cúchulain, then called Setanta, kills and replaces (hence Cúchulain, the Hound of Cúlain). 'Smith' is a common name that sits well with Cúlain's socialism; a smith is also a manual worker of the kind championed by Cúlain (Connolly). Connolly had sympathy with the Gaelic Revival, and AE had a social, even socialistic interest in the old sagas, both of which make felicitous AE's use of the Cúchulain saga as a source for his socialist's name.

If Leroy is unique in his advocacy of self, Heyt is unique in his military imperialism. Heyt is "president of the Air Federation", whose airships now beleaguer the rebels (Heyt = height?), and has been arrested in error, conveniently for the symposium. In his anti-labour views and lofty arrogance (another kind of height), he conjures up the figure of William Martin Murphy, the industrial magnate and leader of the Employers' Federation against whom Larkin's strike during the Dublin lockout of 1913 was directed. Beyond Irish commercialism, Heyt is enlarged into British imperial power and the bureaucracy and centralization AE railed against in his essay, "Ideals of the New Rural Society."⁶ And this is not all. Heyt's ideal society is the world state which "will absorb its romantics," like Lavelle, Cúlain and Brehon, "and transmute emotion into wisdom" (p. 72). Whereas Leroy is for variety among individuals and Lavelle for variety among nations, Heyt is for total uniformity, and human evolution he sees as "the eternal revealing of the Self to the selves" (p. 73). In what seems to be a contradiction, Heyt upbraids Leroy for nourishing "a fantastic conception of freedom" while, according to Heyt, every cell of the sceptic's body and every atom of nature stirs with impulses beyond Leroy's control, but then defines the will as power, as the self, "the king principle in our being." But the paradox is resolved: "The will," says Heyt, "grows stronger by self-suppression than in self-assertion." That the figure of Heyt does not prove an anomaly or imbalance in AE's symposium is due to the fact that where power and self-denial are concerned, Heyt speaks language Cúlain and Lavelle can readily understand. Indeed, AE himself believed that we must cultivate power and an unshakeable will if we are

to scale the Heavens, but that we must do so by purifying our being into selflessness so that the energy of the awakening power be not misdirected.⁷ Heyt, on the other hand, cultivates power and will for unspiritual ends and suppresses others rather than suppressing himself. He threatens to take Paradise by storm. Heyt, however, belongs philosophically and even spiritually in AE's world by being an object of that "inverted love that is hate" and a "perverted hindrance that is truly helpful," an enemy who like many enemies can be "dearer to you than ever your friend can be."⁸ These are notions attributed to AE by James Stephens in a reminiscence, and in a sequel reminiscence Stephens recalled a belief of AE's that would suggest that a vigorous symposium like *The Interpreters* was a literary form especially congenial to AE: "It was his belief that we travel through life and time with our own company of friends and enemies. That there is a small clann of personages, and that this is the real family. The wives, husbands and children of such a person are almost unimportant, almost accidental."⁹ And, interestingly enough, the family is not nearly so important in Revival fiction as it is in post-Revival Irish fiction, though Joyce and Stephens are important exceptions. Why not? One answer may be that the ideological and philosophical business of the Revival precluded concerns and textures at once more novelistic and more mundane, which may be, indeed, one reason why the Revival did not produce a body of fiction recognizably novelistic, another reason being the peculiar nature of the venerable Irish narrative tradition on which the fiction writers of the Revival drew. A second answer may be that many of the Revivalists, unlike most of the post-Revival Irish writers, were Protestants of a leisured social background, and among such people the immediate family does not loom quite so large as among Catholics, especially unleisured Catholics.

II

A virtual handbook of attitudes in Revival Ireland, *The Interpreters* is, just as absorbingly, AE's philosophical autobiography, and as such more interesting in form than most auto-

biographies. For in the independent theories we can trace to real holders, AE contrived to reflect the various facets of his own complexity. It is not merely that since AE creates (even while borrowing) the diverse characters in *The Interpreters* then he must be all those characters, as Shakespeare must in a sense be the veriest villain he portrays: it is that AE in a very sincere fashion shared many of the attitudes of the fictional symposiasts with their real-life models. There is a good deal of AE in Leroy's shifting viewpoints, as well as in Leroy's championing of "the freedom of the local community" (p. 76), and in Leroy's intellectual remove, a version of which enables AE to re-create, rather fairly, contradictory, occasionally distasteful ideas. Culin's socialism is a heightened and urban equivalent of AE's involvement with the rural co-operative movement, while Culin's contempt for separateness and egotism accords with AE's blueprint for the ideal rural society: "The first thing to do," he asserted, "is to create and realize the feeling for the community, and break up the evil and petty isolation of man from man."¹⁰ Too, AE supported the Dublin strike of 1913 and spoke on behalf of it at a rally in the Albert Hall, London. And in Rian the architect we see something of AE the painter.¹¹ The relationship with Brehon and Lavelle is more complex. Towards the end of the symposium Brehon, perhaps in his judicial role, is given thirty pages in which to sum up his philosophy, and in so doing he ceases to be O'Grady and becomes AE. He labours to harmonize the divergent views he has listened to, and delivers himself of the judgment that only Leroy, the self-sufficing and anarchic man asserting absolute kingship over his own being, is on the true path since only anarchy correctly founded guarantees justice not only for the individual but for congregations of men, including nations: "The external law imposed by the greatest of states must finally give way before the instinct for self-rule which alone is consonant with the dignity and divinity of man" (p. 125). Yet Leroy will not attain his full stature until he comprehends "the spiritual foundations on which other political theories rest, and can build on them as do the devotees of beauty or love or power" (p. 125). Once the spiritual ideal was a widespread reality during a Golden Age (O'Grady's Heroic Period,

presumably) before it gave way to "the terrible and material powers ruling in the Iron Age" (p. 175), by which Lavelle seems to mean the 'Anglo-Saxon' age of industry and the megalopolis. Now it is simply that, an ideal, but it must not on pain of loss be striven for or defended by material means such as those employed by the insurrectionists. The goal is psychic evolution towards self-fulfilment that sheds interest in the politics of time and awakens and attracts spiritual powers and elements akin to our expanding consciousness.

Although Lavelle earlier protested that "all distinctions of nationality seem to dissipate in a haze in this transcendentalism" (p. 143), he is finally converted to Brehon's position. Before the guards come to release Heyt whose side will be the probable winner of the material battle raging outside, Lavelle stands in Brehonic contemplation: "Everything was understood. Everything was loved. Everything was forgiven. He knew after that exaltation he could never be the same again. Never could he be fierce or passionate" (p. 177). The exaltation has caused him to add to a poem he had written before the rising and believed finished a final section in the light of Brehon's transcendentalism. What is interesting is that the poem, "Michael", a curious piece of over four hundred lines in four-beat couplets with stylistic elements from Wordsworth, Yeats and Pearse and which has the same kind of importance for *The Interpreters* as has Stephen's villanelle for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, is a verse *immram* (or voyage tale) and *fis* (or vision tale). It is, according to Lavelle, "the last poem in a Book of Voyages wherein I, like the poets of our country before me, tell of journeyings to the Land of Immortal Youth" (p. 159). He might well be thinking of that account of a journey to Tir-na-nOg written centuries before: Yeat's *The Wanderings of Oisín* (1889), part of which was also cast in four-beat lines. Lavelle's title hero lives in the west of Ireland in a cabin where old tales and legends are told, and embarks on a visionary voyage that closely resembles the voyages in *Immram Brain (The Voyage of Bran)* and *Immram Máile Dúin (The Voyage of Maelduin)*, both Medieval tales. The journey amidst glimmering isles and cloudy seas filled with mythic forms is a spiritual pilgrimage on which Michael is

vouchsafed a momentary sight of paradise. Since phrases from the journey echo phrases from the beginning of *The Interpreters* describing Lavelle's journey to the city, '*Immram Michael*' in a sense repeats Lavelle's own spiritual journey in the course of the symposium towards the momentary and exalting vision of the spiritual destination and ideal provided by Brehon. After his voyage, Michael can be found drudging in a dark, Dublin-like city, a reminder of the pastoral philosophy of a book which associates the city with the hellfire of combat and the cosmopolitan philosophy of Heyt. In the city he meet a Donegal Gaelic speaker, one of "The army of the Gaelic mind, / Still holding through the Iron Age / The spiritual heritage." In the company of Gaelic Leaguers he reads the old stories, including the one about he "who with his single sword / Stayed a great army at the ford" — Cuchulain. Then — for Lavelle's *immram* is set several centuries before in early twentieth-century Ireland — Michael takes part in an Easter Rebellion:

The Lord in man had risen here,
 From the dark sepulchre of fear,
 Was wilful, laughing, undismayed,
 Though on a fragile barricade
 The bullet rang, the death star broke,
 The street waved dizzily in smoke,
 And there the fierce and lovely breath
 Of flame in the grey mist was death.
 Yet Michael felt within him rise
 The rapture that is sacrifice. (p. 169)

Since this part of the poem was written before the insurrection, Lavelle when he used the phrase about sacrificial rapture in describing the dying rebels outside the gaol (p. 102) was quoting his own poem, a rather Pearsian touch. In death, Michael has a last vision of the mystic isles he once saw momentarily and ends "Afloat upon the heavenly seas." The poem is a clever use of the ancient *immram* and *fis* as a mould into which the content of Pearse's career is poured. But now, having heard Brehon (AE), Lavelle adds a harmonic new ending in which the slayer and the slain are pictured united and the be-all and end-all of life are seen as one spirituality "To which all life is journeying." In short, Lavelle becomes AE, that most myriad-minded and

peacemaking of the Revivalists. Having shattered himself into the fragments of his diverse activities and beliefs, fleshed out as simulacra of real people, AE re-composes himself into a harmonic self-conception. It is as if in writing *The Interpreters* AE had kept in mind what Yeats wrote to him in 1898: "You are face to face with the heterogeneous, and the test of one's harmony is our power to absorb it and make it harmonious."¹² But long before this letter, George Russell had taken for his pseudonym Aeon, the name of a mythical figure he later said "mirrored himself in chaos and became the lord of our world."¹³ *The Interpreters* is a re-statement of AE's mystical approach to the practical and intellectual world: the conception of himself and of Ireland at which he arrives is of a man and a nation whose self-fulfilment is self-transcendence, participation in the All. The temporal and the immortal, the human and the eternal are resolved; so too are politics and spirituality, Ireland and the universe of nations. It is a resolution of that conflict between self and alterity that underlay the Irish Literary Revival and for which the question of national identity was merely catalyst and metaphor. As a resolution it is as effective as that of W. B. Yeats in his later poetry and James Joyce in his fiction, if perhaps not as impressive because less fictional and imaginative, more philosophical.

For *The Interpreters* is not really a novel, as AE in his Preface admits. "I was not interested in the creation of characters but in tracking political moods back to spiritual origins." To do this he uses the symposium which seems an appropriate form for the democratic side of AE, but Northrop Frye might remind us of other appeals it made to AE the Revivalist writer when he remarks that "Most of the Renaissance humanists show a strong sense of the importance of symposium and dialogue, the social and educational aspects respectively of an elite culture."¹⁴ It is AE who comes closest of all the Revivalists to recalling for us, through an encyclopedic interest and refined concern for humanity, the ethos of Renaissance humanism. For the form to accommodate AE's other side, the transcendentalist, was not so difficult, given the association of the symposium with Plato, but it did require him to draw the characters into the unanimity of

one dominant voice, AE's, which, though it might be autobiographically satisfying, sacrificed, especially in the case of Brehon who changes shamelessly from O'Grady into the author, any autonomy of character; it also sacrifices AE's humanism on the altar of AE's mysticism. *The Interpreters* at the end and upon a second reading becomes less a symposium than a transformation and imitation of the pre-humanist *immram*. It is a spiritual and philosophical journey in which, until Brehon's high nonsensical words and Lavelle's exaltation upon hearing them, various philosophical positions on the map of intellect take the role of place in the spiritual landscape of the Old Irish *immrama*. *The Interpreters* is a voyage-tale where ideas, not places are visited, but one that ends in a vision whose resemblance to the *físi* is more literal. In that vision, contraries are harmonized in "that multitudinous meditation which is the universe."¹⁵

NOTES

¹*We Two Together* (Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1950).

²*The Interpreters* (London: Macmillan, 1922), p. viii. All references are to this edition.

³See AE's "Priest or Hero?" in *The Irish Theosophist*, 5 (1896-7), 127-131, 148-52.

⁴According to George Sigerson, a Revival scholar, poets were judges until their incomprehensible technical language forced princes to add laymen to the court. "Irish Literature: Its Origin, Environment, and Influence," in Charles Gavan Duffy, George Sigerson and Douglas Hyde, *The Revival of Irish Literature* (1894; rpt. New York: Lemma, 1973), p. 74.

⁵*That Myriad-Minded Man: A Biography of George William Russell, "A.E." 1867-1935* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1975), p. 212.

⁶*In Imaginations and Reveries* (Dublin: Maunsel & Co., 1915).

⁷*The Candle of Vision* (New York: University Books, 1965), pp. 137-142.

⁸*James, Seumas & Jacques. Unpublished Writings of James Stephens*, ed. Lloyd Frankenberg (New York: Macmillan, 1964), p. 120.

⁹Frankenberg, p. 113.

¹⁰"Ideals of the New Rural Society," in *Imaginations and Reveries*, p. 101.

¹¹Henry Summerfield sees in Rian something of the young Yeats and perhaps John Hughes the sculptor (*That Myriad-Minded Man*, p. 212). Rian promotes aesthetic harmony, even uniformity as Lavelle, Culain, Heyt and Brehon (as AE) respectively promote its national, socialist, imperialist and transcendental equivalent. (*Rian* in Irish means order, arrangement, system.)

¹*The Letters of W. B. Yeats*, ed. Allan Wade (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), p. 294.

²*The Candle of Vision*, p. 75.

³*Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1971), p. 59.

⁴*Imaginations and Reveries*, p. x.

For the Alternate Guide:

83E

18. 8. 78.

the heat
above the hills
takes the birds

up
an eagle
on the thermal

circuit
the copper wings
my lips

around your breath

Monty Reid