



1970

Children Who Dance Under the Moon: Calvinistic Concepts of Depravity in Selected Progeny of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry James, Projecting to William Golding and Tennessee Williams

Norma G. Rooney
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Rooney, Norma G., "Children Who Dance Under the Moon: Calvinistic Concepts of Depravity in Selected Progeny of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry James, Projecting to William Golding and Tennessee Williams" (1970). *Dissertations*. Paper 1053.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1053

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © Norma G. Rooney

**CHILDREN WHO DANCE UNDER THE MOON:
CALVINISTIC CONCEPTS OF DEPRAVITY IN SELECTED
PROGENY OF NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE AND HENRY JAMES,
PROJECTING TO WILLIAM GOLDING AND TENNESSEE WILLIAMS**

by

Norma G. Rooney

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

January

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Most directly, the writer is indebted to Agnes McNeill Donohue, Ph.D., whose numerous suggestions, intelligent counsel, and constant encouragement to scholarship have contributed so importantly to the completion of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. "EVEN AMONG CHILDREN"--JOHN CALVIN	9
II. AMERICAN CALVINISM AND THE CHILD	29
"The Easiest Room in Hell"--Michael Wigglesworth	
"'Tis an Hereditary Distemper"--Cotton Mather	
"But Are Young Vipers"--Jonathan Edwards	
III. "A BROOD OF BABY FIENDS"--NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE . .	83
IV. "WOONG THEIR VICTIMS FORTH"--HENRY JAMES	180
V. PROJECTION: THE DEPRAVED CHILD STILL AT LARGE. .	278
"The Beast in Us"--William Golding	
"Black, Plucked Little Birds"-- Tennessee Williams	
CONCLUSION	313
BIBLIOGRAPHY	323
APPENDIX	341

INTRODUCTION

The study of man is limitless. The physicist may study man as a body, or he may merely study the motion of bodies. The psychologist may concentrate his study on the mind of man, while philosophers and theologians study the passions and will of man. Man may also be studied by his conscious and unconscious acts.

The methods of studying man have increased over the centuries, but the subject is constant. What has always interested students of the nature of man, under any discipline, is the identity of the reality or essence of man. The identification, of course, must include not only a logical definition of man's being, but also a description of qualities and a list of man's philosophical properties.

After all the introspection that has been done on the human mind, man is still able to make only a few conclusions about his own nature. Is he free? Is he rational? Does he have an immortal soul? What is the principle of life?

The nature of man's origin has, of course, a most important bearing on all answers to questions about man. Mythologically man traces himself back to the gods. Through evolution, he finds that he may be in a process of developing from an ancestral archetype. In Christianity man's origin is

the image of God, although Christianity does not deny that man has the darkened attributes of Adam after the Fall. Thus, man keeps on questioning, for it is important for him to identify his nature if he is to know his place in the universe.

Since colonial times, however, American writers have demonstrated interest in the grimmer characteristics of man's innate disposition. The Puritan divines, especially, proclaimed the negative concepts of man's nature. In fact, their belief in the sovereignty of God and man's disobedience through Adam necessitated that they depict man as a denial of all that they believed by faith about the infinite. Much of their reasoning about man and much of their denial of his worth stemmed from the view of man's nature held by John Calvin; however, Calvin alone was not completely responsible for the Puritan idea of man's nature. The Puritans borrowed elsewhere theologically and also developed their own definitions and concepts of man's human and spiritual condition:

It is true, the Puritans were Calvinists if we mean that they more or less agreed with the great theologian of Geneva. They held, that is, that men had fallen into a state of sin, that in order to be saved they must receive from God a special infusion of Grace, that God gives the grace to some and not to others out of His own Sovereign pleasure, and that therefore from the beginning of time certain souls were "predestined" to heaven and others sentenced to damnation. But if the New Englanders were Calvinists, it was because they happened to agree with Calvin; they approved his doctrine not because he taught it, but because it seemed

inescapably indicated when they studied scripture or observed the actions of man.¹

Such indemonstrable and intangible tenets, then, as the sovereignty of God, the total depravity of man, predestination, election, damnation, original sin, etc., were to the Puritans rationally inescapable predications about man's human situation.

None of these doctrines, however, can be satisfactorily applied to man in literature, if these doctrines are used by authors only after their characters have complicated human nature experientially in this world. When doctrines that point toward corruption are offered as principles for depraved conduct of adult characters,² the claim may be made that the depravity was induced by institutions, society, or other worldly organizations that adventitiously corrupt man. Calvin's definition of man's worldly nature makes worldly influences unnecessary:

Hence, even infants bringing their condemnation with them from their mother's womb, suffer not for another's, but for their own defect. For although they have not yet produced the fruits of their own unrighteousness, they have the seed implanted in them. Nay, their whole nature is, as it were, a seed-bed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious

¹Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson, The Puritans, rev. ed.; (New York 1963), I, 56.

²"To a considerable extent the conservative Calvinist tradition . . . worked out rationally consistent implications of key doctrines that it found in the Bible. For example, some of its spokesmen so interpreted the doctrine of divine election as to set beside it, as on the same level, the doctrine of reprobation." John B. Cobb, Jr., Living Options in Protestant Theology: A Survey of Methods (Philadelphia 1962), p. 139.

and abominable to God. Hence it follows, that it is properly deemed sinful in the sight of God; for there could be no condemnation without guilt.¹

In order, then, for an author to depict man prior to the possibility of external corruption, he is required to examine man in his most primary condition--morally and intellectually--and to examine his early overt conduct as it develops through his latent faculties. Since these examinations are only possible theoretically, the most practical approach is to minimize the overt, worldly influences. The obvious character for the almost objective investigation of inherited nature is a child--not the child as defined sentimentally by the Victorians or by those who apply the doctrine of perfectibility to man, but the child as he is defined in early American writing. The early American divines understood that the child is as complicated as the adult and that the behavior of children defies any simple or sentimental explanation.

The definition of a child's human predicament, as expressed and as promulgated by such early writers as Wigglesworth, Sewall, and Mather, is, regardless of any author's faith or belief, dramatically more effective than a sentimentalized version of the child's human nature, because inherited evil can never be fully known or completely explored, even in literature.

¹John Calvin, Institutes of The Christian Religion, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964), I, 217-218. All subsequent references shall be merely to the Institutes and shall be taken from the translation by Beveridge.

Thus it arouses man's everpresent curiosity about forbidden knowledge. Additionally, those authors who use the concept of inherited sin may advance a compromise with the concept of depravity. They may avoid committing themselves to a totally pessimistic view by providing man with a free will to choose good or evil. Another possibility open to an author, enabling him to avoid complete pessimism, is to depict God as being activated to mercy, even for a corrupted mankind. Authors desiring to introduce man's basic conflict, good versus evil, into their writings have a wider and deeper subject to probe if they see man as being in a spiritually fallen state or as having a weakened spiritual nature, rather than man as wholly good. In literature, doubt about man's original nature or man characterized as fallen or weakened can lead into the realms of the tragic or the epic, while a simple or sentimental view imposes the limitations of shallowness of theme and character, especially causing the child to be the perennial subordinate in his confrontations with the adult world, if not always its victim. The child character, to be effective, must be able to instigate moral evil positively, not only to bring it about indirectly. To be artistically effective in a story developing juvenile evil, the child must be more than an object of adult conduct; he must also be the subject of his own conduct and certainly the motivating force behind the moral conduct of his associates. If he is always the victim of circumstances or entirely subject to

the will of others, he is soon reduced not only to a sentimental figure but also to a pathetic character, lacking in identity and failing to arouse any true human empathy.

This theme has been chosen for study because of an existing interest in literature by American authors on the subject of man's origin and nature. The purpose or end of the thesis, however, is limited to an attempt to present the Calvinistic and American-Puritan concepts of original sin and universal moral depravity--the fallen nature of man--and also to demonstrate that these concepts are applicable to children and to youth. Additionally, the end or purpose of the thesis is to investigate, from an analysis of the literary works of the early colonial writers, the Calvinistic doctrine that children have in them the devils of their fathers and to reveal the fact that this heritage of sin persists in child characters throughout American literature. Wigglesworth, Mather, and Edwards, in their writings and sermons, not only fully articulate the moral nature of the child but also present the accepted doctrine that children can be possessed by the devils of their immediate fathers or by the devils of fathers as remote as Adam.

Additionally, it is the intention of this thesis to demonstrate that this expression of the Puritan principle of the heritage of sin continues throughout early American literature and into the nineteenth century. Thus, for the purpose of investigating the theme in the literature of the nineteenth

century, selected works of both Hawthorne and Henry James have been chosen. It is believed that a study of these two major American writers will reveal that they effectively applied the principle of inherited sin in their artistic creation of the child character.

To illustrate further the continuing interest in the child as depraved, and to demonstrate that the concept of the child in literature has not become completely enveloped in psychological secularization and sentimentality, Tennessee Williams' Suddenly Last Summer and William Golding's Lord of the Flies will be introduced into the thesis, but with the limitation that these two works are used only as cases in point to project the concept of inherited childhood depravity into contemporary literature. This projection is used to suggest the possibilities for further study in American literature,¹ and also to suggest that Golding's employment of the concept indicates that the theme is possibly not limited to American writers.

¹The interest in the depraved child has carried over successfully to films: "On Sunday through Wednesday of next week, Trinz has scheduled a 'little monsters' festival under the general heading, 'Are These Our Children?' Among the films included are obvious choices like 'Lolita,' 'Lord of the Flies' and 'Tiger Bay.' But Trinz, an encyclopedic memory and a vast knowledge of films, has also programmed some movies that aren't obvious choices, but good ones: 'War of the Buttons,' Bunuel's 'Young and the Damned' and Audrey Hepburn and Shirley MacLaine in 'Children's Hour.'" Roger Ebert, "Movies Mated with a Method," Chicago Sun-Times, August 18, 1967, p. 56.

An examination of theses similar to this study reveals that no analysis or investigation of the child character in literature has been done within the terms of the Calvinistic system that is part of the American literary tradition. Previous studies, which will be referred to throughout this text, have investigated the child's innocence or the effects on the child of his confrontation with the adult world, but no previous study has demonstrated the child as effective in manifesting the nature of man as seen by American writers; therefore, the present investigation has been undertaken to study the child character within the terms of American Calvinism that define and characterize man's human condition.

CHAPTER I

"EVEN AMONG CHILDREN"---JOHN CALVIN

History has frequently and voluminously declared the importance of Calvin's doctrines, emanating from Geneva through Northern Europe, France, and into England and the New World. The purpose here, however, is not to investigate Calvinism in America as a systematic theology, but to investigate its expression by selected writers. This investigation is possible because the importance of Calvin extends beyond his theology. McNeill, for example, in his evaluation of Calvin as an influence, establishes a summary view of him as one of the "makers of the modern mind,"¹ and his Institutes as the "whole of his theology" from which "other writers gravitate," considering Calvin not only as a theologian but also as a man of literature.

Any definition of Calvinism is complicated and difficult, but in this text Calvinism will be understood to mean:

. . . the entire body of conceptions, theological, ethical, philosophical, social, political, which, under the influence of the master mind of John Calvin, raised

¹John T. McNeill, History and Character of Calvinism (New York, 1954), p. ix.

itself to dominance in the Protestant land of the post-Reformation age, and has left a permanent mark not only upon the thought of mankind, but upon the life-history of men, the social order of civilized peoples, and even the political organization of states.¹

More than a theology, Calvinism was a new system of thought, leaving an indelible mark upon mankind.² Impressive though the influence, extension, and definition of Calvinism may be, its basic characteristics do rise out of the referent terms of theology that are frequently reduced to five basic points:

1. Total Depravity. This point asserts man's sinfulness through Adam, and it also asserts the inability of man to aid his own salvation. God is sovereign in all things; man is nothing but the source of evil. Man destroys the harmony God intended and deserves to be cast aside.³

2. Unconditional Election. God has no obligation to save even one man, but God is free to "elect" or choose whomever he pleases. Since God has foreknowledge about salvation, he knows who will be saved. Thus election or reprobation is predetermined.⁴

¹Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, Calvin and Augustine (Philadelphia, 1956), p. 287.

²As a point of information, it may be interesting to note that the Institutes has been included in the Great Books program and that Will Durant calls it "one of the ten books that shook the world."

³Rod W. Horton and Herbert W. Edwards, Backgrounds of American Literary Thought (New York, [1952/]), p. 20.

⁴Ibid., p. 21.

3. Limited Atonement. Christ did not die for all men, but only for the elect. If Christ had not died, however, none could be saved. Christ's death is a positive indication of God's love for man.¹

4. Irresistible Grace. God's grace can neither be earned nor rejected. It is defined as "the transfiguring power of God, offering newness of life, forgiveness of sins, the power to resist temptation, and a wonderful peace of mind and heart."²

5. Perseverance of the Saints. The elect have the power to do God's will. If man could reject the grace of God after having once received it, man would be "asserting his power over that of God, and in Calvinism this is impossible."³

Although the five points were not new, they were reaffirmed at the Synod of Dort as being necessary to salvation and derived from Holy Scripture. The reduction of Calvinism to these five points came as an answer to part of the interminable argument and debate with the five points of Arminianism.⁴ (See the Appendix for a history of the development of the Calvinistic-Puritan church in America.)

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas, The Five Points of Calvinism Defined, Defended, Documented (Philadelphia, 1965), p. 19.

Not discounting the fact that there will be references made to the other basic points of Calvinistic doctrine, the concern in the present thesis is with total depravity and its specific application to children in American writing. Basically, then, establishing an accurate but working definition is necessary for any discussion of the Calvinistic concept of the doctrine of total depravity:

The adjective "total" does not mean that each sinner is as totally or completely corrupt in his actions and thoughts as it is possible for him to be. Instead, the word "total" is used to indicate that the whole of man's being has been affected by sin. The corruption extends to every part of man, his body and soul; sin has affected all (the totality) of man's faculties--his mind, his will, etc.¹

This total depravity of all the parts of man is more important in Calvinism than is the degree of depravity in any one part. It is not difficult to understand that the purpose of the doctrine was to aid man in discovering his identity, in knowing his true nature, and in knowing his place in the universe and his relation to God. Affirmatively, the doctrine is really a support for the concept of the sovereignty of God. God is everything, and man, consequently, must be nothing in parts. Logically, if the parts have no positive attributes, the whole of man must also be nothing but dependent on God. This negative view of the nature of man is especially true of the Calvinism of the seventeenth century which stressed the glory of God.

¹Ibid., p. 25.

Even though man is defined as nothing, this definition does not reduce him to dullness or stupidity. His evil nature makes him cunning and intellectually elusive. Thus, even though he may be depraved, man may be interesting. Additionally, a man's depraved nature does not mean that he is not among God's elect. If he is among the elect, his struggle in this world will be rewarded by God; if he is not among the elect, he will receive what his depraved nature deserves, and that is damnation. There is no denying that the early Calvinists were realists: Man should struggle and hope for the best, but he should expect no more than damnation.

Since the reduction of man's nature to total depravity does not simplify his nature, the next point of interest becomes the effects or results of this total depravity on both man's internal nature and his overt actions. Briefly the following summary description of man is a compilation of the effects of the doctrine of total depravity:

Men are born in sin as a result of Adam's transgression, and they must be reborn through the Spirit.¹ Because of the fall, men are incapable of knowing spiritual truth, for their minds are "darkened by sin."² Unless sinners are "born into God's kingdom through the regenerating power of the Spirit,"

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 26.

they remain under the power of the devil.¹ No man is righteous because the "reign of sin is universal."² Finally, man, in the state of sin, is unable to help himself to believe the gospel, and man cannot change his own nature or prepare himself for salvation.³

The cause of sin is Adam's transgression, which was a free act; but sin requires a new spiritual birth in each man to overcome the moral death, resulting from Adam's original transgression, which opposed authority and now reproduces itself in all men. Without a rebirth, man stays a child of the devil. There is no neutral ground, for without regeneration sin reigns universally. Again, then, man is saved only by the will of God, since man is corrupted in all parts and unable to raise his spiritual state from one of enslavement.

Consequently, when Calvin discusses evil in the innate disposition of man, his discussion includes man from his conception to his death; therefore, Calvin denies that children are born innocently in their instincts, desires, and appetites. Infantile nature is part of fallen nature, sins by necessity, and participates in the doctrines of predestination, election, man's inability to aid his own salvation, and other theological

¹Ibid., p. 27.

²Ibid., p. 28.

³Ibid., p. 29.

principles of Calvin's system. Calvin himself speaks of evil as existing by heredity rather than by habit:

We say, then, that man is corrupted by a natural viciousness, but not by one which proceeded from nature. In saying that it proceeded not from nature, we mean that it was rather an adventitious event which befell man, than a substantial property assigned to him from the beginning. We, however, call it natural to prevent any one from supposing that each individual contracts it by depraved habit, whereas all receive it by a hereditary law.¹

Obviously, in the quoted passage, Calvin speaks of mankind universally, and relates man in a brotherhood of sin. He includes children in this brotherhood by theological necessity and consistency, for he establishes the nature of man as originally depraved by "hereditary law" and not only subject to temptation and actual sin in this world but avidly espousing evil. This results, of course, from a corrupted human ancestry.

The Calvinistic acceptance of the doctrine of depravity² as applicable to children stresses the importance of religious education at an early age. In America, Mather, Sewall, Wigglesworth, and Edwards stressed religious education of the child and youth. This stress was not unusual, for education and "religious precocity" were assumptions for children ranging in age from two to five. Jonathan Edwards, as a matter of fact,

¹Institutes, I, 219.

²Calvin defined depravity: "Thus our feeling of ignorance, vanity, want, weakness, in short, depravity and corruption, reminds us . . . that in the Lord, and none but He, dwell the true light of wisdom, solid virtue, exuberant goodness." Institutes, I, 38.

wrote like an adult at twelve, and Timothy Dwight was prepared for college at eight.¹ Precociousness does not mean, however, that a "pert child" could not be delirious or bewitched,² so that all gifted children were not necessarily of the elect. However, "in other words, the main business of education was to prepare children for conversion by teaching them the doctrines and moral precepts of Christianity."³

In fact, within the Puritan faith, this attitude toward children remained unchanged until the nineteenth century. Although the Puritan child participated extensively in church life, he had little or no real identification as an individual.⁴ Within a Puritan family, obviously, exposing a child to correction by means of child psychology was hardly the ultimate in discipline, for youth had to mature early, as seen by the average age for entering college and the professions. Morally, however, Fleming, in his study of the Puritan family, states that the then "current view" was the "doctrine of total depravity, identifying the child with the unregenerate."⁵

¹A. W. Calhoun, A Social History of the American Family, Vol. I: Colonial Period (Cleveland, 1917), 110.

²Ibid., p. 111.

³Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Family, rev. ed.; (New York, 1966), p. 90.

⁴Sanford Fleming, Children and Puritanism (New Haven, 1933), p. 59.

⁵Ibid., p. 61.

Not only were children identified with the unregenerate, but they had an acute sense of sin and expressed it in the terminology of adults.¹ Based on the following, such expression should not seem unusual:

Had we no positive evidence whatever we could assume that a system which was marked so strongly by repression on the one hand, and emotional excess on the other; which regarded conversion in such rigid fashion; and which stressed so strongly the doctrines of the sovereignty of God, human depravity and inability and irresistible grace, would have no place for the child as a child, but would regard him merely as a subject of sin who must pass into an experience of grace under the stress of great emotion.²

By placing the sovereignty of God in close approximation to man's depravity, Fleming emphasizes the seventeenth-century stress on the principle that God is all and man is nothing, and that conversion is closely related to the emotions as well as to the intellect. Thus, a child demonstrating the necessary emotional conviction could arrive at conversion, regardless of any lack of intellectual appreciation of doctrine. Even during the Great Awakening, it was not unusual for children to be cited as unregenerate and "the most hardened sinners and equally sinful and equally in need of conversion."³

¹Ibid., p. 153.

²Ibid., pp. 61-62.

³Ibid., p. 14.

From Calvin's definition of the source and effect of human depravity and from the attitude of the American Puritan¹ in his accepting this doctrine, it becomes less difficult to correlate the major doctrines of Calvinism that pertained to the nature of man, namely, those stressed during the seventeenth century: original sin, damnation of the unregenerate, election, and predestination. When Calvin accepts disobedience as the beginning of the Fall, he means that man first became subject to lying, and from this proceeded to infidelity, ambition, pride, and unthankfulness.² Since disobedience was the beginning of the universal Fall, Calvin places a heavy penalty on the child in this world who opposes parental authority as man opposed the authority of God:

Moreover, while the Lord promises the blessing of present life to children who show proper respect to their parents, he, at the same time, intimates that an inevitable curse is impending over the rebellious and disobedient; and, that it may not fail of execution, he, in his law, pronounces sentence of death upon them, and orders it to be inflicted. If they escape the judgment, he, in some way or other, will execute vengeance. . . . But if any do escape till extreme old age, yet, because deprived of the blessing of God in this life, they only languish on in wickedness, and are reserved for severer punishment in the world to come; they are far from participating in the blessing promised to obedient children.³

¹The term Puritan refers to a particular Protestant outlook expressed in the late sixteenth and seventeenth century in England and New England. Denominationally, the Puritans comprised primarily Presbyterian, Congregational and Baptist groups. In religious viewpoint, most of them represented a vital Calvinist tradition." John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, Protestant Christianity (New York, 1954), p. 99.

²Institutes, I, 213.

³Ibid., I, 346.

Disobedience, then, is a curse of the depraved nature that can be transmitted through original sin to posterity, corrupting a nature that was once spiritually good. Surely, rebellious and disobedient children were constantly reminded that such an attitude was an expression of their original sin, bringing with it full condemnation. No interpretation alleviating this awful conclusion could be introduced, for Calvin had called even Pelagius into error for saying that Adam sinned alone, not committing his posterity to his fallen nature; for Scripture proved to Calvin and the Puritans that the sin was "not by imitation but by propagation":

The orthodox, therefore, and more especially Augustine, laboured to show, that we are not corrupted by acquired wickedness, but bring an innate corruption from the very womb. It was the greatest impudence to deny this. But no man will wonder at the presumption of the Pelagians and Celestians, who has learned from the writings of that holy man how extreme the effrontery of these heretics was. Surely there is no ambiguity in David's confession, "I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. li. 5). His object in the passage is not to throw blame on his parents; but the better to commend the goodness of God towards him, he properly reiterates the confession of impurity from his very birth. As it is clear, that there was no peculiarity in David's case, it follows that it is only an instance of the common lot of the whole human race.¹

Adam, then, became the "depository" of the gifts of God and lost all that God gave him when he lost these, and this "pollution extends to all his seed."² As God is not blamed by Calvin for

¹Ibid., I, 214.

²Ibid., I, 216.

man's fallen nature, neither may the child blame his parent, for the point is to praise God for any goodness shown to so deplorable and despicable a nature as man's. Calvin relies both on Scripture and logic for his conclusion, citing David's confession from the Psalms and then, because of David's accepted position, drawing a conclusion from his premise for the whole of the race, which Calvin, obviously, meant to apply to infants literally as well as to man figuratively: "Children come not by spiritual regeneration but carnal descent."¹ Quoting from Augustine, Calvin adds:

"Both the condemned unbeliever and the acquitted believer beget offspring not acquitted but condemned, because the nature which begets is corrupt." Moreover, though godly parents do in some measure contribute to the holiness of their offspring, this is by the blessing of God; a blessing, however, which does not prevent the primary and universal curse of the whole race from previously taking effect. Guilt is from nature, whereas sanctification is from supernatural grace.²

The regeneration or spiritual birth of a man does not extend to acquitting his children, since any grace a man receives is given directly and personally to him from God, while his children descend carnally from his nature; consequently, original sin relates closely, if not identically, to natural depravity. Calvin does directly predicate this identification and cites its effects in man's nature:

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., I, 216-217.

Now, it has been previously shown . . . that original sin is the depravity and corruption of our nature, which first makes us liable to the wrath of God, and then produces in us works which Scripture terms the works of the flesh (Gal. 19). The two things, therefore, must be distinctly observed--viz. that we are vitiated and perverted in all parts of our nature, and then, on account of this corruption, are justly held to be condemned and convicted before God, to whom nothing is acceptable but purity, innocence, and righteousness. And hence, even infants bring their condemnation with them from their mother's womb; for although they have not yet brought forth the fruits of their unrighteousness, they have its seed included in them.¹

The advance in thought here over the previous statement of a similar nature is that Calvin sees original sin as the depravity and corruption of human nature, making human nature "liable" to judgment and also compelling it to commit actual sin in this life. Thus, when man sins, it is by his very nature, and his works become like that nature--corrupt. Indirectly Calvin is also arguing that man condemns himself--condemnation is not from God; therefore, any mercy from God shows him as benevolent, for man alone convicts himself before God. Eventually, Calvin cites the doctrines of election and predestination as extreme acts of mercy, since the nature of man asks only for condemnation. This attitude was true for Luther as well as for Calvin: they both saw man as unable to rely on himself. Further, any attempt to rely on alleged abilities was again an expression of revolt. Man's attempt to rely on himself is the ultimate in revolt, and

¹Ibid., II, 518.

is "corruption at the point of his noblest ambition, his desire to be related to God."¹

In Book III of the Institutes, Calvin anticipates the reprobate who may call out that he cannot escape human nature and thus, in justice, stands excused from damnation on this basis. Calvin denies even the positing of such an argument when he declares:

They cannot impute this corruption to God, because he bears testimony to the goodness of His creation. For though, by the eternal providence of God, man was formed for the calamity under which he lies, he took the matter of it from himself, not from God, since the only cause of his destruction was his degenerating from the purity of his creation into a state of vice and impurity.²

To summarize briefly the concept of the nature of man based on the Institutes, Calvin shows man in Book I as totally depraved in all his parts, unable to help himself spiritually, in bondage to an evil nature; in Book II Calvin's definition of depravity, supported through Scripture, again deliberately fails to affirm any positive quality of the nature of man; in Book III Calvin anticipates man's denial of guilt by evasion, imputing his corruption to God; and finally, in Book IV the corruption becomes twofold--inherent in man's nature and extending to all his works. Thus, Calvin excoriates man, not only because he is totally depraved but because he is inextricably involved in this depravity by his own volition.

¹Dillenberger and Welch, p. 30.

²Institutes, II, 233.

The doctrine of predestination,¹ which seems so arbitrary to the opponents of Calvinism, was, of course, not new in theology, for it can be found in the writings of St. Augustine and in the catechism of the Anglican Church. Calvin, however, calls predestination a "dispensation of divine justice . . . because it is certain that those predestined to that condition [damnation] were not unworthy of it."² In predestination, then, Calvin finds the mercy of God, not the justice of God, for none are just. Again, man's failure to qualify for justice comes through his Adamic inheritance:³

But whether they will allow it or not, predestination is manifest in Adam's posterity. It was not owing to nature that they all lost salvation by the fault of one parent. Why should they refuse to admit with regard to one man that which against their will they admit with regard to the whole human race? Why should they in cavilling lose their labour? Scripture proclaims that all were, in the person of one, made liable to eternal death. As this cannot be ascribed to nature, it is plain that it is owing to the wonderful counsel of God. It is very absurd in these worthy defenders of the justice of God to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. I again ask how it is that the fall of Adam involves so many nations with their infant children in eternal death without remedy, unless that it so seemed meet to God? Here the most loquacious tongues must be

¹Calvin moved from faith to predestination to demonstrate God as the author of faith. Double predestination is a "guarantee against any concept of merit," and a final decision that God alone controls our end. Dillenberger and Welch, p. 34.

²Institutes, II, 232.

³Calvin stresses that man's natural depravity does not proceed from nature; that is, it is not a "substantial property," but is man's by "hereditary law." Ibid., I, 219.

dumb. The decree, I admit, is dreadful; and yet is impossible to deny that God foreknew what the end of man was to be before he made him,¹ and foreknew, because he had so ordained by his decree.

Although, in this statement, Calvin admits predestination to be a "dreadful" decree, more importantly, it is the only hope of some, and man must not speak of the unfairness of the doctrine, since man deserves nothing: "Man falls by his own fault." Human nature must curse and condemn itself rather than argue against the predestination and election which is God's decision. The foreknowledge that God has does not make him responsible for man's actions. In reality, the doctrine frustrates man, because election is entirely God's will and man can do nothing to gain or lose salvation. According to Calvin, man should not even question the doctrine, since God has no obligation to render salvation to any, and God becomes an arbitrary deity only when the original principle of man's meriting nothing is refused by man.

Even the elect, however, do not find life necessarily pleasant, for they, too, must be purged. Also, they must be made obedient, and, even though purged, they will be set upon by evils. Finally, the life of the elect is one long conflict, or a "daily struggling with the evil by which we are entangled."²

¹Ibid., II, 231-232.

²Institutes, I, 520.

Within such an entanglement, baptism becomes extremely important to the nature of man, for even though Calvinists believed the elect were predestined for heaven, baptism, instituted by Christ, was not a neglected sacrament. Krauth¹ presents historically the Calvinistic position on baptism. In summary, he clarifies the orthodox position by stating that baptism seals the grace of regeneration, that Christ took on no sins except those of the elect, and that the grace of baptism is conferred by the Holy Spirit only according to the will of God.² It is in the manner of baptism that elect infants must be acknowledged; however, "the doctrine of genuine Calvinism then is that there are reprobate infants who are left to the total penalty which original sin brings and merits."³ No assumption must be made that the child of any believer is elect, for: "Not all baptized children are true regenerate Christians, who shall be saved; for God the Lord hath reserved to Himself His secret foreknowledge toward children, also, yet unborn."⁴ Interestingly enough, baptism is not a conversion or a spiritual

¹C. P. Krauth, Infant Baptism and Infant Salvation in the Calvinistic System (Philadelphia, 1874), p. 14.

²The lengthy and impressive discussion in Krauth relies especially on the following authorities: Heidegger (Corpus Theologiae), Witsius (Mis. Sac. II), and, of course, the Westminster Confession (XXVIII.VI), cited in Krauth, p. 14.

³Ibid., p. 19.

⁴Masson (Becman) VI.90, cited in Krauth, p. 20.

rebirth, for in the Calvinistic system one is baptized "not in order to obtain Grace, but because it is already present."¹ The elect child is predestined to salvation because he begins in faith, not because of parental spirituality or because of the administering of the sacrament of baptism. Even though there is never absolute evidence that a child is among the elect, the spirituality of the parents is propitious in influencing their decision to baptize the child. The children of nonbelievers, however, are more easily dealt with: They are denied baptism.

The moral attitude of the Calvinists persisted long after the religious conviction had disappeared.² Surprisingly, neither the earlier nor the later statements by the Calvinists are as far removed from a modern psychological viewpoint as would at first seem obvious, for in her discussion of the nature of the child, Bender offers a summary view:

However, the belief in instinctual destructive aggression in children has been advanced by many in the field of child psychology, psychopathology, and pedagogy. The child has been seen as instinctively destructive, and needing to acquire inhibitions, sublimations, and discipline for inborn infantile hostility and death wishes.³

The aggressive instincts singled out in the above report characterize the newborn with aggression, destruction, and a

¹Krauth, p. 29.

²Horton and Edwards, p. 47.

³Lauretta Bender, M.D., Aggression, Hostility, and Anxiety in Children (Springfield, Ill., 1953), p. 138.

need for inhibitions and discipline. Such instincts definitely reveal the propensity or inclination of men to be "estranged from the womb." Thus, regardless of the cloaking of the basic description of man in scientific vocabulary, the "instinctual destructive aggression" recognized by the psychologist and the "wicked estrangement" recognized by the theologian show some agreement about the human predicament.

In further support of this agreement is the report of Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud:

It is one of the recognized aims of education to deal with the aggressions of the child's nature, i.e., in the course of the first four or five years, to change the child's attitude toward these impulses in himself. . . . The danger, i.e., from a world war, lies in the fact that the destruction raging in the outer world may meet the very real aggressiveness which rages inside the child. Children have to be safe-guarded against the primitive forces of the war, not because horrors or atrocities are so strange to them, but because we want them at the decisive stage of their development to overcome and estrange themselves from the primitive and atrocious wishes of their infantile nature.¹

The aggression diagnosed in the report of Burlingham and Freud is unfavorable to the character of man, since the desire of the psychologists is to change these aggressions as soon as possible. Psychologists readily admit that the "real aggression" rages inside the child, opposing even such open and public influences as war. From the aggressive nature proceeds the outward act of destruction, or, as the Calvinistic divine

¹Anna Freud and Dorothy T. Burlingham, War and Children (New York, 1943), pp. 22-23.

would say, sin. Psychology, therefore, supports the position that the nature of man, from his beginning, is not simple, nor is it innocent; it may possess "primitive and atrocious wishes." The Calvinist would be the first to say that the atrocious wishes are not strange to man, for did he not once destroy the nature God gave to him, and has he not inherited the same wish? Man's will, then, is aggressive, and his aggressiveness tends toward destruction, even of himself. Although they could not agree upon the cause or source of man's unfavorable nature, the psychologist and the Calvinist see the potential and the actual in man, see the dangers of destruction in that nature, and desire strongly that the inherited attitudes of early childhood be changed for the preservation of the individual and the race.

The early American writers did not anticipate that their attitudes would be demonstrated and supported by modern psychology; they were merely accepting Scripture's definition of man and, observing the conduct of both adult and child, they did not find it too difficult to apply to their own progeny the "damnatory" Scriptural definition of human nature and its inheritance by posterity.

CHAPTER II

AMERICAN CALVINISM AND THE CHILD

The American Puritans of the seventeenth century accepted the tenet of the complete sovereignty of God, and logically accepted its corollary or drawn consequence, that man is totally depraved. These Puritans, like Calvinists generally, believed in the sovereignty of God in all things, in his ordering and governing of man and nature.¹ They accepted God's sovereignty so completely that "even sin could not be excluded from His providential activity, though he was not held accountable for it. The guilt for sin was man's because of the Fall."² In the sense of God's complete authority over nature, events, and man, therefore, the Puritans believed in a theological determination. In this determination, however, man alone assumed total guilt for his sins. Logically, then, the Puritans had to declare man's nature unworthy, in contrast to God's nature as perfect. The prime factor in making man execrable was his exercising of his free choice to commit sin

¹Dillenberger and Welch, p. 100.

²Ibid.

at the Fall.¹ Thus, the American Puritan held to the core of Calvinism--the sovereignty of God and the total unworthiness of man.

Though not entirely a transfer of the attitude of English Calvinism, the theological attitude of seventeenth-century Massachusetts toward the natures of God and man came primarily from England. To clarify the attitude of the American Puritans toward the natures of God and man, Rooy, in his monograph about the Puritan mission, first presents the beliefs concerning man's nature held by two Nonconformists in England, Richard Baxter (1615-1691) and Richard Sibbes (1557-1635). Since Sibbes was the divine who strongly influenced John Cotton before Cotton came to America, Sibbes' attitude is most pertinent to American Calvinism. Rooy traces the Puritan tradition through the theology of Sibbes and Baxter to the theology of two American divines, Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards.

Baxter, as quoted in Rooy, presents the following attitude toward man's human predicament:

¹Supralapsarianism asserts that, before the creation of the world, God had decreed who would be saved and who would be damned. Thus, the decision of God concerning man individually had no reference to the Fall (lapsus). On the other hand, infralapsarianism relates God's ordinance to the Fall. In this explanation, God again made his decision concerning man individually before creation; however, when he did this, he included the fact of man's free choice in the Fall. Ibid., p.90.

Now "sinful, guilty, and miserable natures are propagated to all mankind." Those who deny original sin and its deep-rooted effects "go against plain Scripture, reason, and the experience of mankind." God does not impute to men what they are not already. We were seminally, not personally, in Adam; so is our guilt.¹

Baxter is, of course, doing no more in the quoted passage than reflecting Calvin's words that man receives depravity by the "hereditary law."² Furthermore, he allows no denial of man's Adamic inheritance, because man is "seminally" present in Adam's guilt. The word "seminal," however, provides not only for the seed of man's nature but also for his having possibilities of future development. Consequently, under hereditary law, man's guilt is a continuous and developing reality. When the guilt or inherited seed develops, it becomes all those sins that evolve from Adam's original act of disobedience. Original sin is, thus, only logically distinct from actual sin, not really separated from it; for "original sin is the depravity and corruption of our nature, which makes us liable to the wrath of God, and produces in us works which Scripture terms the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 19)."³ In other words, when Adam chose to disobey God, he chose the whole repertory, the stock and store of sin, and he chose it for his posterity, who were potentially, if not personally, present in the Fall.

¹Richard Baxter, The Complete Works, pp. 264-265, as quoted in Sidney H. Rooy, Th.D., The Theology of Missions in the Puritan Tradition (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1965), p. 71.

²Institutes, I, 219.

³Institutes, II, 518.

Agreeing with Baxter's restatement of Calvinism, Rooy points out that Sibbes in his Complete Works supports the Calvinistic definition of man in three senses:

"The corruption of nature through Adam is multiplied by continual sinning." . . . Fallen man is dead in sin. In a sermon on Ephesians 2:1, Sibbes points out that man is dead in sin in these senses. 1. By the "sin of Adam" we are all damned; a corruption of nature results. We cannot act, think, will or choose spiritually. 2. By a "death of sentence;" upon us, not only for Adam's sin, but for actual sins of our own, we add to the condemning judgment already upon us. 3. By being "dead in law" or guilt we are bound over into eternal death.¹

In Sibbes' commentary on man and in the Institutes, nature is adventitiously depraved by the transgression of Adam, but the multiplication of that transgression in Adam's posterity is an inherent and continuing process. Sibbes sees death as a lack of vital spirituality. Thus, spirituality in man is the seat or source of life; the vital part of man is spiritual, is critical, is essential, imparts life or vigor, and is the principle of human life. Any lack of spirituality is death and damnation. Nature in itself, however, is not corrupt, except through Adam, and in this sense Sibbes is paraphrasing Calvin, for Calvin proclaims that man is "corrupted by natural viciousness." But Calvin uses the term "natural" to "prevent any one from supposing that each individual contracts it by depraved habit, whereas all receive it by hereditary law."² Sibbes, of course,

¹Richard Sibbes, The Complete Works, as quoted in Rooy, pp. 18-19.

²Institutes, I, 219.

reflects in the above passage the Calvinistic idea of hereditary law when he says, "the corruption of nature through Adam is multiplied by continual sinning and is an essential effect."

[Italics mine.]

The second sense in which Sibbes describes man is also illustrative of Calvin's view: man depends upon God for extraordinary assistance to gain spirituality, the principle of life. In the third sense Sibbes considers man dead under the law because of Adam's guilt. The proscriptions of Sibbes and Calvin are from the Old Testament, and the "plain" interpretation of that Scripture is also used by both Calvin and Sibbes. It is obvious, therefore, that the Puritan mission, at least in the definitions of the nature of God and man, was one with Calvin's precepts.¹

"The Easiest Room in Hell"--Michael Wigglesworth

The most popular text of seventeenth-century Massachusetts was the Day of Doom, by Michael Wigglesworth.²

¹"We think of the original settlers of New England as 'Calvinists.' So indeed they were, if we mean that in general terms they conceived of man and the universe much as did John Calvin." Perry Miller, Errand Into the Wilderness (New York, 1956), p. 50.

²"The Day of Doom became America's first best seller, circulating 1800 copies during the first year. It has been estimated that at one time one copy was owned by every thirty-five people in all of New England; every other family must have had The Day of Doom on its parlor table." Milton R. Stern and Seymour L. Gross, eds., American Literature Survey, Vol. I: Colonial and Federal to 1800 (New York, 1962), 153.

UCLA
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The poem sets forth the beliefs for which the strong-minded and stronger-willed personalities migrated to America. Wigglesworth himself taught at Harvard, served as a minister to a Puritan congregation, and wrote his grim but popular poem in 1662.¹

The poem represents the religious attitude of the seventeenth-century Puritans, "for the mark of the Puritan was not his human warmth but his zeal, his suspicion of pleasure, his sense of guilt . . ." ² Religious zeal and a sense of guilt are qualities that are most evident in the text of Wigglesworth's infamous poem.³ Such a criticism as "infamous" is, however, a modern evaluation of the poem:

The ideas seem so harsh today that some commentators have supposed erroneously that Wigglesworth was a morbid fanatic. In reality the poem merely dramatizes the abstractions that all orthodox Puritans agreed upon, and it is interesting for its disclosure of Puritan psychology as well as doctrine.⁴

In his versification of Calvin's doctrines, Wigglesworth, like his English predecessors, Sibbes and Baxter, relies heavily

¹Biographical data of Wigglesworth may be obtained in John W. Dean, Memoirs of the Reverend Michael Wigglesworth (Albany, 1871) and in Richard Crowder, No Featherbed to Heaven: A Biography of Michael Wigglesworth, 1631-1705 (East Lansing, Michigan, 1962).

²The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657, ed. by Edmund S. Morgan (New York, 1965), p. ix.

³The text cited throughout the thesis is The Day of Doom, ed. K. B. Murdock (New York, 1929), pp. 9-65, and reprinted in Vol. I: Colonial American Writing, ed. Roy Harvey Pearce (New York, 1950), pp. 233-297. The spelling and punctuation of the text have been maintained throughout.

⁴Stern and Gross, pp. 152-153.

on Scriptural support. He uses 2 Cor. 5:10 and Mat. 25 as a basis for the lines of his poem in which he separates the sheep from the goats (verse 21):

Thus every one before the Throne
of Christ the Judge is brought,
Both righteous and impious
that good or ill had wrought.
A separation, and diff'ring station
by Christ appointed is
(To sinners sad) 'twixt good and bad,
'twixt Heirs of Woe and bliss.

The doctrine of predestination is evident in the above lines, especially when Christ appoints the "diff'ring station" to the sinners who are not only "good and bad," but who are "Heirs of Woe and bliss." The statement in the text that men are "Heirs," of course, reaffirms the idea of the Adamic heritage, but Christ, through the doctrine of "limited atonement," may allow some to remain "heirs of Woe," or he may appoint others to the eternal state of "bliss."

Again, by paraphrasing Mat. 5:10, 11, Wigglesworth identifies in his verse those who stand to the right of Christ: "Holy Martyrs" (verse 22), "chast'ned" ones (verse 23), and such as love much, who are also sheep (verse 24). The last of the elect are those weak in faith, yet true, including an "Infant throng of Babes" (verse 25).

At the left of Christ, however, stand the "whinning hypocrites" (verse 27); the "Apostates and Run-awayes" are also there (verse 28) with the unprofessed (verse 29). The

cataloging of the reprobates continues with idolators, false worshippers, profaners (verse 30), blasphemers, the lewd, swearers, the impure, those who pollute the Sabbath, those who persecute the saints, and the presumptuous and the proud (verses 30-31). The index lengthens to include adulterers, whoremongers, covetors, and the ravenous for riches (verse 32). Finally, among the reprobates appear the "children flagitious,/ with their parents." These children appear in the company of false witnesses, murderers, witches, and drunkards (verse 33). The long roster of the damned continues down the scale of being, moving from false Christians to the heathen, then to the animal level, classifying the worst as lion, dragon, and serpent, and finally to the unclean sprites and fiends (verse 36).

Predestination is a completed doctrine when Christ pardons those on his right; they, too, have been born under the inheritance of original sin and have committed actual sin, but they are redeemed by the mercy of his limited atonement, limited to the elect or those predestined to heaven (verse 40):

These Men be those my Father chose
 before the worlds foundation,
 And to me gave, that I should save
 from Death and Condemnation.
 For whose dear sake I flesh did take,
 was of a Woman born,
 And did inure my self t'indure,
 unjust reproach and scorn.

The meaning of Wigglesworth's lines differs not at all from the meaning of the lines of Steele and Thomas in their

interpretation of the concept of Unconditional Election: "God's choice of certain individuals unto salvation before the foundation of the world rests solely in His own sovereign will."¹ Not only are the fortunate ones chosen before their birth, but only for these chosen ones does Christ offer the atonement of the Passion and Crucifixion (verses 41 and 42):

For them it was that I did pass
 through sorrows many one:
 That I drank up that bitter Cup
 which made me sigh and groan.
 The Cross his pain I did sustain;
 yea more, my Fathers ire
 I underwent, my Blood I spent
 to save them from Hell fire.

Thus I esteem'd, thus I redeem'd
 all these from every Nation,
 That they may be (as now you see)
 a chosen Generation.
 What if ere-while they were as vile,
 and bad as any be,
 And yet from all their guilt and thrall
 at once I set them free?

These lines of the poem merely versify another of the basic concepts of Calvinism: particular redemption or limited atonement, for "His [Christ's] death was a substitutionary endurance of the penalty of sin in the place of certain specified sinners."² Since no man, elect or unregenerate, inherits the right to grace, none need raise a voice against God's particular rejection of any man. God, even in his

¹Steele and Thomas, p. 18.

²Ibid., p. 17.

covenant with man, never relinquishes his authority to save whomever he will (verse 43):

My grace to one is wrong to none:
 none can Election claim,
 Amongst all those their souls that lose,
 none can Rejection blame.
 He that may chuse, or else refuse,
 all men to save or spill,
 May this Man chuse, and that refuse,
 redeeming whom he will.

In several verses Wigglesworth enumerates the continual hardheartedness of the sinners in rejecting Christ and in choosing "damnation before salvation." Although it may not seem obvious, one intention of the poet is to reveal the mercy of God, who saves men even though he has been repeatedly rejected by them. It is only at too late a date that the hardhearted hypocrite presents a plea to his God and receives the negative decision (verses 68-75).

The debate between the hypocrites and the judge continues until the complete docket of offenders has been heard. In each judgment the reason for Christ's adverse decision becomes clear, and the shame of man becomes greater each time Christ refutes a plea. Having judged all adult offenders, Christ presides at the bar over those who died in infancy (verse 166):

Then to the Bar, all they drew near
 who dy'd in Infancy,
 And never had or good or bad
 effected pers'nally,
 But from the womb unto the tomb
 were straightway carried,
 (Or at the last e're they transgrest)
 who thus began to plead:

There is an admission in the above verse that the infants did not commit actual sin and did not actively transgress God's laws; however, there follows a direct and immediate accusation concerning their inheritance of Adam's guilt (verse 167):

If for our own transgression,
 or disobedience,
 We here did stand at thy left-hand
 just were the Recompence:
 But Adam's guilt our souls hath spilt,
 his fault is charg'd on us;
 And that alone hath overthrown,
 and utterly undone us.

Like the older sinners who were judged and sentenced to eternal damnation, the children attempt to deny or excuse their guilt because they feel the interdiction placed on Adam should not extend to their moral condition (verse 168). They try to build a legal case for themselves by saying they would accept a "Recompence" for their own "transgression," but they deny the justice of being punished for inherited guilt:

.
 How could we sin that had not been,
 or how is his sin our,
 Without consent, which to prevent,
 we never had a pow'r?

The reply of their judge, of course, is against the heresy of calling the transgression only Adam's. In reality it is the sin of all humanity, since Adam stood for the head of the race, acting spiritually for all men (verse 171):

Then answered the Judge most dread,
 God doth sum doom forbid,
 That men should dye eternally
 for what they never did.

But what you call old Adam's Fall,
 and only his Trespass,
 You call amiss to call it his,
 both his and yours it was.

The Judge shows the infants' reasoning to be fallacious when he injects the reverse argument, showing their willingness to accept unearned good but not, as they deem it, unearned punishment. If Adam had not fallen into sin and brought to mankind the inheritance of woe, no man would now complain about receiving unwarranted grace, but all would readily accept God's generosity uncomplainingly (verses 174-175):

Would you have griev'd to have receiv'd
 through Adam so much good,
 As had been your for evermore,
 if he at first had stood?
 Would you have said, we ne'r obey'd,
 nor did the Laws regard;
 It ill befits with benefits,
 us, Lord, to reward?

Since then to share in his welfare,
 you could have been content,
 You may with reason share in his treason,
 and in the punishment.
 Hence you were born in state forlorn,
 with Natures so depraved:
 Death was your due, because that you
 had thus your selves behaved.

The "forlorn" state of nature is, of course, the depraved nature of man. Spiritual death is the only conclusion, since deprivation of grace is the fault of man. Since mankind generally in the person of Adam rejected God's grace, it follows that God may now bestow it upon whom he will; it is now an extraordinary gift to some but merited by none (verses 177-178).

Only once does Wigglesworth introduce a brief note of mercy for the condemned children who are guilty only of original sin, if it can be called merciful. Apparently, their guilt is less only in comparison to the guilt following upon actual sin; in comparison to innocence, they are totally depraved (verse 180):

You sinners are, and such a share
 as sinners may expect,
 Such you shall have; for I do save
 none but mine own Elect.
 Yet to compare your sin with their,
 who liv'd a longer time,
 I do confess yours is much less,
 though every sin's a crime.

The only tempering that divine justice allows to the sentence the children receive in this popular presentation of American Puritanism is a very minor mitigation which most certainly is not tender or complete (verse 181):

A crime it is, therefore in bliss
 you may not hope to dwell;
 But unto you I shall allow
 the easiest room in Hell.
 The glorious King thus answering,
 they cease, and plead no longer:
 Their Consciences must needs confess
 his Reasons are the stronger.

Thus, the Puritans grant the "easiest room in Hell" to the child who has committed no actual sin. Even though their minds have not reached the state of rationality, Wigglesworth adds that these children consciously understand and accept, over their own pleas for salvation, the stronger reasons that Christ presents to them for their damnation. Like the mature sinners

who were condemned before them, they plead no longer. The elect feel neither pity nor sorrow for the damned, even though the condemned may be a child of their own (verse 199). Such an attitude on the part of the elect toward the damned is not to be considered as one of cruel indifference, but is to be seen as an acceptance and an understanding of the will of God. The remaining verses of the poem dramatize the rejoicing of the saints in heaven to see God's judgment brought about.

To call The Day of Doom poetry is a defamation of that art form, but to call it "versified Calvinism" is to oversimplify the intricacies of that theological system. It is not difficult to account for the book's popularity when it is remembered that one of the chief qualities of Puritan "literature" was didacticism; furthermore, the poem was readily committed to memory because of its doggerel meter and simple rhyme scheme. Its immense popularity, of course, proved not only the extent to which the basic tenets of Calvinism were known, but also substantiated the acceptance of the tenets among the preaching clergy and the listening laity. The eschatological concepts that Wigglesworth presented throughout these verses were no more than a recapitulation of the statements of Calvin on the final judgment of man. Obviously, the congregational audiences of New England were listening to and accepting the ideas of predestination, election, reprobation, final judgment, and limited atonement.

"'Tis an Hereditary Distemper"--Cotton Mather

Although Cotton Mather was an American Puritan of the third generation, his zeal and ardor for religion were as intense as those of his two famous Calvinistic grandfathers, John Cotton and Richard Mather. During his life Mather wrote more than 450 volumes, and American intellectuals have recognized Mather as a positive force in their thinking.¹ The prevailing attitude in New England toward the nature of man, and especially the nature of childhood, is easily abstracted from his prolific writings.

When presenting the position of the New England churches, Mather wrote that they "afforded a singular prospect of churches erected in an American corner of the world, on purpose to express and pursue the Protestant Reformation."² Mather's writings, as will be demonstrated, reflected not only the theological language used by John Calvin, but also the same meaning and intent that Calvin prescribed for terms defining man's nature. Further, when Mather discussed the innate

¹"Benjamin Franklin was influenced throughout his life by one of Mather's books. Emerson was no stranger to them. Harrier [sic] Beecher Stowe in her girlhood delighted in the stories she found in the Magnalia; Lowell found much to read, if little to praise in Mather's pages. Hawthorne, Longfellow, and Whittier pored over his histories of old New England. Even to-day in America one cannot wisely leave Cotton Mather quite unread." Selections from Cotton Mather, ed. by Kenneth B. Murdock (New York [1926/]), p. xxxix.

²Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana: A Ecclesiastical History of New England (Hartford, 1820), I, 79.

disposition of children, there was much evidence that he accepted their natures as depraved.

Mather had a considerable interest in the spiritual nature of children and in their educations. These interests are understandable for two reasons: He was a minister and the father of fifteen children. Additionally, he could well understand the problems of pious parents who had delinquent children, since he had a profligate son, and realized full well that a spiritual education did not, by way of necessity, guarantee any child eternal election. In fact, education, like the pious parent, could guide the child, but the unfortunate inheritance from Adam remained influentially present. Like Calvin, Mather felt man's relationship to man was founded in sin, not in grace.

In his account of the Goodwin children,¹ Mather demonstrated first that the children "had enjoy'd a religious education, and answer'd it with a towardly ingenuity: children indeed of an exemplary temper and carriage, and an example to all about them for piety, honesty and industry."² Regardless of the good report of their minister and the good example from

¹"The prominence given the pranks of these children by all the ministers, and the special attention of this eminent though youthful minister, must have been the well-spring of the Salem witchcraft. Just as the children aped the pranks performed by the English children when Matthew Hale tried the witches of Suffolk, so the Salem girls based their performance on those of their predecessors." Ralph and Louise Boas, Cotton Mather: Keeper of the Puritan Conscience (New York, 1928), p. 103.

²Magnalia, VI, 396.

their immediate parents, the oldest girl was taken with "diabolical fits" and two of the boys "suffered pains and cried out against tormentors."¹ As a result of their testimony, the local community condemned Mother Glover as the tormentor of the children; however, it was only a year later, after the death of another old woman, that the children stopped their convulsive antics. The tragic conclusion of their conduct was the death of one woman on the gallows.² Mather felt that these were good children, but, because of their humanity, they were subject to attack by the devil; he did not believe that the children were the attackers. Such naivete was not unusual. Children often perpetrated such hoaxes on their elders.

The following examples demonstrate characteristic symptoms of demon possession by children. Additionally, the examples show that the children knew and understood the tragic consequences such antics could lead to, but continued to make their deadly accusations. The irony, of course, exists in the fact that the children were able to convince their elders that they were victims of witchcraft. In reality, they were able to victimize those they accused and also victimize the moral consciences of their elders, who believed their ravings and proceeded to impose the ultimate punishment upon the supposed witches.

¹Ibid., 398.

²Rossell Hope Robbins, Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology (New York, 1959), p. 228.

Witchcraft belongs not only to American Calvinism but to the whole of the Christian tradition. In fact, witchcraft, if it is to be categorized as a study, must come within the field of theology; however, each Christian sect interpreted witchcraft more or less by its own religious principles and convictions. Generally, however, witchcraft was defined as a conspiracy against God. The witch and the devil entered into a compact to deny God. The witch's ability to raise storms and cause illness in cattle, etc., were secondary data, introduced into trials merely as supposed evidence that the accused was a witch. Witches were condemned to death because of their compacts with the devil to conspire against God, not for any supposed acts of witchcraft.¹

Undisciplined youngsters and youths found witches fair game. England had several such monsters, and, unfortunately, the children of America were only too willing to copy their mischief. Still more unfortunately, these children were never exposed at the proper time because adults, including church officials and judges, felt that children were not morally strong and were easy prey for the devil and his advocates. The Goodwin children are remembered for being the first youthful imposters in America, and their pretence was followed by that of three young girls at Littleton, Massachusetts, who chose a woman at random and accused her of being a witch. She was hanged, and

¹Ibid., pp. 7-8.

the girls confessed to the hoax.¹ The most astonishing example in America, however, is the example at Salem, where 22 people died "from the pranks of several 'witch bitches.'"² The reason given by these young girls for their antics was: "They must have some 'sport.'"³ Fourteen years later Ann Putnam, the leader of the girls, confessed: "'It was a great delusion of Satan that deceived me that sad time, whereby I justly fear I have been instrumental . . . to bring upon myself, and this land the guilt of innocent blood.'"⁴

A look at some of the trials in which children were the accusers or in which they gave testimony will easily substantiate not only their roles in convictions, but also the general cruelty of the children involved and their ingenuity in playing on the beliefs of their parents and of ministers like Cotton Mather. These children not only did not fear parents, church, or state, but they seemed to have no conscience about causing the deaths of others, and they had no fear of retaliation from God, in whom they professed a belief. These children, indeed, displayed no human emotion other than that of evil. If the devil had plotted such a scheme, there could not have been more

¹Ibid., p. 95.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 96.

irony involved, for supposedly innocent children, in the name of God, employed all known authority (parents, church, and state) to carry out against mankind a diabolic "sport." The wryest twist was that the children were never legally reprimanded; this calls to mind what the ministers and magistrates all too frequently advised during the trials--how well the devil protects his own.

The conduct of the Goodwin children followed a pattern of antics begun prior to their own performance. The following instance also provided a precedent for the trials at Salem. It was heard before Lord Chief Justice Hale in Bury St. Edmunds in 1665.¹ The afflicted were children and when they entered the court:

. . . Three of them fell into strange and violent fits, shrieking out in a most sad manner . . . and although they did after some certain space recover out of their fits, yet they were every one of them struck dumb, so that none of them could speak neither at that time, nor during the assizes until the conviction of the supposed witches. Elizabeth Pacy, eleven years of age, one of the afflicted, was brought into the court at the time of the framing of the indictment and afterwards at the trial of the prisoners, but could not speak one word all the time, and for the most part she remained as one wholly senseless, as one in a deep sleep, and could move no part of her body, and all the motion of life that appeared in her was, that as she lay upon cushions in the court on her back.²

¹Winfield S. Nevins, Witchcraft in Salem Village in 1692 (Boston, 1892), p. 260.

²Ibid., pp. 260-261.

Suddenly, however, when the accused touched Elizabeth, she leaped up and scratched the accused witch until the blood came.¹ Deborah, on the other hand, went into fits, suffering any time the accused witch had visited her home.² Donna Becking, involved in the same trial, vomited crooked pins and nails. Additionally, she accused one Rose Cullender, and when the accused was brought into court, Donna screamed, "Burn her, burn her."³ All of the above children were judged to be bewitched; however, after the verdict of guilty was passed on the accused witches, the children recovered within a half hour,⁴ convincing the elders that the death of the witches was necessary.

Cotton Mather reported similar conduct for the Goodwin children. The eldest daughter Martha (age 13) quarreled with a washerwoman over some supposedly stolen linen. Following the argument, the girl had strange fits going beyond catalepsy or epilepsy. Then another sister (age 7) and two brothers (ages 11 and 5) were seized. All the seizures were concluded to be results of "hellish witchcraft." Interestingly enough, Mather adds, the children were not annoyed at meals or at bedtime. They were, however, terribly tortured during prayers.⁵ The

¹Ibid., p. 261.

²Ibid., pp. 261-262.

³Ibid., p. 262.

⁴Ibid., p. 265.

⁵Cotton Mather, "Memorable Providences," reprinted in Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706, ed. George Lincoln Burr (New York, 1914), pp. 100-102.

children, Mather reports, would have done much mischief to themselves, but their acts of personal violence were always done when an adult was present to prevent such acts.¹ If small acts were done, such as the breaking or tearing of things, the children went into uncontrollable laughter.² If the parents attempted to correct the children, the devils tortured the youngsters even more.³ Also, the children were unable to do any useful work, but nothing seemed to disturb them like religious exercises.⁴ For instance, they could not read the Bible, but could read joke books. They could not read the works of Increase Mather, but could read a Popish book. In fact, they were struck dumb when trying to read any religious works.⁵

In February 1692 the community became aroused about the conduct of the girls at Salem, and Dr. Gregg, a minister, declared them bewitched. An Indian slave of Reverend Parris had been meeting with the girls and had been discussing black magic, ghost stories, hypnosis, etc. Since the girls would not freely tell who had bewitched them, Tituba, the slave, was allowed to administer a remedy to make them tell, and "they never stopped until twenty innocent persons had been hung [sic] and over

¹Ibid., p. 108.

²Ibid., p. 109.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 112-113.

two hundred imprisoned."¹ The ages of the talkative girls ranged from 9 to 20, and nearly all who were arrested for witchcraft at Salem had been accused by these girls, whose leader, Ann Putnam, was only 12 years of age.²

The following excerpts have been selected to emphasize the conduct and the attitude of the children who were the accusers in the Salem hoax:

Trial of Bridget Bishop: Mary Lewis (age 17) testified that Bridget Bishop came and tortured her.³ Sue Sheldon (age 18) said that in an apparition it was reported to her that Bridget Bishop killed two small children.⁴ John Cook (age 18) testified that Bridget Bishop appeared at his window while he was sleeping and struck him on the head.⁵ Bridget Bishop was hanged.⁶ Cotton Mather reported that Bridget looked at the church on her way to the scaffold, causing a great timber to fall.⁷ Obviously, he was as convinced of her guilt as were the judges who listened to the youths and then passed sentence on her.

¹William Nelson Gemmill, The Salem Witch Trials: A Chapter of New England History (Chicago, 1924), p. 48.

²Ibid., pp. 47-48.

³Nevins, p. 57.

⁴Ibid., p. 66.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 69.

Trial of Reverend George Burroughs: Burroughs was a Harvard graduate and a former minister at the Salem church, but he had quarreled with his congregation, especially with the father of Ann Putnam.¹ The "Circle Girls" cried out against him, especially Ann Putnam (age 12) and Mercy Lewis (age 17).² All records prove Burroughs was honorable and his death a result of his quarrel with the Putnams, but to add to his problems, Sue Sheldon testified that two of his dead wives appeared to her and told her that Burroughs had slain them.³ Mary Lewis fell into a fit when Burroughs even looked at her, as did Mary Wolcott (age 17) and Elizabeth Hubbard (age 17).⁴ Ann Putnam testified that Burroughs tortured her and tried to force her to write her name in a book.⁵ She testified further that she told the Rev. Burroughs, "It was a dreadful thing for him which was a minister that should teach little children to fear God should come persuading poor creatures to give their souls to the Devil."⁶ Burroughs was executed for witchcraft.

Trial of Giles and Martha Corey: Mary Warren (age 20) and Mercy Lewis (age 17) testified that Giles Corey tormented

¹Ibid., p. 71.

²Ibid., p. 72.

³Ibid., p. 74.

⁴Ibid., p. 76.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

them, and Susan Sheldon (age 18) testified that Giles murdered his first wife and would have murdered his second had she not been a witch. Then John Dorich (age 16) said that Giles had threatened him. Giles Corey was executed by being crushed to death.¹

Trials of Sarah Good and Sarah Osborn: These women were charged with bewitching Ann Putnam and other "Circle Girls." Tragically, Dorcas Good (age 5) testified against her own mother.²

Trial of Elizabeth Howe (age 94): Mercy Lewis and Mary Walcott fell in fits when this aged woman came into sight, but it was Ann Putnam who testified that Elizabeth Howe hurt her. This inspired Abigail Williams (age 11) to call out that Elizabeth Howe was also hurting her.³

The girls appeared at several other trials, including that of Susanna Martin, Rebecca Nurse, and Martha Carrier. Eight of Martha Carrier's children testified against her. She was finally accused of being the "Queen of Witches."⁴

Perhaps Mather, the "eminent though youthful minister" of the Goodwin children, accepted their story too readily

¹Ibid., p. 94.

²Ibid., p. 98.

³Ibid., pp. 103-104.

⁴Ibid., p. 148.

because he believed so sincerely in the unfortunate estate of children:

A child no sooner begins to do anything rational, but Satan begins to show it how to do something that is criminal. Methinks I see the image of it, Rev. xii:4. The dragon stood to devour the child as soon as it was born.¹

Mather could well understand that the devil stood to devour the child, but he did not understand the real aggression that can rage in a child. The above quotation points up his stress on the corruption of man's rationality and on man's works which proceed from that faculty. The devil does not wait for rationality to develop, but attacks it immediately. The accusation Mather makes is that there is little or no objection on the part of man in a natural state to that which is evil. The Calvinistic implication in the statement is that man has already fallen before his birth, and thus has a natural propensity toward evil.² It is perhaps in the sense of man's early vulnerability that Mather thought the Goodwin children and the Salem girls were morally attacked. Mather would not have been caught in the hoax if he had applied to the children at Salem what he wrote in a sermon some years later:

First. I pray, what is that Heart which these poor Children of yours are born withal? Truly, such an one as you know, that you before them were born withal.

¹Cotton Mather, Corderius Americanus: A Discourse on the Good Education of Children (Boston, 1828), p. 11.

²Institutes, I, 217-218.

A Sinful Heart, a Corrupt Heart, a Vicious Heart, an Heart that is a very Hell of Wickedness. What are your Children by Nature! Such a Nature as the Poison of the Old Serpent entering into our First Parents, has brought upon them? . . . What is the Heart which your Children bring into the World with them? What? But an Heart that is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked? What? But an evil Heart of Unbelief which always departs from the Living God?¹

Cotton Mather's rhetoric in the paragraph is extremely effective, and his theology is extremely Calvinistic. He begins with a rhetorical question, rising to interest in the nature of the child. He grants that the hearts of children are familiar to the parents because of the parents' own evil natures at birth. Then he proceeds to describe the human heart with the adjectives of "sinful," "corrupt," and "vicious"--the heart attaining these evil qualities from the wickedness of hell. The paragraph concludes with a repetition of the rhetorical question: "What are your children by nature?" Using the imagery of the Bible about the "Old Serpent" and the "Poison" that entered Adam and Eve, he concludes that the corrupted nature of the human heart with its damning qualities is man's, not alone through his immediate parents but through the law of inheritance, going ultimately back to Adam.

Additionally, in the text on "Early Piety," Cotton Mather addressed the following consideration to the child:

. . . Let thy CONSIDERATION remove the Bars of the Pit, and uncover the dismal Vault, and look down into the

¹Cotton Mather, et al, "What the Pious Parent Wishes For," The Course of Sermons on Early Piety (Boston, 1721), pp. 11-12.

Infernal World. Consider the tremendous things which inflicted on the Despisers of Early Piety, who for being so, shall be condemned and confined unto that Place of Torment. Visit the gloomy and howling Regions, where GOD set them in dark places, who have been Dead of Old GOD is as a Lion unto them in the Secret Places; He pulls them in pieces and makes them desolate. GOD Causes the Arrows of His Quivers to enter into them, and he fills them with bitterness Almighty GOD Himself, will take me into his own Hands, and make me feel such scalding Strokes of His Wrath as no Tongue is able to express, no heart is able to conceive.¹

Presuming that the child can consider and reflect on the text, Mather addresses him directly. In this particular text something Dantesque as well as Calvinistic comes through in the description of hell. It includes the God of the Old Testament, the one of wrath and justice, who sets the "despisers of early piety" into the "dark places." The phrase "dead of Old," of course has closer relationship to original sin than to actual sin. In addition to reflecting past literature and Scripture, Cotton Mather anticipates Jonathan Edwards' infamous and fiery sermon, to be presented later at Enfield, Connecticut, where Edwards orated on a God who can and will induce punishment with the "Arrows of His Quivers." Mather finally arrives at the point of no description; the anger of God is infinite and, therefore, the tongue cannot with any degree of verisimilitude approach a description of such anger. His attempt at description is, however, a rhetorical dilation on the element of fire, on the infernal world, and on the scalding strokes, all demonstrating a

¹Ibid., pp. 31-32.

stylistic attempt to arouse terror in the hearts of sinners. The eternal tortures are, however, identifiable with the most horrible physical sufferings. Essentially, he exposes children to a hell-fire sermon, stressing physical tortures and arousing the sense of fear. Furthermore, the Diary of Cotton Mather supports the concept that the Puritans made children aware of their duties at an early age:

It may now be a Time for me to revive my Exercise of Catechising. A Multitude of restored Children coming to this Exercise, I would make it a precious Opportunity, to inculcate mightily upon them, the Lessons and the Duties, which they ought now to be exceedingly mindful of.¹

First Mather implies that the children were sinful because they had to be "restored" by instruction, and then, following their restoration, they had to be instructed in their duties. The catechizing method of Mather supports Fleming's statement that the child in the American colonial period was regarded as a "subject of sin who must pass into an experience of grace under the stress of great emotion."² Additionally, the Puritan ministers considered their young charges capable of pondering the state of their souls:

That I would oblige each of the Children, to retire, and ponder on that question, what should I wish to have done if I were adying! And report unto me

¹Cotton Mather, Diary of Cotton Mather, 1709-1724, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 7th series (Boston, 1912), VIII, 273.

²Fleming, p. 62.

their Answer to the Question: of which I may take ¹ unspeakable Advantage, to inculcate Piety upon them.

The above entry reveals that the ministers were accepting sin as belonging inherently to the nature of children, and they expected the children to work actively to understand and to correct their depraved natures. In the diary, Cotton Mather very emotionally demonstrates his belief in the evil "origin, production, and conception" of the child and his concern for the spiritual protection of the child:

I am continually crying to God, for his Favour to my Children; that they may be pious, useful, happy Children. But I ought to bewayl some inexpressible Circumstances of Meanness, relating to their Original, [sic] their Production and Conception. I ought to obtain a pardon thro' the Blood of that Holy Thing, which was Born of the Virgin.²

Regardless of the vileness of the child's nature, Mather sees the parent as responsible for the origin of the child, insofar as he is the physical parent; however, through education, he can and should obtain grace for his child through Christ, whose pardon can overcome the vileness of the carnal nature inherited through the parent.

Mather clearly advises parents that if they do catechize, but to "no avail," they have done their parental duty.³ If a parent does not do his duty, however, the effect on

¹Diary, VIII, 25.

²Ibid., VIII, 118.

³Cotton Mather's Views on Catechising [1708], reprinted in the New England Primer, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York, 1897), p. 266.

his conscience will be a "thousand times more Bitter than Death."¹ The concept of education and correction of the young, the weak, and the vulnerable, was an extensive one in Puritan society. Mather extends the responsibility for education and correction to the masters of servants and to teachers.²

In conclusion, there is a fitting statement to both parents and children from one of Mather's essays published in 1699:

Alas, man, till thy children become Regenerate, thou art the Father of a Fool; thy children are but the Wild Asses Colt! . . . Till thy Children are brought home to God, they are the slaves of the Devils.³

Throughout his writings on human nature, and especially the nature of children, Mather places emphasis on the human propensity to sin and the conscious struggle to develop spiritually in this world. To accomplish his objectives, he uses Biblical citations and images that are similar to the ideas and expressions of Calvin in his description of man's nature. Mather, like Calvin, and later like Hawthorne, desires to take his readers and listeners close to whatever he describes. This technique of using images is, of course, extremely useful in an attempt to arouse moral ardor for the inner life. From childhood to adulthood, life reads as one long struggle to

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., pp. 268-269.

³ Cotton Mather, Family Well-Ordered, or an Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in one Another (Boston, 1699), p. 12

overcome man's origin in sin and the developing effects of that sin. Mather's interpretation of man is certainly more moral than philosophical, for he fully expects the depraved man to continue his struggle against his own depravity and inclination to sin throughout his entire life. The emphasis again, for him, is on sin and death, unless man learns very early to divert himself to a spiritual path and tries, agonizingly, to stay there.

Mather directs much of his polemical instruction to parents; however, this direction is not irrelevant to the thesis of depravity in children, since he adheres so closely to the doctrine of inherited depravity. Parents must have the willingness to correct the burden they have placed upon their children because they procreate the child's human nature:

. . . how to restrain and rescue them from the "paths of the destroyer" and fortify them against their peculiar temptations. There is a world of good that you have to do for them. You are without the natural feelings of humanity, if you are not in continual agony to do for them all the good that lies in your power.¹

Indeed, it is unfortunate that Mather did not apply his analysis of the human heart to the "Circle Girls" at Salem. Surely they could have justified many of his statements about the human heart. Instead of listening to the ranting of these youths, he should have seen them as "the Wild Asses Colt!" Although he and

¹Elizabeth Bancroft Schlesinger, "Cotton Mather and His Children," William and Mary Quarterly, X (1953), p. 102. Quoted from Mather's Essays to do Good (Johnston, 1815).

many other ministers preached the corrupted nature of the child, they seemed unable to face the overt evil of children. Even psychology could have dealt more readily with such children, for it knows "the child as instinctively destructive, needing to acquire inhibitions, sublimations, and discipline for inborn infantile hostility and death wishes."¹ The Salem children suggest an incapacity for human feeling. The general attitude in modern studies is to explain such actions away under terms of personality disorders. The disorders of the Salem trials, however, seem best covered by the following statement:

Many types of behavior formerly regarded as voluntary wrongdoing or the just results of sin are now classed as disease. This does not prove that eventually all wrongdoing will be plainly revealed as disease and all conduct necessarily evaluated at a level at which good and bad are non-existent.²

No one will deny the possibility of mental and emotional disturbances in the Salem girls or in other children cited as accusers; however, as Dr. Cleckley states, this does not prove that all their wrongdoing can be diagnosed as disease, nor can the moral level of their knowledge of good and bad be dismissed. A modern psychological maze presents an easy trap for the unwary, and one should not get lost in it as the ministers and judges at Salem got lost in the maze of witchcraft charges. Cleckley explains, "The current prevalent psychodynamic theories are of

¹Bender, p. 138.

²Henry Cleckley, The Mask of Sanity (St. Louis, 1964), p. 458.

such a nature that they can be glibly used to 'demonstrate' (by inference) the truth of virtually any assumption, however implausible, that one might make out about what is in the unconscious. Let us not mistake these easy inferences for actual evidence."¹ Since Mather and the judges did not have the benefit of psychology, they should have taken a lesson from Scripture, "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Finally, the studies of Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud recognize the aggression in youth and children--however, not necessarily as disease. Their studies recognize that horror and atrocities are not strange to children, but children must be safeguarded by education "at the decisive stage of their development to overcome and estrange themselves from the primitive and atrocious wishes of their infantile natures."² The "primitive and atrocious wishes of their infantile natures" can be expressed in overt antisocial conduct such as that exhibited at Salem. Anna Freud felt that there was a "real aggressiveness" raging inside children; the conditions of Salem presented only one opportunity for the expression of such rage. Cleckley, Burlingham, Freud, and Bender, of course, do not condemn the child as depraved, but they do recognize, as did the early church fathers, the need for a moral conversion, and they

¹ Ibid., p. 30.

² Freud and Burlingham, pp. 22-23.

further recognize that the conversion must be begun early if it is to be effective.

From the evaluation of the human condition posited by Baxter and Sibbes in England and by Wigglesworth and Mather in America, it becomes evident that predestination and redemption were central to the orthodoxy of the Puritans; however, by the time of Jonathan Edwards, there was a growing tendency to make the doctrines of Calvin more easily acceptable. Theologically, Jonathan Edwards became a representative of the "revitalization" of the orthodox doctrines. "He attempted to make Calvinism relevant again to the social forces of the time."¹

"But Are Young Vipers"--Jonathan Edwards

Jonathan Edwards is thought of as one of the most important figures in American intellectual history, deriving his ideas from Cambridge Platonism, Lockean epistemology, Newtonian empiricism, and Calvinistic theology, but conforming to no one single discipline. Within such an extensive and varied background, he could not conform to the relaxing theology of eighteenth-century America. He was a devoted supporter of a system of thought that did not fit into his contemporary society, which taught that man's direction and intentions were good and were ever increasing in goodness. Edwards argued that man had a limited will, that saving grace was ministered to men

¹Dillenger and Welch, p. 137.

at the discretion of God alone, that no man can know if and when he is saved, and that God is first a God of justice. Using the materials of his age, science and psychology, Edwards traced man's nature back to its origin once more. In the Great Awakening (see Appendix) he turned to religious experience for causes and effect, but he did not turn to the legalistic argumentation that limited his Calvinistic predecessors.

Jonathan Edwards used the intellectual findings of his own day to cut away what he thought was intellectually weak in the eighteenth century. Indeed, the scientific discoveries of his century assisted Edwards in the study of nature and enabled him to articulate clearly his ideas on predestination, original sin, election, and freedom of the will. He analyzed and compiled data from individual experience to reach a universal design in the Puritan terms that held man as entirely culpable but still capable of nothing positive spiritually. Edwards would not let man rest quietly or easily, but made him think on the last things of life, using the new means science was furnishing for temporal existence. With the assistance of science and psychology, he stressed the sovereignty of God and Christ's redemptive powers, denying man the initiative to move towards a spiritual life because of original sin. Edwards felt, however, that man could move toward a spiritual life under the grace of God through conversion, but this emphasis on conversion is American in origin and not orthodox Calvinism; thus, the move

toward spirituality became synonymous with The Great Awakening, the first great religious revival in America (see Appendix). Edwards was a firm believer in the Calvinistic tenets of justification by faith and in predestination; however, there was also in eighteenth-century thinking a tendency toward Arminianism.¹ Edwards' first attack on the liberality of Arminianism was in a Boston sermon entitled "God Glorified in Man's Dependence," calling for a return to the rigorous principles of Calvin.

Edwards soon became a notable pulpit orator, and the result of his sermonizing was a large number of conversions. In 1740 George Whitefield, itinerant English Methodist divine, visited Edwards, and together they assisted the growing religious frenzy of New England until it became known as the "Great Awakening." Together they supported the evangelical orthodox view of man, and it was through their efforts that Calvinism remained an obvious influential force in America for several more generations.

The basic theology of the "Great Awakening" is briefly given by Iain Murray in Whitefield's Journals:

Strengthened by his reading of the Scriptures, the Reformers, and the Puritans, Whitefield gradually grasped the great related chain of truths revealed

¹Arminianism was the heretical doctrine that claimed man could save himself and that God would accept all sinners who repented. See the Appendix for a complete definition and explanation of the development of the sect during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in America.

in the New Testament--the Father's electing love, Christ's substitutionary death on behalf of those whom the Father had given Him, and the Spirit's infallible work in bringing to salvation those for whom it was appointed. These doctrines of "free-grace" were the essential theology of his ministry from the very first and consequently the theology of the movement which began under his preaching in 1737.¹

Within Murray's summary statement is the basic text for orthodox evangelicalism: (1) the Father's electing love, (2) Christ's substitutionary death for the elect, and (3) the Spirit's infallible work in bringing salvation to the elect. The reprobate was thoroughly ostracized. In fact, Whitefield's coming to America was a factor that encouraged the more liberal Wesley, who remained in England, to publish his sermon on Free Grace,² condemning the doctrines of predestination and election and preaching universal redemption. Whitefield opposed universal redemption, which was espoused by Wesley, but Whitefield was undoubtedly supported in his views by Jonathan Edwards. The final outcome of the controversy with Wesley was a split in the church. Whitefield remained orthodox, and Wesley became a liberal evangelical.³ The pertinency of this is that Whitefield and Edwards, the preaching divines in America, taught the total depravity of man and encouraged this belief among thousands of converts in America.

¹Iain Murray, "Appendix II--Prefatory Note," George Whitefield's Journals (London, 1965), p. 564.

²Selections from the Writings of John Wesley, M.A., rev. ed. Compiled by Herbert Welch (New York, 1918).

³Whitefield, pp. 565-567.

The conversions of the "Awakening" demonstrated the emotional characteristics that were described as necessary by both Edwards and Whitefield. Their converts cried in agony of death, turned pale, lay on the ground, and called for mercy.¹ These actions were not unusual, for apparently whole congregations "melted" in tears, while little children cried along the street. "The groans and cries of the children continued all night, and a great part of the next day."²

The conversion of children differed not at all from the conversion of adults. The most important step in any conversion was, of course, the conviction of sin by the convert himself. It is important to note in the following statement Whitefield's concern for and treatment of the child as a sinner and as a convert. There is first the breaking of the child's will, then the child's own awareness of sin or guilt, and finally repentance--all at four years of age:

Had a good instance of the benefit of breaking children's will betimes. Last night going between decks (as I do every night) to visit the sick and to examine my people, I asked one of the women to bid her little boy who stood by her, to say his prayers; she answered his elder sister would, but she could not make him. Upon this, I bid the child kneel down before me, but he would not till I took hold of his two feet and forced him down. I then bid him say the Lord's Prayer (being informed by his mother that he could say it if he would); but he obstinately refused, till at last, after I gave him several blows, he said his prayer as

¹Wesley, pp. 424-425.

²Ibid., p. 425.

well as could be expected and I gave him some figs for a reward. And this same child, though not above four years of age, came to-night on deck, and when the other children came to say their prayers to my friend Habersham, he burst out into tears, and would not go away until he had said his too. I mention this as proof of the necessity of early correction. Children are sensible of it sooner than parents imagine, and if they would have resolution to break their wills thoroughly when young, the work of conversion would be much easier, and they would not be so troubled with perverse children when they are old.¹

Obviously the writings and oratory of the orthodox evangelists of the eighteenth century supported predestination, election, reprobation, and the sovereignty of God. The nature of the child was not excluded from any negative concepts about the nature of man. Whitefield, like Mather, reasoned that children were aware of their moral needs and able to respond to catechizing on both intellectual and emotional bases. This attitude toward children stems, of course, from the orthodox attitude toward human nature, and Jonathan Edwards in his Doctrine on Original Sin (1758) defines very thoroughly the thinking of the Puritans on the nature of man as manifested by the conservatives in the mid-eighteenth century:

By Original Sin, as the Phrase has been most commonly used by Divines, is meant the innate, sinful Depravity of the Heart. But yet, when the Doctrine of Original Sin is spoken of, it is vulgarly understood in that Latitude, as to include not only the Depravity of Nature, but, the Imputation of Adam's first Sin; or in

¹Whitefield, p. 146.

other Words, the Liableness of Exposedness of Adam's Posterity, in the divine Judgment to partake of the Punishment of that Sin.¹

In one of his most famous works Edwards thus speaks of original sin as he understands it in the common sense, and this sense includes not only the concept of the depravity of nature, but the extension of that concept to include liability for Adam's sin in his posterity. Edwards maintains in his thesis that the acquiring of sin is not from experiential existence in this world, but that:

The universal Reign of Death, over Persons of all ages indiscriminately, with the awful Circumstances and Attendants of Death, proves that Men came sinful into the World.²

Not only does Edwards speak of man's coming into the world in a sinful state, but also he implies that this condition is most explicit in infant mortality, which is a sign of mankind's universal guilt:

If Death be brought on mankind only as a Benefit, and in that Manner which Dr. T. mentions, viz., to mortify or moderate their carnal Appetites and Affections, wean 'em from the World, excite 'em to sober Reflections, and lead 'em to the Fear and Obedience of God, ETC., is it not strange that it should fall so heavy on Infants, who are not capable of making any such Improvement of it; so that many more of Mankind suffer Death in Infancy, than in any other equal Part of the Age of Man?³

¹Jonathan Edwards, The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended; Evidences of Its Truth Produced, and Arguments to the Contrary Answered (Boston, 1758), pp. 1-2.

²Ibid., p. 121.

³Ibid., p. 128.

He is so assured of the depravity of man's nature that he continues to support his view of infant guilt by a terrible illustration from Scripture:

Especially may Death be looked upon as the most extreme of all temporal Sufferings, when attended with such dreadful Circumstances, and extreme Pains, as those with which Providence sometimes brings it on Infants, as on the Children that were offered up to Moloch, and some other Idols, who were tormented to death in burning Brass.¹

Unrelentingly, he continues to argue against the innocence of infants:

We may well argue from these things, that Infants are not looked upon by God as sinless, but that they are by Nature Children of Wrath, seeing the terrible Evil comes so heavily on Mankind in Infancy. But besides these things, which are observable concerning the Mortality of Infants in general, there are some particular Cases of the Death of Infants, which the Scripture sets before us, that are attended with Circumstances, in a peculiar Manner, giving evidences of the Sinfulness of such, and their just exposedness to divine Wrath.²

In analyzing the above sequence of statements, one finds that Edwards offers the high rate of infant mortality as proof of man's corrupt nature. Death cannot be held up to the newborn as a threat, for they obtain no benefits from early death--no mortifying of carnal appetites, no turning from the things of this world, no reflection on the nature of their duties to God. Death, therefore, cannot be argued to be beneficial to the souls of children. In the second statement, Edwards cites Scripture

¹Ibid., p. 132.

²Ibid., p. 133.

to show that children can receive death as a penalty for sin. Since they are not guilty of actual sin, they must receive the death penalty for original sin. Edwards' assumption in the second argument is that his audience accepts Scripture as proof of the argument and that no argument logically proceeds beyond the proof of Scripture. Often Edwards seems most secure when arguing from Scripture, which indicates that his audience still accepted such proof. In the third statement he combines Scripture and observable fact to maintain his position that man comes into the world in a sinful state. In these statements Edwards, like a much earlier Calvin, is not discriminating against infants; he is supporting and defending the concept of natural depravity, and it is essential to the consistency of the doctrine that he establish the nature of man as it descends from Adam. He must demonstrate that the nature of man is related to Adam's sin and that man is, as a result of this relationship, corrupted before he commits actual sin. Furthermore, the establishing of the concept of original sin enables Edwards to explain what he believes to be man's natural propensity for sin and evil throughout man's lifetime.

Jonathan Edwards was a kind man, but he was not a sentimental man. Obviously he was willing to face the rational consequences of the doctrine of original sin as he interpreted it, for he wrote:

. . . That to suppose God imputes not all the Guilt of Adam's Sin, but only some little Part of it, this relieves Nothing but one's Imagination. To think of poor little Infants bearing such Torments for Adam's Sin, as they sometimes do in this World, and these Torments ending in Death and annihilation, may sit easier on the imagination, than to conceive of their suffering eternal misery for it. But it does not at all relieve one's Reason.¹

Jonathan Edwards wrote extensively on the nature of man because he had a sincere love of his fellow man and wanted eternal salvation for him, but he accepted the consequences of his unpopular theological conclusions in the face of a society that was searching for other answers from theology than those Edwards was ready to present. He did not give adults easy answers for their own salvation or for that of their children. Like Cotton Mather before him, however, Edwards devoted much of his time to the catechizing of children and included much in his writings pertaining to early conversion. He had no concern for the psychological consequences that might follow from the frightening of a child; his concern was only for the soul of the child:

What has more especially given offence to many, and raised a loud cry against some preachers, as though their conduct were intolerable, is their frightening poor innocent children, with talk of hell fire, and eternal damnation. But if those that complain so loudly of this, really believe, what is the general profession of the country, viz., that all are by nature the children of wrath, and heirs of hell; and that everyone that has not been born again, whether he is young or old, is exposed, every moment to

¹Ibid., p. 353.

eternal destruction, under the wrath of Almighty God; I say, if they really believe this, then such a complaint and cry as this, betrays a great deal of weakness and inconsideration. As innocent as children seem to be to us, yet, if they are out of Christ, they are not so in God's sight, but are young vipers, and are infinitely more hateful than vipers, and are in a most miserable condition, as well as grown persons; and they are naturally very senseless and stupid, being born as the wild ass's colt, and need much to awaken them. . . . A child that has a dangerous wound, may need the painful lance, as well as grown persons; and that would be a foolish pity, in such a case, that should hold back the lance and throw away the life.¹

The passage reveals that Edwards did not believe in sparing the theological rod on the child's soul. Children may be "young vipers," but the fact that a "viper" is "young" does not change or improve the nature of the viper. The passage includes much vocabulary that is Calvinistic in tone and meaning. Nature in the passage is the opposite of spirit and, therefore, man in the natural state must be enlightened, awakened, raised from a miserable animal state. The state of a viper or colt surely is repulsive for human nature and a condemnation. In the instance of children, then, one must not sentimentalize or be guilty of "foolish pity." The soul is more important than the physical life. It is the whole of life--physical, intellectual, and spiritual. It is the vital spirit of mankind's whole nature. The reference to the "wild ass's colt" takes Edwards back to the Biblical image chosen by Mather in his essay. The reference

¹Jonathan Edwards, "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England, (1740)," Works of President Edwards, eds. Jonathan Leavitt and John F. Trow (Boston, 1843), III, 340, a reprint of the Worcester Edition.

shows that both men, Edwards and Mather, hold the natural state of man to be depraved and in need of correction.

Just as Whitefield and Mather discuss the necessity of educating and correcting children, Edwards gives the lengthy account of the conversion of a four-year-old child, Phebe Bartlett, in his work entitled "A Narrative of Surprising Conversions."¹ The account seems to be more typical of an adult's conversion than of a child's; however, it must be borne in mind that Edwards made little distinction between the state of an adult's soul and the state of a child's: both were in need of religious conversion and could actually undergo such an experience.

Phebe was affected by her older brother's conversion, he being eleven years of age.² Phebe listened to religious instruction on her own accord, and spoke to her mother of the fact that she could not find God.³ One day, however, her mother overheard her in a closet: "Pray, blessed Lord, give me Salvation! I pray thee pardon all my sin!"⁴ When questioned, she said she was afraid of going to hell.⁵ Finally she

¹Jonathan Edwards, "A Narrative of Surprising Conversions," Selected Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. I (London, 1965).

²Ibid., p. 63.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 64.

⁵Ibid.

announced that the kingdom of heaven had come to her and that she was no longer afraid.¹ Edwards gives an account of her "remarkable abiding change":

She has been very strict upon the Sabbath; and seems to long for the Sabbath-day before it comes, and will often in the week time be inquiring how long it is to the Sabbath-day. . . . She seems to love God's house, and is very eager to go thither. . . . When she is in the place of worship, she is very far from spending her time there as children of her age usually do. . . . She seems to delight in religious conversation.²

Phebe, of course, was a morally good child, but the attitude of Edwards in the account of her conversion is not as positive an affirmation of her nature as it seems to be on a first reading. Edwards' attitude toward the child is not that she is innocence recognizing her creator and moving toward him. His attitude toward her is that she is a sinner who has been converted from a state of evil existence to one of salvation. He sees her conversion as a serious moral lesson. God has visited one of his creatures and has extirpated the sin that was born into the child. Edwards' pleasure is in the fact that Phebe turned so soon to God. The motive behind his account is to move parents to assist their children toward an early conversion. Phebe manifests all the overt attributes of a soul that has been saved. She convicts herself of sin, repents, and is conscious of God's goodness and mercy.

¹Ibid., p. 65.

²Ibid., p. 66.

It was usual for Edwards to use Scriptural passages in instructing children about the nature of their souls. In his selection of these passages, he most decidedly spared children nothing. Not only were they "young vipers," but they were "children of the Devil":

They were "young snakes" no different in nature from their parents. They too were "children of the devil."¹

Gerstner is particularly impressed with the passages from the Bible that Edwards used in his sermons to children: "'Many persons,' he warns the youth, 'never get rid of the guilt of the sins of their youth but it attends them to their graves and goes with them to eternity.' (Job 20:11) God will not excuse children nor does he forget their sin" ² Further on, he states: "'Early piety is especially acceptable to God (11 Cor. 34:2-3).'" ³ Gerstner's study on this particular subject then abstracts five reasons from Edward's sermons for the conversion of children:

First, their youth was the flower of their lives, and it was especially appropriate that this prime period should be given over to the Creator. Second, they should begin their lives with God. Third, if they do give their lives to God in youth, they have more of their lives to spend with God. . . . Fourth, conversion in youth prevents a great deal of sin, and it is

¹ John Gerstner, Steps to Salvation (Philadelphia [1960]), p. 34.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 35.

therefore more acceptable than at any other time of life. Fifth, those who begin early are likely to achieve more godliness and become eminent saints."¹

Gerstner's study considers Edwards' greatest sermon to youth to be the one based on the incident of Elisha's cursing the children who had laughed at him (II Kings 2:23-24); Edwards' comment on the incident was: "'God is very angry at the sins of children.'"² He shows children they can be guilty of much sin: "'Their hearts are naturally full of it. They hate God by nature, are children of disobedience and there is nothing good in them (Ps. 58:3).'"³

Even though Edwards had read and absorbed the science of the eighteenth century, and even though he applied the newest discoveries to his reasoning about God, he believed as the first generation of Calvinists in America believed: "The main business of education was to prepare children for conversion by teaching them the doctrines of moral precepts of Christianity."⁴

In Images or Shadows of Things Divine, Edwards repeats the picture of children as depraved:

Children's coming into the world naked and filthy and in their blood, and crying and impotent, is to signify the spiritual nakedness and pollution of nature and wretchedness of condition with which they are born.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 35-36.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 34.

⁴Morgan, p. 90.

⁵Jonathan Edwards, Images or Shadows of Things Divine, ed. Perry Miller (New Haven, 1946), p. 45.

Here, most decidedly, Edwards is returning to the doctrine of original sin, for man is spiritually naked only because of Adam's Fall. Edwards is not as despairing of man's nature as these passages seem to show, however, for redemption is the other side of the coin imprinted with depravity:

The Calvinist doctrine of the corruption of man through the fall of Adam (explained by Edwards as the loss of "supernatural principles" and the selfish use of the natural human principles) is an attempt to take seriously the radical contrast between "old" man and "new"; the doctrine of original sin is the other side of the doctrine of redemption.¹

Edwards wrote that "the work of redemption is a work that God carries on from the fall of man to the end of the world."² It must never be forgotten, however, that redemption is applied only to the "elect" and through "limited atonement."

Primarily, Edwards wants parents to be cognizant of the necessity of an early conversion because of the depraved nature of man. Adam's posterity here on earth did not begin until after the Fall. All generations, consequently, participate in the Fall, and all generations are continuously corrupted by the Fall. Man's human predicament is most precarious from the moment of his generation until the moment of his death, and since he can do nothing for himself to gain the needed spiritual grace for salvation, it is most essential that he fully accept

¹Conrad Cherry, The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal (New York, 1966), p. 200.

²Edwards, Works, I, 298.

God's gift of grace early in life. Edwards, therefore, tells children that God is not only angry enough to correct them but to cast them into hell.¹ He advises them further that they deserve to burn, "for they have more knowledge than they practice,"² and "God is particularly angry because they give the first part of their lives to the devil."³

In his analysis of Jonathan Edwards' view of original sin, Cherry explains the strong demonstration of orthodox Calvinism in Edwards' theology:

Central to Edwards' interpretation is his attempt to show how original sin illuminates the Pauline "justification by faith alone." Salvation by grace through faith means God accomplishes for man what man cannot do for himself; confidence in God's power to deliver has as its correlate a conviction that man needs deliverance by a power not his own. The abandonment of the Calvinist doctrine that all men are totally corrupt coram deo has as its counterpart the abandonment of the doctrine of justification by grace through faith. For the depravity of man and the glorious majesty of God's saving grace mutually illuminate each other. That is why Edwards insists that sin is a fall of the race in Adam (the continuity of guilt being maintained by the direct power of God) and not simply a series of separate human acts. It is a corruption of heart that reaches deep into the human subject, a corruption to be estimated primarily by comparing the selfishness of man with the overflowing love of the infinite God. The divine deliverance appears in its true light when one acknowledges that man cannot lift himself out of the mire of his own sin.⁴

¹Gerstner, p. 38.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Cherry, p. 201.

There can be no doubt that Cherry sees Edwards as upholding the core of Calvinism in his controversy with the relaxing theology of Arminianism. To think that man could have the power to deliver himself by an act of his own will from the state of depravity was, for Edwards, a usurpation of the power of the Almighty. Edwards' main objection to Arminianism was the Arminian belief that man had some control over his ultimate destiny. To Edwards, any assumption on the part of man of freedom of the will was merely another assertion of his depraved nature.

There is no doubt among theologians and historians that Edwards was not only one of the greatest Calvinistic divines, but that he had one of the most far-reaching intellects of his own age: "Edwards' pilgrimage of the mind was throughout those pathways of rationalist and empirical logic under which virtually all thought of his age was subsumed."¹ Even though his pathways may have been in the world of rationalism and empiricism, they were not of it:

It is also not surprising to find that when Jonathan Edwards came to feel that rationalism and ethics had stifled the doctrine of God's sovereignty and dethroned the doctrines of grace, he threw over the whole covenant scheme, repudiated the conception of transmission of sin by judicial imputation, declared God unfettered by any agreement or obligation, made grace irresistible, and annihilated the natural ability of man. It was Jonathan Edwards who went back to the

¹Edward H. Davidson, Jonathan Edwards: The Narrative of a Puritan Mind (Boston, 1966), p. ix.

doctrine from which the tradition had started; went back, not to what the first generation of New Englanders had held, but to Calvin, and who became, therefore, the first consistent and authentic Calvinist in New England.¹

Edwards' return to Calvinism, however, was not as a reactionary but as one who had a real understanding of man based on new discoveries about man, for he had something more to say than had been previously said within the scholastic frame of reasoning. He would not let society rest easily; he would not let it live with easy assumptions that God was bound by a covenant of faith, giving the elect a religious security.² He would not let society presume that man's belief in God moved God to redeem man and that man was saved simply because he believed:

He never bewildered his auditors by expounding scientific analogies beyond their grasp, but he quietly took into the realm of theology the principles he had learned--or believed were obvious--in his inspired reading of Newton. Obviously his imagination had taken fire from such remarks of Newton's as, "It is not to be conceived that mere mechanical causes could give birth to so many regular motions." Thousands of Newtonians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries took this to mean only that "God" created the universe; Edwards took it to mean that cause in the realm of mechanics is merely a sequence of phenomena, with the inner connection of cause and effect still mysterious and terrifying. He interpreted the sequence of belief and regeneration by the same insight.³

Perhaps because of his background, Edwards' theological position was Calvinistic in regard to the nature of man, but as an

¹Miller, Errand Into The Wilderness, p. 48.

²Ibid., pp. 49-50.

³Perry Miller, Jonathan Edwards (New York [1949]), p. 79.

enlightened man of the eighteenth century he held to his theological position on the basis of applying the laws of science to theology. Thus, he felt that the development of faith and regeneration came through man's experience with various phenomena; however, he also felt that the real or ultimate cause of the world was still undiscovered.

Edwards was one of the few American Calvinists who remembered that the New England Israel was founded to advance the ideas of the Reformation by returning to the pure doctrines of early Christianity. He was thoroughly convinced of the Christian paradox that divine deliverance comes to man only when he admits that he cannot lift himself out of the pit of his own existence. The doctrines of election and reprobation symbolized for Edwards the constantly precarious position of man from birth to death, and neither science nor a new social theology could reduce man's situation to one of safety and comfort.

CHAPTER III

"A BROOD OF BABY FIENDS"--NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE

Although the Puritanic-Calvinistic conflict concerning the concepts of good and evil had been in the hearts and minds of Americans for more than two hundred years, it was Nathaniel Hawthorne who fully brought man's moral drama into the American novel and tale. Hawthorne frequently wondered how his long ancestral line would have assessed him; however, the proper and more important assessment is his evaluation of his early Puritan ancestors, striding largely and sternly through the pages of his writings. What does he absorb from them, and what attitudes does he assume toward them?

This investigation will attempt a close examination or lineal explication of selections from Hawthorne's tales and novels, revealing implicit and explicit demonstrations of the thesis that he taints his fictional children with innate depravity or with a propensity toward evil. Hawthorne's use of the child character for this end assists his readers not only to understand his adult characters but also to understand the nature and actions of mankind generally. Hawthorne's child characters are startlingly effective as a manifestation of sin

and evil, but the presentation does not exclude the possibility of virtuous development. The purpose and intention of this study is to investigate Hawthorne's dramatic use of the doctrine of innate depravity in fiction, not to prove that this is the only reading.

The selections will be examined in two major divisions: one consisting of the investigation of the child character in tales published from 1832 to the posthumous publication of Doctor Grimshawe's Secret in 1883; the second consisting of the child characters in The Scarlet Letter and The House of Seven Gables. The analysis of Pearl will, of course, assume the larger portion of the second section, since she is the major child character in all of Hawthorne's fiction and a significant character in The Scarlet Letter.

Hawthorne was born into a Puritan culture, of Puritan ancestry, and apparently had an interest in both through his reading in early Americana. Some of the more pertinent selections he read between 1826 and 1850 which contributed to a development and understanding of his New England background are: Cotton Mather's Magnalia, S. Mather's Apology, "Remarkables" of Increase Mather, Ward's "Cobbler,"--all presenting historical background.¹ He also read Increase Mather's Illustrious Providences, Snow's History of Boston, Thacker's History of

¹Marion L. Kesselring, Hawthorne's Reading 1828-1850 (New York, 1949), p. 7.

Plymouth, Macy's History of Nantucket, Felt's Annals of Salem, Smith's Description of New England, and Morton's New English Canaan.¹ Some time before 1838 he read the works of Washington, Hamilton, and Jefferson.² From the realm of curious information he read Robbins' Disorders of Literary Men, Brewster's Letters on Natural Magic, Scott's Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft, and Lavater's Essays on Physiognomy.³ Besides his historical and curious readings, Hawthorne's readings consisted of sermons and biographies: Samuel Parr, Bishop Hurd, Baxter, and Jeremy Taylor in England, and Samuel Willard and Samuel Mather in the colonies.⁴

Hawthorne also read at least two anthologies of American poetry: Specimens of the American Poets and Specimens of American Poetry.⁵ To his reading of religious materials can be added: Taylor's discourses (1828), election sermons (1828), funeral sermons (1828), and ordination sermons (1828).⁶ Any interest Hawthorne had in guilt and retribution could have been stimulated by his reading in the Mathers and in the other Puritan divines. His interest in the Puritans was important to

¹Ibid., pp. 9-10.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 11.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 25.

him, since he also read books dealing with the Cromwellian era of English history: Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, The Newgate Calendar, and English State Trials, all excellent examples of "guilt and retribution" which "he liked to ponder."¹

An important part of Hawthorne's nature was his pondering of guilt and retribution:

Certain it is, however, that this great power of blackness in him derives its force from its appeals to that Calvinistic sense of Innate Depravity and Original Sin, from whose visitations, in some shape or other, no deeply thinking mind is always and wholly free.²

Then what is the attitude toward man that Hawthorne expresses? Does it evolve out of the Calvinistic culture into which he was born; does such a culture merely give encouragement to the development of an innate attitude he held about man; or does the New England culture provide an opportunity for the expression of what was merely a dramatic attitude?

There are, of course, several scholarly opinions of Hawthorne's attitude toward man. Some of this scholarship concerns itself with Hawthorne's use of Calvinism and will be discussed because it validates the reasoning behind the thesis. Schneider, for instance, believes that Hawthorne's attraction to Calvinism lies in his insight into the truth behind Calvinistic

¹Arlin Turner, Nathaniel Hawthorne: An Introduction and Interpretation (New York, 1961), p. 18.

²Herman Melville, "Hawthorne and His Mosses," as quoted in Edmund Wilson, The Shock of Recognition (New York, 1943), p. 192.

symbols.¹ Parrington, the literary historian, sees Hawthorne's age as one of "flux," but he also sees Hawthorne as rejecting Channing's theory of perfectibility of man, for man "seemed to him [Hawthorne] quite as likely to turn out to be of the Devil as the first born of God."² Hoffman notes other than an historical reason for Hawthorne's choosing settings and characters from the past; they permit him to "take full advantage of the romancer's prerogative of presenting the truths of the human heart 'under circumstances to a great extent, of the writer's own choosing or creation.'"³

Even though Hawthorne's contemporaries Emerson and Channing hold forth in their writings about the perfectibility of man's nature, Hawthorne was not alone in his interest in the dark side of life. Published from 1837 to 1842 were several titles demonstrating not only an interest in the Puritans but also an interest in evil in the preternatural form of witchcraft: The Witches: A Tale of New England (1837); Delusions: or The Witch of New England (1839); The Salem Belle, or a Tale of Love and Witchcraft in 1692 (1842); Ruth Valley: or the Fair Puritan (1845); and The Puritan and His Daughter (1845).⁴ Regardless of

¹ Herbert W. Schneider, The Puritan Mind (New York, 1930), p. 262.

² Vernon Louis Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought, Vol. II: 1800-1860 The Romantic Revolution in America (New York, [1927/]), 435.

³ Daniel Hoffman, Form and Fable in American Fiction (New York, 1965), p. 105.

⁴ G. Harrison Orians, "New England Witchcraft in Fiction," American Literature, II (March, 1930), 60-63.

this list of titles, which seem to demonstrate an interest similar to Hawthorne's, he found himself opposing almost alone the soft attitude of the New England intellectuals toward the nature of man. In fact, he must have found himself somewhat in the same position as Jonathan Edwards when that Puritan opposed the eighteenth-century optimism of the Arminian position of freedom of the will.

Historically, Spiller aligns Hawthorne's attitude with that of Jonathan Edwards, because Hawthorne continued the moral explorations begun by Edwards and because the writings of both men reveal a curiosity concerning not only man's relation to man but also man's relation to God.¹ Additionally, by relying for sources on such writers as Bunyan, Milton, and Spenser, Hawthorne tried to "communicate unseen moral laws."²

Hawthorne's introspective attitude turned him, of course, to reading Puritan histories, sermons, and literature, and the mind of the Puritan with its habit of self-analysis is a "natural forerunner to psychology."³ It then becomes a moot point whether Hawthorne anticipated modern psychology or whether he artistically refined the Puritan habit of introspection and applied the Puritan process to areas of human nature that his

¹Robert Spiller, et al., Literary History of the United States (New York, 1959), p. 419.

²Ibid., p. 420.

³Ibid., p. 419.

ancestors dared not probe. "It was Hawthorne who restored to the American mind that doctrine of sin which Emerson and other transcendentalists so studiously ignored."¹ Certainly it was not just the Calvinistic concern with sin that caused Hawthorne to interest himself in the Puritan attitude towards man. The methodology of the Puritans appealed to his imagination, but even more than that, he demonstrated a concern for the ethical values of the Puritans rather than for the values of the Romantics.² In addition to Spiller, another literary historian specifies the existence of a relationship between Edwards and Hawthorne. Parrington relates Hawthorne to Edwards' "psychological clinic of the Great Awakening," for Hawthorne, like Edwards, approaches an examination of human nature through sin and conscience.³

Although American Calvinism surrounded Hawthorne, he molded it into artistic form, and held both the "moral and psychological problem in a state of delicate suspension," not falling into Whitman's "mud of optimistic conclusion."⁴ Decidedly, no optimistic conclusions are present in the following interpretations:

¹Russell Kirk, "The Moral Conservatism of Hawthorne," Contemporary Review, CLXXXII (December, 1952), 361.

²Parrington, II, 436-437.

³Ibid., p. 437.

⁴Marius Bewley, The Complex Fate: Hawthorne, Henry James and Some American Writers (London, 1952), p. 7.

In view of the inexorable fate that overtakes the men and women who err in Hawthorne's stories and novels, his inability to completely forgive them, or to make a termination to their punishment--in view of these things, it is tempting to say that Hawthorne's conception of human nature continued to be corrupted by Calvinism, even though, intellectually, it was unacceptable to him. The native defect of heart, or the inherited malaise of the will, which are so recurrent throughout Hawthorne and which I have remarked on many times in these pages, comes at last to impress one as some taint of the soul with which man is born, and for which, though hardly responsible, he must be endlessly punished.¹

If the defect in Hawthorne's fictional characters is a "taint of the soul" and one for which the character is "hardly responsible" but for which "he must be endlessly punished," then it seems that Hawthorne does express a Calvinistic view of original sin. The taint, of course, suggests that Hawthorne accepted the doctrine of original sin. Bewley's statement that the characters are hardly responsible for their taint suggests that Hawthorne accepted the Adamic inheritance of man, which contributes to personal sin; however, it also suggests the doctrines of election and reprobation, which depend on God's will alone and for which man is "hardly responsible." Hawthorne's use of original sin carries him into the frame of Calvinism more than his use of any other theological dogma.

There is, however, much conflict in the criticism interpreting Hawthorne's view of man's moral nature. Of all the ambiguities in Hawthorne's writings, his concept of man's moral nature is undoubtedly the most difficult.

¹Marius Bewley, The Eccentric Design: Form in the Classic American Novel (New York, 1963), p. 172.

Warren sees Hawthorne as vacillating between pessimistic and optimistic determinism.¹ Thorslev defines Hawthorne as working out answers to man's nature in terms both fatalistic and deterministic.² Countering these statements is Stewart's interpretation of Hawthorne as stamped "indelibly and forever with the Puritan stamp."³ Of course, this statement, too, has been countered by Hazard, who sees the terms "Puritan" and "art" as incompatible.⁴ Further, Hawthorne is interpreted within a rational frame rather than within a theological frame, but with his "vision of evil" still based in a "theological tradition."⁵ Each statement about Hawthorne's theological position or about his interpretation of man's moral nature must be somewhat qualified or it becomes inaccurate, for any dogmatic statement about Hawthorne's attitude toward the human predicament can be refuted somewhere in his writings.

In his early exposition of the themes of sin and salvation, Hawthorne is not sympathetic with the soft answers

¹Austin Warren, Nathaniel Hawthorne (New York, 1934), p. xxxiii.

²Peter L. Thorslev, Jr., "Hawthorne's Determinism: An Analysis," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIX (September, 1964), 156.

³Randall Stewart, American Literature and Christian Doctrine (Baton Rouge, Louisiana, [1958/]), p. 18.

⁴Lucy Hazard, The Frontier in American Literature (New York, 1941), p. 29.

⁵F. O. Matthiessen, American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman (New York, [1964/]), p. 355.

which the transcendentalists adduced about man's eventual perfectibility. Evil is both real and present to him. Evil is decidedly present in the child characters of his early works; for example, Hugh Crombie in Fanshawe (1828) "had been distinguished, almost from his earliest infancy, by those precocious accomplishments, which because they consist in an imitation of the vices and follies of maturity, render the boy the favorite plaything of men."¹ Also, in Alice Doane's Appeal (1835), Hawthorne describes "children who had played a game that the imps of darkness might have envied them, since it disgraced an age, and dipped a people's hands in blood."² Within the context of the tale, the reference is obviously to the Salem witch trials.

To read Hawthorne is to know that he accepts the universality of sin and that he concentrates on its effects in man's human nature.³ Even in his notebooks "he preferred the old Puritan Divines to the Unitarian clergy with their repudiation of the dogma of human depravity."⁴ But it is in "Fancy's Show Box" (1837) that he makes his most explicit

¹The Complete Writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne (22 vols.; New York, [1900/], Old Manse Edition. XVI, 47-48. All future references will be from this edition and referred to as Works.

²Ibid., XVI, p. 242.

³A. N. Kaul, The American Vision (New Haven, [1964/]), p. 148.

⁴Randall Stewart, ed., The American Notebooks (New Haven, 1932), p. lxxii.

statement on man's human predicament, revealing that he very early entertained a general vision of evil:

Man must not disclaim his brotherhood, even with the guiltiest, since though his hand be clean, his heart has surely been polluted by the flitting phantoms of iniquity.¹

Within his general vision of evil, Hawthorne anatomizes sin into types or degrees. The "unpardonable sin" has been discussed most, but for the purpose of this thesis, attention will be focused on original sin and its effect on the conduct of children. Briefly, though, the unpardonable sin "is the violation of the sanctity of the human heart,"² committed by an individual who permits his intellect to destroy his human emotions, i. e., an Ethan Brand or a Roger Chillingworth.

In his attitude toward witchcraft as a sin, Hawthorne:

accepted for fictional purposes the theological sin of witchcraft, of a signed compact whereby one transferred allegiance and worship from God to the Devil. He then elaborated his characters, real and imaginary, under this conception until they embodied all the reputed characteristics, drawing from the resulting fabric the threads of his allegory.³

Hawthorne developed the characteristics of witchcraft specifically in Feathertop, where the devil, under the familiar name of Dickon, waits upon the witch. Then, of course, Mistress Hibbins in The Scarlet Letter has the sour disposition of a

¹Works, I, p. 306.

²Stewart, Notebooks, p. lxxiii.

³Orians, p. 65.

witch and invites Hester to participate in a sabbath. She also prophetically recognizes the sinful thoughts and guilt of Dimmesdale, and she suggests that Pearl is the child of the devil. The witch consultant in "The Hollow of the Three Hills" demonstrates her ability to conjure up visions for the young woman who visits her. It is in "Young Goodman Brown," however, that Hawthorne develops the most witch lore, including a full sabbath with the devil present.

In a sense, however, the "unpardonable sin" is not too far removed from the sin of witchcraft, although its characteristics are more subtly drawn. In the unpardonable sin, a desire to set the world right consumes the sinner, so that intellect is elevated over heart, and the result is a monomania. The unpardonable sin finally develops into the sin of pride, the lack of all human warmth. As a result the individual is isolated, and the devotion to evil, like witchcraft, becomes an allegiance with the devil, which is a hatred of God and a usurpation of God's role.¹

In his anatomizing of sin, therefore, Hawthorne develops the concept of the unpardonable sin, and uses witchcraft to dramatize it further, but the sin to which he gave full acceptance was original sin. There is more blackness in Hawthorne than there is "supernal grace," and the "curse of Cain

¹James E. Miller, "Hawthorne and Melville: The Unpardonable Sin," Publications of the Modern Language Association LXX (March, 1955), 95.

is on the heads of the generations of Adam."¹ The primary condition of man thus becomes important, and the resulting action or immorality becomes of secondary importance. The adultery, for example, of Hester and Dimmesdale is of little interest to Hawthorne, for he analyzes not the adultery but the conditions of the characters that lead to the immoral act, and he certainly analyzes the effects of the act.

All that can be said is that Hawthorne was alert to man's nature, good or bad, and that he frequently presented man within a theological or religious environment, requiring him to make decisions based on traditional morality or religious concepts. Whether Hawthorne worked out the moral or allowed his readers to do so is not the point. What is important is that the moral ambiguity of the characters is associated with Hawthorne's acceptance of human guilt, and, unmistakably, human guilt is associated with the doctrine of original sin, especially within the child characters. This concern of Hawthorne with man's predicament may be related directly or indirectly to his reading, to his acute awareness of his ancestry, or to the many observations he made about man and child. In presenting the child's predicament, however, he modifies his approach. Instead of tracing the effect of previously committed sin, he treats of the immediate conduct of the child and admits that the cause of

¹Harry Levin, The Power of Blackness: Hawthorne, Poe, Melville (New York, 1958), p. 55.

the conduct lies deeper than immediate childhood nature. The child, unlike the adult, does not turn away from laws, institutions, and relations that he has been conditioned by experience to accept. Hester and Dimmesdale know the law of God concerning adultery and know the acceptance of the law within their social environment, but they deliberately set it aside for a reason of their own, their physical love for each other. Pearl, on the other hand, is attracted to the scarlet letter, the symbol of adultery, but the attraction cannot be so easily distinguished as in the case of the adults. Perhaps the attraction is caused by her origin, which was a violation of the law. Perhaps she is attracted to the letter because of a precocious or mature knowledge about sin and evil, but it cannot be denied that there is within a child a strong propensity for the letter and that she demonstrates an affinity with a symbol of evil by her overt and immediate conduct rather than by any moral or psychological effects of deliberate acts of the will.

Hawthorne dramatizes the complexities of man's character; he does not moralize about them. Because of his understanding of man's nature as complex, he finds multiple alternatives and ambiguity useful to his presentation of that nature. Even his doubts he never states dogmatically, but he works through questions, implications, and possible alternatives to establish his attitude toward man. Hawthorne's characters suffer because of their partial knowledge of their own nature,

one of the effects of original sin, and he never relents from the position that man must accept this nature and endure the consequences of it. To understand Hawthorne is to understand the ambiguities and contradictions in the nature of man, for if Hawthorne is ever dogmatic, it is in his attempt to be faithful to the sanctity of man as an individual.

In totaling more than 70 child characters in the writings of Hawthorne, Levy finds that only those with a Puritan background show evil, and he cites the children in "The Gentle Boy" and The Scarlet Letter to substantiate his conclusion.¹ He further adds that "it is singular, at any rate, that not a child in any of the stories--except the Puritan children--is shown as anything but sweet, innocent, and unspotted."²

A close reading of Hawthorne, of course, calls for an objection to Levy's interpretation of the child character. By recognizing the "iron-fisted baby" in "The Artist of the Beautiful," the children who attack Doctor Grimshawe, the street urchins in The House of Seven Gables, the symbolic cannibalism of Ned Higgins, and the imp in the eyes of Pearl, one may see that Hawthorne was not so intolerant of Puritan children that he thought them to be the only bearers of childhood sin. There are

¹Alfred J. Levy, "Hawthorne's Attitude Toward Depravity and Evil," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957), p. 71.

²Ibid., p. 72.

many children to answer the question of Tobias in "The Gentle Boy," "'Do we not all spring from an evil root?'"

First published in Griswold's Token in 1832, "The Gentle Boy" begins with a historical sketch, presenting the position of the fanatical Quaker martyrs in seventeenth-century Massachusetts. The pietistic attitude of the so-called heretical sect provokes the Puritans to viciousness. On both sides, Puritan and Quaker, religion loses the theological virtues of true faith and charity and becomes "extremism." The Puritan theocracy is guilty of inflicting fines, corporal punishments, imprisonments, and legal execution.

Into this imbroglio Hawthorne introduces a six-year-old Quaker child whose father has been hanged by the Puritans and whose mother has been exiled. To save the immediate life of Ilbrahim, and possibly to save his heretical soul, Tobias Pearson takes him into his childless household. This, of course, makes the Pearsons suspect in the community, but nothing remarkable happens until Ilbrahim, the gentle boy, shares the Pearson home with another child who has been injured in a fall. Ilbrahim has wisely avoided communication with the Puritan children of the town, for "any circumstance made him sensible that the children, his equals in age, partook of the enmity of their parents."¹ The "enmity" of which they "partook" is an inheritance, but in this instance Hawthorne probably intends to

¹Works, I, 115.

present it as acquired rather than as instinctive since they "were taught to hate him," Ilbrahim.¹ Ilbrahim is the object of their "scorn and bitterness." He knows and understands their attitude, and avoids them. "The unappropriated love" he yearns to bestow, however, becomes the cause of his trouble, and his selection of a villain for a friend points up the fact that "the moral taste of the fruit of that forbidden tree corrupts his heavenly nature and makes his heart elect as friend a 'foul-hearted little villain.'"² The villain that he selects, of course, displays the effects of original sin much more than do the "brood of baby fiends" who have been taught to hate and inflict punishment on the Quakers in imitation of their elders' conduct toward Quakers. The suggestion that the children merely respond to parental influence explains some of the overt aggression as effects of perverse social instruction or suggests that the aggression is conduct learned from experience, though it would be legitimate to wonder why young children of "untainted bosoms"³ learn to imitate evil so readily, while good must be presented again and again before it becomes a virtuous

¹Ibid.

²Agnes McNeill Donohue, "'The Fruit of That Forbidden Tree': A Reading of 'The Gentle Boy,'" Casebook on The Hawthorne Question (New York, 1963), p. 158.

³Works, I, 118.

habit.¹ Besides presenting their acquired animosity, Hawthorne also notes that the "devil of their fathers entered into the unbreeched fanatics" when they saw Ilbrahim, and they displayed not only the conduct of torture that they had witnessed, but also, Hawthorne reports, the "brood . . . displayed an instinct of destruction"² far more loathesome than the blood thirstiness of manhood."³

Donatello must discover the meaning of good and evil to be human. Pearl and the "brood of baby fiends" are examples of the truth that good is not a human instinct.⁴ Is such destruction more loathsome because it arises from a seemingly childhood innocence, or is it truly more loathsome because it is

¹Masback sees the children as a "pack of wolves." This characterization, however, is presented as a response to parental influence. Frederic J. Masback, "The Child Character in Hawthorne and James" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1960), p. 48.

²The nineteenth century accepted a "semi-prophetic discernment" peculiar to childish innocence. Joe in "Ethan Brand" supposedly reflects this discernment; the child and dog in "Feathertop" possess it; and Ned in The House of Seven Gables has been accredited with it. If Hawthorne truly followed such a theory, then Ilbrahim should have this discernment. Why does the child in "The Minister's Black Veil" frighten the other children when he places a veil on his face? If his soul were innocent, he could not reflect guilt. It is more likely that Hawthorne saw all mankind, including children, as capable of recognizing the human heritage of sin. The gift should be most evident in Ilbrahim when he is in most danger.

³Works, I, 119.

⁴Millicent Bell, Hawthorne's View of the Artist (New York, [1962]), p. 17.

without rational control and represents man's unleashed inheritance? The description of the "unbreeched fanatics" suggests the "baby fiends" are still diaper-clad and younger than the age of reason. Further, they display an "instinct for destruction," suggesting that they need little or no instruction or example to perform their brutal, bloodthirsty act of beating Ilbrahim; they merely wait upon the opportunity to respond to their inherited devil, "the instinct of destruction."¹

The concept of "the devil of their fathers" supports the Adamic inheritance, and the children may then be responding to a general or central influence. If so, the classical concept of the hydra is also a possible interpretation. The hydra, of course, is a universal image for evil in the form of a serpent, and the image that Hawthorne uses for evil in "The Bosom Serpent." The several heads of the hydra suggest an analogy to the "brood of baby fiends." The heads (children) respond to the central or immortal head of the hydra (the instinct for destruction or devil of their fathers). The several heads are expendable, for each time one is severed two more reappear. The central head, like original sin, is immortal and spawns other sins.

Abhorrent as all this seems, Hawthorne leaves no doubt as to the reason behind the perverted act of the boy two years Ilbrahim's senior, the one friend upon whom Ilbrahim bestows his

¹Works, I, 119.

love. The boy is Judas-like, not betraying Ibrahim for silver but merely for the sake of betrayal. Hawthorne is almost too obvious when he introduces this character as having injured himself in a fall from a tree. Turning from a traditional Biblical allusion, Hawthorne relies on his interest in phrenology and his early reading of Lavater's Essays on Physiognomy¹ and introduces the boy as physically twisted, symbolizing a tortuous morality. The boy's face impresses the beholder "disagreeably":

. . . but it required some examination to discover that the cause was a very slight distortion of the mouth, and the irregular, broken line and near approach of the eyebrows. Analogous, perhaps, to the trifling deformities was an almost imperceptible twist of every joint, and the uneven prominence of the breast, forming a body, regular in its general outline, but faulty in almost all its details. The disposition of the boy was sullen and reserved, and the village schoolmaster stigmatized him as obtuse in intellect; although, at a later period of life, he evinced ambition and very peculiar talents.²

The description is almost a cataloguing of characteristics of a morally perverse nature; however, Hawthorne concludes his coloring of the character by adding the boy's responses to the romances that Ibrahim read to him. The boy "sometimes

¹Hawthorne read Johann C. Lavater, Essays on Physiognomy, trans. Rev. C. Moore (London, 1797), I, 137; and George Combe, The Constitution of Man (Boston, 1829), pp. 147-148; see Kesselring, pp. 55-68. The theory was that parental moral traits can be transferred to children. Hawthorne uses the concept several times: The Scarlet Letter; The House of Seven Gables; "The Artist of the Beautiful."

²Works, I, 116.

interrupted them by brief remarks upon the incidents, displaying shrewdness above his years, mingled with moral obliquity."¹ No doubt exists that the slight distortion and "imperceptible twist of every joint" suggest a morally depraved nature. The face and head demonstrate, according to the pseudo-science of phrenology, an internal moral obliquity; the uneven breast connotes a misshapen heart; and the shrewdness beyond years suggests knowledge not taught by "the village schoolmaster." The boy's ambition and peculiar talents seem to be his only qualities; they are dubious. He also remains without a name, suggesting any man or everyman.

If the boy, like the other children, had learned animosity at the knee of his Puritan parent, he would not now stand apart from the group,² but would join in the tumult to injure Ilbrahim. He, however, openly displays his peculiar talent when he calls from the side:

"Fear not, Ilbrahim, come hither and take my hand;" and his happy friend endeavored to obey him. After watching the victim's struggling approach with a calm smile and unabashed eye, the foul-hearted little villain lifted his staff and struck Ilbrahim on the mouth, so forcibly that the blood issued in a stream.³

This display is not an imitation of the conduct of the parents. This is betrayal, not persecution. It has an

¹Ibid., I, 117.

²Ibid., I, 119.

³Ibid., I, 119-120.

"original" style, a peculiar cruelty that the perpetrator enjoys for the cruelty itself. To explain the child as mentally ill is not to deny that he knew his act to be morally wrong, for he is shrewd enough to know upon whom he can practice such talents without receiving retribution.

As a result of original sin, Ibrahim has a weakened judgment. Each of the "brood of baby fiends" has inherited his destructive instinct, and the "fallen" boy, who is no more than eight years of age, has exercised, at his first opportunity, the moral obliquity of his true nature.

In addition to "The Gentle Boy," Hawthorne published another tale in 1832 with a historical setting and background, "My Kinsman, Major Molineux." Robin Molineux arrives in the city to make his way in the world under the care of his uncle, Major Molineux. Robin possesses the confidence of a young man reared in the safety of family and country town, but is unsure of his direction in the city "with crooked and narrow streets." Young Robin seeks his kinsman despite adverse conditions and the uncooperative people from whom he asks his way. After several unsuccessful encounters to get assistance, Robin seats himself on the steps of a church, awaiting his uncle, who he has been told will shortly pass by. Hawthorne introduces a dream sequence in which Robin returns to his home, but finds that he can no longer enter, for he is arriving at the uncertain position of being situated between two worlds. An adult

"friend" now waits with Robin for the kinsman, eventually to be led before Robin by a ghoulish mob. The noble kinsman, tarred and feathered, is the object of the mob's hysteria and irrational laughter. As the kinsmen have a mutual recognition, Robin joins the derisive laughter of the mob and laughs loudest of all. Then all is quiet, and Robin wants to return to his home, but is encouraged to stay by the stranger who sees Robin as a young man well able to make his way "in this world" without his kinsman's assistance.

Robin, like Ilbrahim, seems all innocence, but he, too, has certain flaws.¹ He prides himself on his physical strength, relies on his oak cudgel for protection and on his own "shrewdness" for moral and intellectual direction. Robin is so certain of his shrewdness that he reiterates the possession of this quality several times, but since he is the loser in each encounter with the citizens of the city, his "shrewdness" hardly seems adequate for direction in the city. Yet Robin may be more shrewd about the things of this world than even he realizes. Frequently his name has been interpreted by critics as relating him to a young bird; however, Hawthorne reports in a narrative passage that Robin was only one name for the youth. Robin discovers that men have more than one face, more than one voice, and certainly man has more than one name by which he is

¹"Robin's innocence was largely compounded of ignorance and a foolish confidence in his shrewdness." Lionel Trilling, The Experience of Literature (Chicago, [1967]), p. 14.

known, innocence perhaps the least known of them all. Possibly Robin has another kinsman, the literary and mythical Robin Goodfellow who is a mischievous fellow, the "shrewd and knavish sprite" who carries a staff and a wallet, and appears in A Midsummer Night's Dream.¹

Because of personal pride, therefore, Robin does not see himself correctly, and he derides a citizen by calling him a country representative because the man has not heard of his kinsman. Ironically, Robin criticizes his own position, since he is the country representative of the family and is exhibiting the worldly position of his uncle to obtain personal recognition. Unknown to Robin is the fact that his uncle no longer has a position with the people of the city. If he were not a country representative, he would know that the "smell of tar" is "the centre of business" for the night.² He, of course, cannot know how close to the real business of the evening the scent of hot tar takes him. He boldly asks with a note of pride for his uncle in the barber shop. He asks for "my kinsman." They laugh at one who is so ignorant of this world that he identifies himself with a fallen nobleman.

When Robin moves on to the tavern, he is aware of the rum and smoke, but feels a kinship with "two or three sheepish

¹Thomas E. Connors, "My Kinsman Major Molineux: A Reading," Modern Language Notes, LXXIV (April, 1959), p. 299.

²Works, III, 298.

countrymen."¹ These men, like Robin, are only passing through. They are merely "sheepmen," a word suggesting no social standing and little worldly knowledge--country representatives. It is with these men that Robin "feels" a kinship. Although he verbally criticized the man of his first encounter for being a "country representative," his true feelings identify him with country people.

Because of a weakened judgment, Ilbrahim could not choose correctly in assigning his love to a friend. Robin arrives at night, when his physical sight is impaired by darkness. This impairment of physical sight is an analog to an impaired or weakened moral insight that will be tested this one night by all the capital sins of the world. Each encounter of Robin's represents a vice and suggests demonic implications. More specifically, the encounters suggest the ferryman as avarice, the old man as pride, the barber shop as evil in man and universe, the inn as gluttony, the crowded street as the opulence of Vanity Fair. The harlot is lust, the sentry is sloth, and finally the crowd collectively personifies wrath.²

The innkeeper immediately cites Robin as a "country representative," but is the first to invite him for "a long

¹Ibid., III, 299-300.

²Arthur J. Broes, "Journey Into Moral Darkness: 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux' as Allegory," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIX (September, 1964), 175-179.

stay with us."¹ Robin's pride immediately comes forth and he suggests to himself, "The rogue has guessed that I am related to the major!"² Robin, this time, ironically judges the man correctly as a rogue, but he has no rational reason for doing so. His only reason is the same false sense of superiority that made him judge the first man as ignorant. Robin reveals his shrewdness when he thinks the man to be a "rogue" but calls him "my honest friend." His speech is deceitful to his own thought, but before the evening is over he will adjust his definitions of "honest" and "friend." Again, Robin is too proud to announce loudly his lack of funds, but he announces boisterously his relationship to Molineux.³ Robin has received no instruction in pride or in deceit, yet both are present in his character and in his conduct. The innkeeper identifies Robin as "Hezekiah Mudge," a "runaway bounden" servant and Robin has yet another name when he is sent forth into the street by the innkeeper. This additional name brings him closer to those of more than one voice and those of more than one face, and, of course, supports the deceitful speech he has just perpetrated. To say that such actions and such an attitude are only trifling wrongs or to say they are normal or human is Hawthorne's point. These are the "imperceptible

¹Works, III, 301.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

twists of every joint" that constitute humanity and its weakened moral nature.

When Robin leaves the inn, he senses the hostility in the others, but it is this hostility that causes him to "relinquish his purpose of breaking the innkeeper's head."¹ When Robin's pride has been hurt by his being identified with a "bounden servant," he turns to violence; yet he should not be offended, since he is willing to serve an important personage who can give him a worldly position. The man really named Robin correctly. He is willing to sell himself to an accomplished kinsman, yet he resents the verbalized truth of his personal ambitions.

Robin's experience on the spacious street reveals a world of "half dancing gentlemen" of European imitation.² Robin becomes ashamed of his "quiet and natural gait."³ His judgment, therefore, is in error; however, when he reaches the "steeped building" he does not enter the church but crosses the street, parading it once more, hoping to find what he searches for. These walks and rambles fatigue him much more quickly than his "journey of several days on the other side."⁴

¹Ibid., 302.

²Ibid., 303.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 304.

The implication is that the "rambles" are not physically fatiguing, but are emotionally and morally fatiguing to an inexperienced will.

Robin thinks his "luck" in searching for his uncle may be better at the third domicile on a darkened street. His choice of the word "luck" is again ironically shrewd, for it is his fate or future that he is inadvertently working out this particular evening. Robin is fully visible to his temptress at the domicile, but only the "sparkling" eye and the suggestive petticoat are visible to him.¹ Robin calls the woman "pretty mistress," since he "knows" nothing to the contrary. He really doesn't know whether he can use the term "pretty," since he sees only a part of a woman's garment and "the occasional sparkle of her eye." He assumes a new voice as well as a new name, and instead of loud and bold in uttering confidence, his voice becomes "plaintive and winning."² "Plaintive" suggests a sad or melancholy state, but "winning" suggests an attempt to engage or charm, with all the Freudian implications. Robin seeks to be winning and engaging for knowledge he does not have. The shift is unconscious; it is not knowledge of his uncle but knowledge of the mistress he seeks. Biblical references to the word "know" have long been connected with sexual knowledge, and it would be appropriate for Hawthorne to use such an

¹Ibid., 305

²Ibid.

interpretation of the word, applying it to both Robin's external search for his uncle and his internal search for forbidden knowledge. Hawthorne gives some textual evidence to support the Biblical interpretation of "know" when he humorously has Robin doubt if the "sweet voice spoke the Gospel truth."¹ In a very worldly sense, she does.

Hawthorne's description of the woman's physical appearance shows her to be attractive to Robin, but Hawthorne also describes her morally through the appearance of her eyes when he says, "Her bright eyes possessed a sly freedom, which triumphed over those of Robin."² Robin's answer reveals this triumph: "'Now, truly, I am in luck,' replied Robin cunningly."³ "Shrewd" is, of course, a synonym for "cunning," but so are "artificial" and "crafty"--all implying an inclination toward deceit. Robin repeats "luck" for a twofold reason--he is lucky to have found his uncle's dwelling, but more lucky to have found so pretty a mistress. He instinctively disguises his subconscious purpose because he knows it is unacceptable to the morality he has been taught.⁴ Robin is deceitful again in this

¹Ibid., 306.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Lesser agrees with this interpretation to the extent that Robin makes only a weak attempt to find his uncle. Leaving home gives Robin both opportunity and freedom. Additionally, when he finds his uncle, "he will have to re-submit to authority." Simon O. Lesser, "The Image of a Father: A Reading of 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux,' and 'I Want to Know Why,'" *Partisan Review*, XXII (Summer, 1955), pp. 375-379.

encounter, for he tells the young mistress that he has lodgings at the inn.¹ His deceit is, however, the use of a lie to alleviate the immoral predicament he discovers for himself. He also discovers that "her touch was light, and the force was gentleness," and although Robin did not "know" anything to the contrary, he could "read in her eyes what he did not hear in her words" and the "scarlet petticoat proved stronger than the athletic country youth."² He escapes the temptation only by the "luck" or a door opening somewhere and the nightwatchman approaching. He is saved not by an act of his will but by accidental "luck" or circumstances. Robin's adventure is lust, if not in act then in thought, and only Robin can judge the guilt of his conscience. It is obvious from the laughter following each incident, including this seduction scene, that the personae know Robin will be one with them before the night is through.

Robin's feelings of guilt follow the emotional conflict with the harlot, and he expresses them in a belief that a spell has been cast upon him. He recalls that a wizard of his country had put a spell upon three pursuers who had been wandering there.³ Robin's interpretation is not altogether

¹Works, III, 306.

²Ibid., III, 307.

³Ibid., III, 308.

incorrect, although he fails to recognize the wizard as his own humanity or himself as the wandering pursuer.

When Robin perseveres in seeking out his kinsman, he again finds the gentleman of "two faces." Hawthorne again uses physical appearance to denote a moral condition, as he did in "The Gentle Boy." The description of the man with the "forehead with its double prominence," with the "broad-hooked nose," with the "shaggy eyebrows," and with the "fiery eyes"¹ takes in all suggestions of active evil; and it is this man that Robin keeps encountering again and again throughout the night--"the fiend of fire and the fiend of darkness."²

When Robin seats himself upon the church steps to await his kinsman's arrival and muses upon places near and far, he looks into the church and passes a judgment upon the "heavenly sanctity of the place." He muses that the sanctity is visible because "no earthly and impure feet were within the walls."³ The spiritual is only visibly separated from the earthly, which he equates with impurity. There are no earthly feet except the impure. Although Hawthorne is speaking of humanity as depraved, this is an evaluation, a conclusion, not a condemnation. Directly following this realization, Robin recalls his family

¹Ibid., III, 310.

²Ibid., III, 310-311.

³Ibid., III, 313.

life to keep "his heart pure."¹ He finds, however, that he cannot return home, for he has been excluded. Yet he has committed no overt act of evil since he left home. Robin has done nothing evil as far as the standards of the world judge him, but he has grown in knowledge of the world. He has had to make choices between good and evil, and he has learned that one must have knowledge of both to choose. It is such knowledge that not only keeps him from returning but also makes him aware that he cannot return.

The man who "befriends" Robin and sits beside him to await the Major admits that he too pursues knowledge and has a "singular curiosity" about Robin's meeting with his kinsman.² The man is obviously capable of deceit for he knows what has become of Molineux or he would not be interested in witnessing the meeting, and he further deceives Robin by saying there are "three or four riotous fellows abroad to-night."³ In reality there is a crowd that has deteriorated into an emotional mob; its behavior is described by "discord," "wild," "confused," "commotion," and "stumbling."⁴ This is the way of the world.

At the climax, under the firelight of the torches, Robin recognizes that he has been especially selected for tonight,

¹Ibid., III, 314.

²Ibid., III, 318.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., III, 320.

since "the double-faced fellow has his eye upon me."¹ Robin, once confused by the sparkle in the eye of the pretty mistress, now held by the fire in the eye of the leader and blinded by the torchlight of the parade, sees his kinsman only too clearly.² He hears the laughter, once directed at him, rise from the various individuals and become a roar of derision at his kinsman. He now participates actively in the laughter, just as he participated in each evil encounter during the evening. His participation seizes him like a "spell," and he joins in.³ This adult mob behaves no better than did the children who stoned Ilbrahim because he was a Quaker. This brood of fiends vent their anger on Molineux only as an object of their emotions. They advance like "fiends" "in mockery." They have "counterfeited pomp" in a "senseless uproar," "trampling all on an old man's heart."⁴

Robin's laughter has been interpreted as a cleansing action, "both emotional and intellectual."⁵ If this is true, then it is legitimate to ask, "Cleansed of what?" Robin has

¹Ibid., III, 322.

²The major is "symbol of moral good and order in a world from which such virtues have disappeared." Broes, p. 183.

³"Robin's laughter is the recognition of the triumph of evil." Ibid.

⁴Works, III, 325.

⁵Richard Fogle, Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1952), p. 111.

overtly done little that is wrong. Yet he violates all he respects to join with the "rioters." The laughter links him to these tormentors, for he is "Robin Goodfellow," who joins the merriment; he too has more than one voice, bold, pleading, or ridiculing with laughter. The laughter is, of course, a key image in evaluating Robin, for through laughter he places himself under the "Lord of Misrule" and joins with the "new prince of war and destruction."¹ These epithets are certainly overt expressions of man's hostile instincts. No man, because of the Fall, can remain innocent in this world, but will eventually come to a knowledge of evil. With this knowledge Robin frees himself from the adult world of parents.²

Unfortunately, Robin must then identify with the rioters. This, for Hawthorne, is the tragedy of being human. If Robin does what all must do, then humanity is in a fallen state. Robin cannot go home; he no longer seeks support or protection for the natural oak cudgel he brought from the country; rather, he clings to a stone post of the town. Perhaps, after Robin has identified with the mob, his friend can predict accurately that Robin will rise "in the world" without help. To rise in this world, Robin has learned to compromise.

As Robin seeks to find a kinsman in this world, the Rev. Mr. Hooper seeks to have mankind find its true nature. "The

¹Works, III, 323.

²Lesser, p. 381.

Minister's Black Veil," published in 1836, develops its meaning from the interpretation of the veil with which the minister covers his face. The story gives an account of the effects of this act upon his congregation and upon Mr. Hooper, himself. Mr. Hooper will always look on the world through the black veil, and no one will ever fully see his face again.

The wearing of the veil has an unnerving effect on some in his congregation; yet Mr. Hooper becomes a powerful speaker and a kindly minister. The veil gives him a sympathy with sinners and the ability to know secret sins of thought or deed. He dies wearing the veil, and to those staring at it he says, "I look around me, and lo! on every visage a Black Veil."¹ Thus the double fold of crepe represents the natural human condition.

The effect of this piece of crepe on adults is not surprising. They are disturbed, but place the cause outside themselves, suggesting that Mr. Hooper has made himself into something awful.² His first sermon, however, after donning the veil concerns "secret sin and those sad mysteries which we hide from our nearest and dearest, and would fain conceal from our own consciousness, even forgetting that the Omniscient can detect them."³ His audience shakes. The veil makes him "ghostlike from head to foot."⁴ Mr. Hooper's appearance loses

¹Works, I, 62.

²Ibid., I, 42.

³Ibid., I, 44.

⁴Ibid., I, 46.

a substantial, material quality and takes on the spirituality of a dreadful truth. The adults sense the truth of his statements as he speaks from behind the veil. They sense that the veil is connected with the melancholy truth of man's condition.

Hawthorne wants to impress his reader with the universality of the human condition and includes not only "hoary" head, "middle aged," and "young," but also children who respond to the veil as do their elders, by recognizing their own condition:

The children babbled of it on their way to school. One imitative little imp covered his face with an old black handkerchief, thereby so affrighting his playmates that the panic seized himself, and he well-nigh lost his wits by his own waggery.¹

It is not innocence in the children that causes them to respond with fear. They recognize the symbol of human sin, just as adults do, and, like them, tremble and fear. An interesting characterization falls to the child who dons the veil. The "imp," in an attempt to imitate the minister, puts on a makeshift veil, and to his own "panic" finds that the effect is more than "waggery." The feelings he arouses in himself and in the other children create an internal response identical to that of the adults and frighten him out of his wits. There are several definitions for "imp" which enable Hawthorne to suggest alternative interpretations for the child's conduct. One definition is "a mischievous child," and that would fit into the idea of "waggery." A second definition is "a little devil

¹Works, I, 50.

or demon, an evil spirit," and this is possibly the character that the makeshift veil releases, and is the same character that frightens the boy out of his wits. The children thus respond to the veil of sin on anyone's face, adult or child, just as they respond to the veil on the minister's face--sin is a universal condition:

It grieved him, to the very depth of his kind heart, to observe how the children fled from his approach, breaking up their merriest sports, while his melancholy figure was yet afar off. Their instinctive dread caused him to feel more strongly than ought else, that a preternatural¹ horror was interwoven with the threads of the black crepe.

What preternatural horror could the children respond to other than that horror introduced into their souls by original sin--the horror of the knowledge of good and evil? Ironically, the veil does bring the members of the congregation closer together, for they all feel the influence of it, and there is a kind of negative communion in a "brotherhood of sinners."²

The child character in "The Artist of the Beautiful" (1844) does not don a black veil, but he does wear the sagacious look of adult wisdom or shrewdness. While the plot of "The Artist of the Beautiful" centers on Owen Warland's search for the beautiful, his search places him in opposition to standards imposed by a materialistic society. Owen was first apprenticed to a watchmaker with the object of turning his delicate

¹Ibid., I, 56.

²Levy, p. 87.

abilities and skills to something of a useful and mundane purpose. Owen, however, is a confirmed idealist, and in the face of materialism retreats into his own world, losing Annie, the woman he loves, and alienating himself from his employer, Annie's father, Peter Hovenden. The mere presence of Peter Hovenden paralyzes Owen's creative imagination. Danforth, the young blacksmith who is Owen's rival for Annie, and Hovenden represent for Owen degrees of an antagonistic world. Of these two adversaries, Hovenden is the cynic, but even Annie is unable to follow the delicate nature of Warland and defines her own limitations when she marries Danforth. Some years later Warland brings the successful embodiment of his imagination in the form of a marvelous butterfly to Annie as a gift. In the presence of Danforth, Hovenden, and Annie, the butterfly performs miraculously at the artist's command. The insect responds according to the sensitivity of the personality it hovers over, being almost paralyzed when near Hovenden. When it goes to Annie's child, so like his grandfather, the baby, in brute fashion, crushes it in his fist. Warland, however, feels that the success he has attained did not lie in the butterfly he created, but in the idea he had caught when he accomplished the beautiful. The spirit of the beautiful remains with the artist, though the object is destroyed.

The conduct of the baby is not caused by acquired destructive habits. He has no conscious antipathy to Warland;

however, he has inherited the nature of his grandfather. Hawthorne describes Hovenden as a man with "cold, unimaginative sagacity, by contact with which everything was converted into a dream except the densest matter of the physical world."¹ Hovenden cannot change the densest matter because it identifies with his own nature. Thus, Hovenden is in opposition to everything spiritual, for "'strength is an earthly monster. I [Warland] make no pretensions to it. My force, whatsoever there may be of it, is altogether spiritual.'"² One reading of the story puts the earthly and the spiritual in opposition. Man's predicament is that, because of his complex nature, he participates in both worlds, materialistic and idealistic. Warland, however, recognizes the predominance of the spiritual in his own nature and sees his antithesis in Hovenden when he remarks that "his hard brute force darkens and confuses the spiritual element within me."³ In this statement the spiritual man attributes imagery to the earthly, material man that traditionally equates fallen man with the "hard brute force," and the result of brute force is the "confusing" of man's "spiritual element." Peter Hovenden is infralapsarian man, man who opposes the spirit and resides in a darkened and confused world. He never fully understands, never fully accepts, and is always cynical.

¹ Works, V, 302.

² Ibid., V, 297.

³ Ibid., V, 298-299.

Perhaps because of Annie's feminine nature, these characteristics of her father are not so obvious in her personality, but once she marries Danforth, who represents a benign strength, the nature of her father, with its deep strain of cynicism, is at large again in Annie's child. In "The Gentle Boy" Hawthorne wrote that "the devil of their fathers" entered into the "brood of baby fiends." Obviously the same cause applies in "The Artist of the Beautiful," and the devil of Peter Hovenden enters into his grandchild; therefore, not only are the sins of the fathers visited upon future generations, but also the devil of the fathers is visited upon grandchildren:

The artist did not immediately reply, being startled by the apparition of a young child of strength that was tumbling about on the carpet,--a little personage who had come mysteriously out of the infinite, but with something so sturdy and real in his composition that he seemed moulded out of the densest substance which earth could supply. This hopeful infant crawled towards the new-comer, and setting himself on end, as Robert Danforth expressed the posture, stared at Owen with a look of such sagacious observation that the mother could not help exchanging a proud glance with her husband. But the artist was disturbed by the child's look as imagining a resemblance between it and Peter Hovenden's habitual expression. He could have fancied that the old watch-maker was compressed into this baby shape.¹

Of all the resemblances to be noted, the most important would be "that he seemed moulded out of the densest substance which earth could supply."² The children of the earth recognize their

¹Works, V, 320.

²Ibid., VI, p. 160. Hester notes in the convex mirror that an imp molds itself into the shape of Pearl.

enemies instinctively, and this child is no exception, for he looks at Warland with a "sagacious observation," and he has the same look when he follows the course of the butterfly "with his sagacious [grandfather's] little eyes."¹ As this small child recognized his antithesis in Owen Warland [the very name opposes earth], he recognizes his antithesis in the butterfly. When the child demands the butterfly for a plaything, Danforth ironically describes the full nature of the child: "'How wise the little monkey looks!'"² It is indeed an animal wisdom, not a spiritual one that the child displays. The doting mother's response has truth far beyond her intention: "The darling knows more of the mystery than we do."³ Again the sagacious look suggests advanced knowledge in the child--mysterious knowledge of creation of life and death, of good and evil; however, while the butterfly "hovered in the air":

The little child of strength, with his grandsire's sharp and shrewd expression in his face, made a snatch at the marvellous insect and compressed it in his hand. Annie screamed. Old Peter Hovenden burst into a cold and scornful laugh.⁴

Much of the vocabulary that Hawthorne used in his earlier stories becomes evident again in "The Artist of the Beautiful." The scornful laugh and shrewdness of Robin appear again as part

¹Ibid., V, 323.

²Ibid., V, 328.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 329.

of Peter Hovenden's personality. The ironic shrewdness of Robin also belongs to the baby, and the delicate spiritual nature of Ilbrahim comes to life in Warland, only to be attacked again by "inherited devils" and the "instinctive destruction" of the "brood of baby fiends," which is in the "little child of strength" when he attempts to destroy the beauty of the spiritual. The compressed shape of Hovenden¹ centers itself in the hand of the child to crush the butterfly out of existence. Here is understanding taking its "due tribute." For whatever is "subject to the senses," cold understanding must command.² Fogle, of course, relates the baby's act to Peter Hovenden's statement that he should understand the butterfly better when he touched it. Hovenden has the wise hypocrisy to hide his true intention, but the baby, as his proxy, performs truly, according to his inherited devil and the "destructive instinct" of brute nature.

Since the Hawthorne texts selected for analysis in this thesis are being presented chronologically, The Scarlet Letter (1850) is the next consideration, and without doubt the most important. Much of this importance comes from the character of Pearl, Hawthorne's most significant child personality. She is probably as infamous in literature as Tom Sawyer or Huck Finn are famous.

¹Ibid., V, 320.

²Fogle, p. 75.

In Hawthorne's first novel, as in several of his short stories, he uses a historical setting and background. The door to the prison in Boston opens one bright morning, releasing a young woman carrying a small infant. On the breast of the woman's gown, in scarlet, is the letter A. She walks to the town's scaffold and under the glare of the sun and the stare of the town takes her place on the pillory for three hours of anguish. The small child in her arms becomes one of the most important children in literature. Pearl is a sinborn infant,¹ the illegitimate daughter of a young matron and her minister, a complication to Puritan society, and an ambiguity in literary analyses.

Apparently, there are as many differing interpretations of Pearl as there are critics to differ. In one instance she represents the "unmorality of a child."² In another instance, characterization has been denied her, for she appears to represent "something latent in all who observe her but [is] incapable of being completely objectified in a single human form."³ Pearl has also been analyzed in terms of Hester, representing the "embodiment of her mother's conscience."⁴ Others see Hawthorne

¹Works, VI, 89.

²Walter Blair, "Color, Light, and Shadow in Hawthorne's Fiction," New England Quarterly, XV (March, 1942), 83.

³Charles Fiedelson, Jr., "The Scarlet Letter," Hawthorne Centenary Essays, ed. Roy Harvey Pearce (Columbus, Ohio [1964]), p. 72.

⁴Alfred S. Reid, The Yellow Ruff and The Scarlet Letter (Gainesville, Fla., 1955), p. 127.

as presenting the moral rather than the biological importance of Pearl's human origin.¹ This last interpretation, of course, has its opposers in those who see Pearl as unable to operate morally, for even when she forces Hester to put the scarlet letter on again, Hester still intends to run away with Dimmesdale.² The position that Pearl is not just a moral force gains support from her capriciousness, which demonstrates her lack of understanding of the "human situation," and thus makes her incapable of functioning as a "moral agent."³ The disparity among interpretations has made her "an embodied angel from the skies, and a void little demon," or a "symbolized conscience to a darksome fairy."⁴ Pearl as imp or fairy is equally attacked, however:

And Pearl, who desperately seeks the status of filial identity as instinctively as Hester her station, is a demonic child only for readers who have been improperly weaned from fairy tales.⁵

The only answer, then, seems to be to place her in a Faustian complex by quoting Mistress Hibbins who, of course, belongs in a

¹Darrell Abel, "Hawthorne's Pearl, Symbol and Character." English Literary History, XVIII (March, 1951), p. 53.

²Robert F. Haugh, "The Second Secret in The Scarlet Letter," College English, XVII (February, 1956), 270.

³Hyatt H. Waggoner, Hawthorne: A Critical Study (Cambridge, 1955), p. 145.

⁴Barbara Garlitz, "Pearl: 1850-1955," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXII (September, 1957), p. 689.

⁵William Bysse Stein, Hawthorne's Faust: A Study of the Devil's Archtype (Gainesville, Fla., 1953), p. 151.

fairy tale of witches, if any character ever did. Mistress Hibbins says that Pearl is "of the lineage of the Prince of the Air."¹ This Faustian conclusion is based on the reasoning that Hester has morally warped the child and that Pearl inherits the enmity of her mother's heart, but that "psychologically" Pearl merely desires recognition from Dimmesdale, "intuitively sensing him as her father," and that, once he confesses, she will share in the sympathies of the community.²

Perhaps somewhere in a reconstruction of this criticism lies the truth. It may be that only those improperly weaned, meaning those never thoroughly weaned, from fairy tales can read Hawthorne at all. The convention of the fairy tale is a frequent and respected device for Hawthorne. He applies the method to "The Lily's Quest," "Earth's Holocaust," "The Great Carbuncle," "Hollow of Three Hills," "Threefold Destiny," with its subtitle of "Fairy Legend," and "Feathertop," which is subtitled "a Moralized Legend."³ Two of the conveniences of the device are its freeing of the author's imagination and the open time element it allows. If Pearl's character is expressed within the conventions of legend, then Hawthorne is free to reveal human nature not ordered by time or by society. Pearl

¹Ibid., p. 120.

²Ibid., pp. 120-121.

³Terence Martin, "The Method of Hawthorne's Tales," Hawthorne Centenary Essays, p. 10.

cannot be reformed or restored to society, for she has never belonged. It is more correct to speak in terms of having her conform to moral laws. Pearl, therefore, must exist in some sort of preternatural world, having no claim to any other. Rising out of the "luxuriance of a guilty passion" gives her no resolute claim to the world of an "angelic sprite." Her mortal being is innocent of overt acts of evil or actual sin; therefore, Hawthorne, like Wigglesworth, may seek for her the "easiest room in hell," since there is no other place. Her place in a "fairy-tale" world explains her lack of "ordered human sympathies," however, and it does not deny her connection by affinity or by consanguinity to the human world. Pearl can thus be many things to many people.

Her precocity is one of her most interesting facets and one of the means by which Hawthorne himself relates to the early Puritans. "She suggests something of the terrifying precocity which Edwards' acute dialectic of the feelings revealed in the children who came under his observation during the emotional strain of the Great Awakening."¹ Since Pearl objects to ecclesiastical and social laws, not the law of nature, Eisinger relates her to nature only through the Puritan concept of that law, which is that nature is immoral; therefore, she is an unregenerate and receives regeneration through Dimmesdale, who,

¹Matthiessen, American Renaissance, p. 279.

specifically, humanizes her more than he saves her.¹ She is at home in the forest, which is a "place of immorality--the home of the savage Indian, the place of witches' sabbaths, the symbol of Hester's 'moral wilderness.'"² What Pearl needs most is a submission to an ordered morality that has meaning for her. Once she is given an identity, she will assume the responsibility for that identity.

Pearl's first real exposure to the world on the scaffold is a rejection of her by law, by church, and by humanity, and she becomes convulsive, taking in "the anguish and despair which pervaded the mother's system."³ Anguish and despair constitute the state of the sinner, the exile, and in addition to Pearl's absorbing her mother's attitude, Dimmesdale rejects her by refusing to acknowledge her in public. The child must be quieted artificially with drugs.

The first description of Pearl is different from that of an accepted human child, for Hester has adorned her in contrast to herself, but more than the attire was the "airy charm that early began to develop itself in the little girl, but which appeared to have also a deeper meaning."⁴

¹Chester E. Eisinger, "Pearl and the Puritan Heritage," College English, XII (March, 1951), 329.

²Garlitz, p. 694.

³Works, VI, 99.

⁴Ibid., VI, 118.

When the children of the town first meet Pearl, their response is violent. Like the children in "The Minister's Black Veil," in "The Gentle Boy," and in "Dr. Grimshawe's Secret," they seem only too willing to "babble" what they vaguely comprehend and "to pursue her at a distance with shrill cries."¹ Cotton Mather wrote, "a child no sooner begins to do anything rational but Satan begins to show it how to do something criminal."²

In her strange attire and estranged social position, Pearl is still the one "whose innocent life had sprung, by the inscrutable decree of Providence, a lovely and immortal flower out of the rank luxuriance of a guilty passion."³ That an innocent life can spring from a guilty passion suggests that Hawthorne establishes the Christian theology of man's dual nature. Man is both good and evil. Momentarily Pearl's life is innocent; she has committed no overt sin, but she has, like all mankind, sprung from a guilty root. The immediate reference is to the adultery of Dimmesdale and Hester, and Hawthorne uses the concept of original sin as resulting from sexual transgression; therefore, the existence man has is tainted at its beginning by guilt. Pearl, in essence, differs not at all from mankind's

¹Ibid., VI, 121.

²Corderius Americanus, p. 11.

³Works, VI, 125.

general nature, and as Hester bought Pearl at a great price, so did Adam and Eve buy man's present nature at a great price.

Further, Pearl is an archetype for the nature of man:

Pearl's aspect was imbued with a spell of infinite variety; in this one child there were many children, comprehending the full scope between the wild-flower prettiness of a peasant baby, and the pomp, in little, of an infant princess. Throughout all, however, there was a trait of passion, a certain depth of hue, which she never lost; and if, in any of her changes, she had grown fainter or paler, she would have ceased to be herself--it would have been no longer Pearl.¹

Not only does Pearl's nature express "infinite variety," which is universality, but also Hawthorne adds, "in this one child there were many children," again drawing attention to her model representation of human nature outside of moral ordinance. The infinite variety of Pearl is internal as well as external, and the internal possibilities for variety exceed the external. This is true of human nature, for a man has one body with many personality traits, but, most importantly, "the child could not be made amenable to rules."² Not only did Hester and Dimmesdale violate a law of God, but also Adam and Eve violated the law of obedience. The only "rule" given to them was one of obedience, and they were not "amenable."

Hester recognizes the "warfare" of her own nature in Pearl, especially her wild, desperate, defiant mood, and she worries that this inheritance may develop into "the storm and

¹Ibid., VI, 127.

²Ibid.

whirlwind."¹ Hester, as Hawthorne's early Puritan, knows what Cotton Mather wrote: "I pray, what is that Heart which these poor Children of yours are born withal? Truly, such an one as you know, that you before them were born withal."² Mather adds that the poison for the corrupted and vicious heart of a child comes not alone from the immediate parents but also from the "Old Serpent entering into our First Parents."³ Hester's inability to understand Pearl is not too strange, for Pearl is a product of unleashed emotion, and Hester is making an attempt to understand her rationally when she concludes:

Physical compulsion or restraint was effectual, of course, while it lasted. As to any other kind of discipline, whether addressed to her mind or heart, little Pearl might or might not be within its reach, in accordance with the caprice that ruled the moment. Her mother, while Pearl was yet an infant, grew acquainted with a certain peculiar look, that warned her when it would be labor thrown away to insist, persuade, or plead. It was a look so intelligent, yet inexplicable, so perverse, sometimes so malicious, but generally accompanied by a wild flow of spirits, that Hester could not help questioning, at such moments, whether Pearl were a human child.⁴

Hester concludes that Pearl is an "airy sprite," with a "strange remoteness and intangibility," responding capriciously to human affection, sometimes clenching her little fist, and hardening "her small features into a stern, unsympathizing look of

¹Ibid., VI, 128.

²The Course of Sermons on Early Piety, pp. 11-12.

³Ibid.

⁴Works, VI, 129.

discontent"; or "she would laugh anew, and louder than before, like a thing incapable and unintelligent of human sorrow."¹ Two terms of the description are most significant. Hawthorne categorizes Pearl as a "thing," and then as "unintelligent." The first designation is for objects or creatures outside of the human order, for one does not say a "human thing." By "unintelligent" Hawthorne does not mean lacking intelligence or stupid; he means irrational. Rational intelligence is not Pearl's guide in controlling her emotions, as it should be in a regenerate human being; like her parents, she is controlled or enthralled by the extremes of emotion. Even when Pearl first awakes, Hester notes "that perverse expression glimmering from beneath her lids."²

Strangely enough, there is a relation between Pearl and Ilbrahim, since they are both "outcast[s] of the infantile world." Pearl, however, is "an imp of evil, emblem and product of sin, she had no right among christened infants."³ Ilbrahim had no distinction among christened infants other than his being an ordinary heretic. Pearl, however, does not want to belong to the group of Puritan children.⁴ When they "gathered about her,

¹ Ibid., VI, 130-131.

² Ibid., VI, 131.

³ Ibid., VI, 132.

⁴ "The relation between Una [Hawthorne's daughter] and the children of the Salem neighborhood was one of mutual curiosity and wonder; between Pearl and the little Puritans there existed

as they sometimes did, Pearl would grow positively terrible in her puny wrath, snatching up stones to fling at them, with shrill, incoherent exclamations, that made her mother tremble because they had so much the sound of a witch's anathemas in some unknown tongue."¹

The significance of Pearl's not being understood is that she does not belong to the group of children, cannot communicate with them, but Hawthorne is either facetious or ironic when he says she does not belong since she has no right among christened infants, for these christened infants are playing at scourging Quakers, scalping Indians, or imitating witches.² It would seem that her "witch's anathemas" should be the password to this group.

When Pearl does play at witchcraft, Hawthorne continues to suggest that the law of obedience is the most foreign to her. He is obviously remembering that the black art is the transfer of allegiance from God. Her "preternatural activity" is characterized by an intellect lacking "continuity"; consequently, Pearl's imaginary world is singular in its hostility to the

bitter enmity, and out of the observation that Una rushed 'from corner to corner of the room . . . as if the devil were in her,' Hawthorne evolved the bolder suggestion that the laughing image of a fiend could be seen peeping out of little Pearl's eyes." Stewart, American Notebooks, pp. xxix-xxx.

¹Works, VI, 132-133.

²Ibid., VI, 132.

Puritan environment. Pearl has a "constant recognition of an adverse world."¹ The adversity of the world was the plight of Adam and Eve after they had become unamenable to the rule of obedience. Thus, the scarlet letter, as the symbol of a broken law, should be the object of Pearl's first awareness--she is the human projection of it. Her grasping at it as Hester leans over her is a symbolic identification with it. There is no question of her precocious knowledge about it when she is "smiling not doubtfully, but with a decided gleam, that gave her face the look of a much older child."² This "old look" is traditionally associated with witch children and forbidden knowledge. Pearl has "something of the supernatural about her; she may even be the devil's child."³ Construing her as the devil's child means no more than calling her unregenerate to a Puritan.

In the following passage, the vocabulary that Hawthorne uses is too intense to characterize Pearl merely as an "angelic spirit," nor does a prelapsarian state account for the description. Hawthorne, of course, gives his usual alternates to the description, but the suggestion of a maladjusted or unadjusted moral nature predominates:

¹Ibid., VI, p. 135.

²Ibid., VI, p. 136.

³Mark Van Doren, Nathaniel Hawthorne (New York, [1949]), p. 158.

Once this freakish, elfish cast came into the child's eyes while Hester was looking at her own image in them, as mothers are fond of doing; and suddenly,--for women in solitude, and with troubled hearts, are pestered with unaccountable delusions,--she fancied that she beheld, not her own miniature portrait, but another face, in the small black mirror of Pearl's eye. It was a face, fiend-like, full of smiling malice, yet bearing the semblance of features that she had known full well, though seldom with a smile, and never with malice in them. It was as if an evil spirit possessed the child, and had just then peeped forth in mockery. Many a time afterwards had Hester been tortured, though less vividly, by the same illusion.¹

The term "freakish" differentiates Pearl from "elf," which is a small, mischievous child or person, but in terms of conduct it emphasizes "capriciousness"--a favorite term Hawthorne reserves for Pearl's disordered antics. "Freakish" was apparently coined by Milton, a favorite Puritan of Hawthorne's, and again the term connotes a capricious nature, streaked or varied. This view of Pearl could be a delusion of Hester's, but this is not the only passage that similarly characterizes Pearl. Additionally, however, this passage is both a description of Pearl and of Hester, whose moral failure Pearl reflects and inherits. The characterization of Pearl is enlarged from her mere tormenting of Hester and from her wrath toward the children. These acts only prepare for Pearl's conduct during her interview at the palace of the governor. Furthermore, it is not Hester but Hawthorne who says that she "began to dance up and down, with

¹Works, VI, 137. See American Notebooks, pp. xxix-xxx, for Hawthorne's evolving the fiend image from his observation of Una.

the humorsome gesticulation of a little imp, whose next freak might be to fly up the chimney."¹ Flying imps and chimneys have connotations of witches, especially in the character of a precocious child who denies that she has a "heavenly Father!"²

The "odd attributes of Pearl" seen by the townspeople cause them to conjecture that she is like Luther, "a brat of that hellish breed."³ Again, Hawthorne facetiously adds that Pearl is not the only "brat of that hellish breed" in New England. The comment, of course, reflects as much on the conduct of adults, and their choice of partners, as it does upon the inherited nature of the children of New England, and now Pearl's desire is to visit herself upon the Puritan children, described by Hawthorne as "sombre little urchins" who intend literally to fling mud at Pearl and Hester because of the scarlet letter.

It is, however, in the governor's palace that Pearl not only demonstrates her lack of respect for state and church law, but also makes her inheritance from Hester most evident.

Hawthorne begins by revealing the relationship in the reflected images in the convex mirror at the palace. The mirror not only distorts and magnifies the letter, but also "convex" means "to carry together," and it is this meaning that is suggested when Hester feels that in the mirror is not the "image

¹Works, VI, 138.

²Ibid., VI, 139.

³Ibid., VI, 140.

of her own child, but of an imp who was seeking to mould herself into Pearl's shape."¹ Hester forgets that she, too, is part of the mirror image, and if Pearl is an "imp," the characterization comes through inheriting not only Hester's beauty, Hester's disposition, but especially Hester's and Dimmesdale's wayward emotions, at the moment of their moral revolt. This interpretation gains support from the closing scene in the chapter. Pearl desires a "red" rose from the governor's garden, and when Hester denies it to her, she gives a supernatural, unearthly, and uncanny "eldritch scream,"² and then silently awaits the governor and his entourage. After Hester thinks that an imp has molded itself into Pearl's shape, the governor, upon meeting Pearl, identifies her as one of a "swarm of these small apparitions," who were "children of the Lord of Misrule."³

Again, by her conduct, Pearl substantiates the governor's doubts. Hawthorne sees her, however, as a child only more perverse than the "average" child; she has a "tenfold portion." Pearl's perversity is man's disposition to rebellion, man's refusal to obey--the mood of the original sin, the mood that predominated in the passionate natures of both Dimmesdale and Hester at the moment of Pearl's conception. Pearl's response to the governor that she was not born but plucked from a wild

¹Ibid., VI, 150.

²Ibid., VI, 152.

³Ibid., VI, 155.

rosebush bears out the idea of her wild, rebellious nature, and, of course, the legend of the bush springing up in the footsteps of Anne Hutchinson suggests that the bush blossoms in the wake of another rebellion and in another refusal to conform to the rules of the theocracy because of an "inner light"--she is a law unto herself. If the Puritan divines see Pearl only as an unregenerate, Hester sees her as a complicated nature, sees the complication that Pearl is both a joy and a punishment to her.¹

Hester's emotional plea to keep Pearl, when the Reverend Mr. Wilson suggests Pearl's placement in another home, is a more mature plea but reflects Pearl's childish demand for the rose in the garden. During the discussion with the governor and Mr. Wilson, Hester's voice rises to a "shriek," and when Pearl was denied the rose, she "shrieked like an Eldritch." Pearl refused to obey her mother and to remain quiet. Hester refuses to relinquish the child, screaming, "'I will not give her up!'"² She finally turns to Dimmesdale, and in her imperative statement there is the threat to "'Look to it!'"³ This is an implied threat, for she possesses knowledge about the scarlet letter that she has not revealed. Dimmesdale recognizes the implication and immediately wins her plea. Parallel to this threat is Pearl's frequent tormenting of her mother, suggesting

¹Ibid., VI, 160.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., VI, 161.

that she, too, has forbidden knowledge about the meaning of the scarlet letter. In summary, the plea is "wild and singular" and a "little less than madness."¹ Pearl is this portion of Hester. Hester is her own law; uncontrolled emotion is Pearl's moral inheritance, is the inheritance of mankind. Dimmesdale then proclaims that "'God gave Hester the child, and gave her, too, an instinctive knowledge of its nature and requirements,--both seemingly so peculiar, which no other moral being can possess. And, moreover, is there not a quality of awful sacredness in the relation between this mother and this child?'"² Hester's insight into the peculiarities of Pearl's nature, correspondingly suggests that Pearl has an awful knowledge of the scarlet A, and the intensity of a normal relationship increases, perhaps, because of Pearl's tenfold perverseness, until they have become not a mother and child "but this mother and this child." The "awful sacredness" of the relation makes it secure from violation by well-meaning but meddling reformers. Hester and Pearl together give to each other their only human relationship, for they are outside the chain of humanity. Dimmesdale knows the danger of complete isolation and does not want to expose them to it. Only together do Hester and Pearl represent man's true nature and his true relation to other men in the communion of

¹Ibid., VI, 161.

²Ibid., VI, 161-162.

sin. Though sin is a torture to them, "it is as Providence hath seen fit to place them!"¹ The "awful sacredness" is their human relationship, but in this mother and this child the relationship is not fully ordered. Hester's words confirm the fact that Pearl is the product only of passion. At the end of the interview, Pearl demonstrates affection for the minister, but Hester is surprised at the gentleness of it, for she knows "there was love in the child's heart, although it mostly revealed itself in passion."² Passion is her only inheritance.³ The good Mr. Wilson, good Puritan that he is, can only interpret her inheritance from her conduct, as, capering down the hall, she does not seem to touch the floor: "She needs no old woman's broomstick to fly withal!"⁴ Roger Chillingworth is wise enough to say the traits in a child's character will lead to an identification of the parent:⁵ "Would it be beyond a philosopher's research, think ye, gentlemen, to analyze that child's nature, and from its make and mould, to give a shrewd guess at the father?"⁶

¹Ibid., VI, 163.

²Ibid., VI, 164.

³Ibid., VI, 165.

⁴Hawthorne read essays on physiognomy and the accepted theory of inheritance at that time was that children inherited the predominating faculty of the parents, and that the faculty was transmitted generally or at the time of conception. Lavater, I, 137, cited in Kesselring, p. 55.

⁵Ibid., VI, 165.

⁶Ibid.

Immediately consequent to the interview Hester and Pearl meet Mistress Hibbins, later executed as a witch, and she invites Hester to visit in the forest with the Black Man. Hester now declines the invitation because of her recent triumph with the governor. Yet, summarizing all the powers present in the scene, we see the church and state, united on one side, winning Hester to God only inadvertently, and the devil's agent, Mistress Hibbins, vying for Hester--all this under the same roof, all this within the same distraught heart. The ambiguity of Hawthorne's concept of man's moral nature in the forces brought together in this scene is most evident. Ironically, the church and state could have been the real agents for evil here if they had not respected the truth in the defense of Hester by the hypocritical minister, when he spoke of the "awful sacredness" of the human relationship of Hester and Pearl.

Chiefly, in summary, Pearl is Hester's and Dimmesdale's sin; sin is what has given her life. Sin is a transgressing of a moral law. Thus Pearl's character reflects not only the positive passionate nature of the sin of her parents, but also the negative aspect of the sin--rebellion, disorder, disobedience, and moral indirection. Isolated from that which gives the average child a name and security in this world--a father, a home, domesticity--Pearl is without order. The one relationship she has is to her mother, a mother who conceived her in intense rebellion, in a wild natural state. Such a state knows only by

instinct; therefore, Pearl intuitively knows her relationship to the scarlet letter. Whatever the scarlet letter stands for identifies Pearl. She naturally has an inclination to it, a propensity for it. To know the letter fully is to understand Pearl and also to understand man's perversity. Pearl seeks to know more about the letter, as anyone seeks to know more of his own being. Pearl, however, merely repeats the same perverseness at seven years of age than she had at three. She does not develop because Hester's perverseness is only half of the scarlet letter, the other half lying in the nature of Dimmesdale who, in his hypocrisy, denies his human sin, denies Pearl, and terminates his own communion with humanity. He pleads for Pearl and Hester to remain together, for Pearl proclaims Hester's sin and Hester's humanity to the world. Linked together in the presence of each other, they are linked to humanity without a denial of their true natures. To deny Pearl's reality is to deny the reality of original sin--man's first communion with man.

This explanation of Pearl as a personality without order explains her dancing on the graves. The dancing is not irreverent. Death is the penalty of time and order in this world, and Pearl is not ordered to the world. Her attitude toward the graves is not unnatural for her state, since she is denied full humanity, especially the sorrow of human suffering. What meaning can death hold for her? What meaning can those who obeyed the law and now lie in their graves have for Pearl? She

is man's sin, not his sympathy or his remorse. She is the symbol of natural life. Her conduct, then, is consistent with her nature.

The scene at the graves not only includes Pearl's attitude toward the Puritan worthies, but also it links her and Hester to them. Near the graves, next to them, in fact, grow such plants as burdock and other weeds.¹ Instinctively Pearl selects the prickly burdock to place along the edges of Hester's scarlet letter. The "dock" was once used in charms to aid in the cure of nettle stings. The plant was also a proverbial symbol of changeableness; however, Pearl knows nothing of these associations. The plant grows next to the tomb of a Puritan divine, and the burrs from the plant adhere tenaciously to the scarlet letter. Later, at the brook, Pearl refuses to let Hester remove the letter, because Pearl's identity depends on it. Thus, she clings to the letter, has a predilection for it, adheres to it. The plant from Isaac Johnson's grave has something in common with the letter; it too adheres to it, has a predilection for it.² The identification between Johnson, one of the first and foremost of the Puritan magistrates, and Hester Prynne cannot be through their mutual respect for the law, because Hester has seriously broken it; therefore, her identification with Johnson is through sin. Accusing Johnson of adultery through this comparison is

¹Ibid., VI, 190.

²Ibid.

not Hawthorne's purpose. He accuses Johnson of humanity. Thus Johnson is guilty of original sin, and, in death, he knows man's relation to man is through sin. The burdock from his grave symbolically clings to man's true image, the scarlet letter. The letter increases in meaning, or rather, its meaning becomes more universal.

Additionally, in the grave scene, Roger Chillingworth watches the conduct of Pearl and is unable to identify her nature.¹ He is unable to classify her, for he has never given himself over to human passion. His sin is of the intellect, not the heart; but Pearl's origin is in the sin of passion, and she is completely foreign to his analytical reasoning. It is Dimmesdale who, in the same scene, immediately elicits the principle of her being--"the freedom of a broken law."² As a man of God, however, he cannot say whether in her nature there is capacity for good, for then he would be admitting theologically that there was a potential good in his sin of passion.

It is Dimmesdale who recognizes Pearl's nature as a broken law; it is she who responds to his night cry from the scaffold. During the minister's vigil he laughs grotesquely, thinking of dying on the scaffold and being found the next morning. Pearl responds to the cry with a "light, airy,

¹Ibid., VI, 191.

²Ibid.

childish laugh."¹ Hawthorne selects the phrase "respond to," which has the alternative meaning of "correspond to." Pearl can give answer to Dimmesdale, for he feels now "as if the universe were gazing at a scarlet token on his naked breast, right over his heart."² His will is out of control; he "shrieks" aloud, the devils making a "plaything of the sound."³ The feeling of guilt and sin takes over his whole nature. The sin of which Pearl is a product, the sin which has thrown them all into isolation, makes outcasts of them all. Pearl's is the only voice that should respond or correspond with his. If he is to give verbal expression to these guilt feelings, Pearl, as a symbol of Hester's and Dimmesdale's guilt, must be present. Yet, when confronted with Pearl's question, Dimmesdale again denies the child.⁴

During the night scaffold scene, Pearl has another role to play. Many times she has pointed⁵ to the letter at Hester's breast, recognizing it as guilt. On several occasions she has also pointed to the scarlet letter in the minister's heart, which he conceals with his hand, but tonight, with witchcraft in

¹ Ibid., VI, 217.

² Ibid., VI, 212.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., VI, 219.

⁵ Pearl's pointing is always a condemning gesture. Anne Marie McNamara, "The Character of Flame: The Function of Pearl in The Scarlet Letter," American Literature, XXVII (January, 1956), 543.

her eyes, she points out the presence of Chillingworth.¹ She further states that she can identify Chillingworth for Dimmesdale,² but then she refuses to do so. It must be remembered that Dimmesdale's refusal to acknowledge her tonight is his second denial of her from the scaffold; therefore, instead of communicating with him, she elfishly laughs, denying to him what he wants to know, as he has denied her. Pearl, however, has identified Roger Chillingworth once before, at the time she saw him watching her from his window above the graveyard:

"Come away, mother! Come away, or yonder old Black Man will catch you! He hath got hold of the minister already. Come away, mother, or he will catch you! But he cannot catch little Pearl!"³

Pearl identifies Chillingworth as the Black Man, but even in the role of the devil he cannot catch Pearl, since she has nothing to hide. Not denying sin, she is the open embodiment of it.

If Pearl's relation to humanity is through sin, then what is her relation to nature? To say she is a creature of nature is to classify her only generically. Nature respects and responds to Pearl, but she has the perverseness of humanity about her, displaying "instinctive destructiveness" in her nature at the beach, when she attacks nature itself. She seizes

¹Works, VI, 221, 223.

²Ibid., VI, 224.

³Ibid., VI, 191.

a live horseshoe by the tail, captures several five-fingers, lays a jellyfish out in the sun, and breaks the wing of a small bird.¹ Pearl is not subhuman, nor has she failed "to rise" to her "human state."² Pearl is tenfold perverse; she is humanity disordered. Pearl's faulty identification lies not with nature but with her human ancestry. Her final touch in this scene is to place a letter A on her own bosom, but one made with green eelgrass, "freshly green."³ Then she wonders if Hester will ask her what it means.⁴ She is assuming Hester's identification with the letter A and gives her identification to Hester in the form of the inquisitor. Her identifying with Hester, however, includes only the letter and its "hidden import." The A on Pearl is green, the color of nature. The letter is thus part of nature, and is naturally or potentially on everyone. It is the symbol for the human condition, as was Mr. Hooper's veil. In her discussion with Hester about the letter, Pearl never gives direct answers, but is usually evasive or proposes counter-questions to which Hester also gives evasive answers. Now, in the reversal of roles, Hester questions Pearl and she, in turn, evades:

¹Ibid., VI, 254-255.

²Fogle, p. 142.

³Works, VI, 255.

⁴Ibid., VI, 256.

"Dost thou know, child, wherefore thy mother wears this letter?"

"Truly do I," answered Pearl, looking brightly into her mother's face. "It is for the same reason that the minister keeps his hand over his heart!"

"And what reason is that?" asked Hester, half smiling at the absurd incongruity of the child's observation; but, on second thoughts, turning pale. "What has the letter to do with any heart, save mine?"

"Nay, mother, I have told all I know," said Pearl, more seriously than she was wont to speak. "Ask yonder old man whom thou hast been talking with! It may be he can tell. But in good earnest now, mother dear, what does this scarlet letter mean?--and why dost thou wear it on thy bosom?--and why does the minister keep his hand over his heart?"¹

"Dost thou know, child, wherefore thy mother wears this letter?"

Pearl's answer to this is absolutely correct, yet it is not direct. When pressed for further answers, she merely says, "I have told all I know"--all that she knows from precocious observation. When she reverts to her own role, she asks Hester the very questions to which Hester has just sought answers. The reversal and identification of roles in the interview is completed.

As Pearl matures, Hester sees the possibility in Pearl for friendship. If she sees any evil in Pearl, Hester sees it as inherited from parental nature, and she sees additionally a noble woman growing from an elfish child. Almost the opposite of romanticism is Hester's philosophy of human nature, improving as it grows away from its infantile and inherited nature.

¹Ibid., VI, 256-257.

Pearl's "innate" and inevitable tendency to the scarlet letter continues, and Hester still wonders over the "marked propensity" of Pearl's three questions:¹ "'What does it mean, why dost thou wear it, and why does the minister keep his hand over his heart?'"² Under the barrage of questions Hester, for the first time, is false to the symbol: "'I wear it for the sake of its gold thread.'"³ Reform for sin does not begin with an external symbol, but must come from within mankind.

Hester's discarding of the letter does occur in the forest where she first sinned. Hester sees herself as having broken only the Puritan law, not the law of nature. In fact, she truly feels that, regardless of how society defines her transgression, it had a "consecration all its own." Pearl, however, feels that the sun in the forest avoids Hester because of the scarlet letter. The sun evades Hester only because she lives in a shadowy world of repression. Pearl, born in sin, the living projection of that sin, the full unabashed expression of sin and passion, hides nothing, represses nothing; therefore, the sun does not hide from her. Since the forest and the sun know only the law of nature, they would not hide from Hester. When Hester exposed herself on the pillory, the sun did not hide.

¹McNamara has noted that Pearl displays an "unearthly inquisitiveness about the minister's placing his hand over his heart," p. 539.

²Works, VI, 259.

³Ibid., VI, 260.

There Hester took all the shame upon herself, refusing to reveal the name of her partner, "with the hot midday sun burning down upon her face, and lighting up its shame."¹ The sun did not hide from Hester then. Since that time, however, Hester has repressed what she continues to feel. Hester has undergone a physical transformation, "withered up by this red-hot brand."² She was a woman of passion; these feelings have left, and she has become a woman of thought.³ When she enters the world of thought, she no longer belongs to the world of the forest, which is a world of nature and emotion. Pearl is free to play in the sun, not because she is innocent or guilty, but because she accepts nature fully and of its own accord. The sun hides from Hester because she is untrue to her emotions by repressing them.

By accepting nature of its own accord, Pearl differs from other children only in the expression of that nature:

She had not the disease of sadness which almost all children, in these latter days, inherit, with the scrofula, from the troubles of their ancestors. Perhaps this too was a disease, and but the reflex of the wild energy with which Hester had fought against her sorrows before Pearl's birth.⁴

Pearl inherits "the wild energy with which Hester fought against her sorrows," but there was no grief or sorrow in Hester for her

¹Ibid., VI, 89.

²Ibid., VI, 234.

³Ibid., VI, 235.

⁴Ibid., VI, 265.

transgression; therefore, Pearl has no such inheritance and can give no expression to it. It will take the repentance and grief of her other parent to acquaint her with such human emotions.

When Hester and Pearl approach the brook that resembles Pearl, it "babbles" a message of human sympathy that Pearl cannot comprehend. Hester explains that Pearl would understand "if thou hadst a sorrow of thine own."¹ Pearl is indictable only as disordered. She has been broken away from a due order and is a living example of a broken law--human nature outside of divine ordinance.

Pearl's ingenuity for placing actions in relation to causes becomes apparent again in the forest, when she observes that the minister has his hand over his heart, and asks Hester if the minister does this because he "'wrote his name in the Black Man's book and now wears his mark.'"² The form of her expression is a question, but by relating the cause of the gesture to the Black Man and to the scarlet letter, Pearl explains the predicament. Hester's only answer is to advise Pearl not to stray from the babble of the brook. Pearl must not stray further from the human message of sorrow, but must be brought closer to it. The one who can change the "babble" to a human message of grief for Pearl is the minister; yet he refuses

¹Ibid., VI, 269.

²Ibid., VI, 270.

to instruct this child of passion by revealing his own worst self, as she and Hester have done.

During the course of the minister's and Hester's colloquy "to decide their fate,"¹ Pearl finds sympathy in the wild environment in which she was conceived: "The truth seems to be, however, that the mother-forest, and these wild things which it nourished [Pearl has just eaten blood-red berries and has been pleased with them], all recognized a kindred wildness in the human child."² Pearl is a child of blood, of momentary passion, of wild nature, and it is these qualities with which the forest has sympathy.

In the woods Hester identifies Pearl not only as a "fitful and fantastic elf" of "strong affections" but as "our Pearl," placing part of the description on Dimmesdale.³ Of all children, however, Pearl is the only one who shows affection to the minister, Pearl intuitively senses the paternity he will not claim. Since the minister rejects Pearl, no child welcomes his attention, for generally they "stand apart and eye me strangely."⁴ Pearl, too, however, eyes him strangely when Hester calls her to them. She becomes more like an elf, more

¹Ibid., VI, 288.

²Ibid., VI, 296.

³Ibid., VI, 299.

⁴Ibid., VI, 300.

estranged from humanity, and so wrathful, for the letter is gone, and she recognizes that Hester's discarding of it is a rejection of her. The denial of the letter makes Pearl less than sin, which is at least a product of human nature alone. She truly becomes amoral, a small, beautiful, wild creature without even a faulty claim to humanity. Sin is a human act, and sin is her only link to mankind, as it is the only real link between all men; and Pearl will not deny her own being, will not negate her one claim to humanity by permitting Hester to discard the letter. When Hester returns the letter to her breast, Pearl, in the same embrace, acknowledges Hester with the letter. Hawthorne refers to Pearl's nature as an "alloy." Sin is thus a complex mixture, and Pearl will not deny her dual role of giving both pleasure and pain. If the letter is gone from Hester's breast, then Pearl is no longer a reminder of the human suffering and sorrow that Hester knows so well and that makes her truly human. When Hester and Pearl first entered the forest, Hester said that Pearl would have been able to understand the brook "'if thou hadst a sorrow of thine own.'"¹ In discarding the letter, Hester wants to discard her sorrow, but Hawthorne believes that sin cannot be denied, will not be denied. In trying to deny sin, man destroys something of his nature. Pearl, like sin, forces Hester to admit her humanity by admitting her sinful nature with her wearing of the letter.

¹Ibid., VI, 269.

During the New England Holiday, while waiting for the procession, Pearl further analyzes the minister and concludes him to be a "strange sad man." What she ascertains most acutely, however, is his refusal to accept Hester and her openly. Like his sin, she is not acknowledged; thus the minister denies his full human nature and is destroying it. Pearl inherits only the wild spirit of a sinful moment, not the substance or the element of order and security that come with a permanent domestic relationship. In fact, a true relationship is so far removed from Pearl that Mistress Hibbins, at the procession, accuses her of being of the "lineage of the Prince of the Air."¹ The old witch then tells Pearl that if she, Pearl, will ride with her, she will learn why the minister keeps his hand over his heart; consequently, Mistress Hibbins sees Dimmesdale, Hester, Pearl, and the devil as interrelated in a kind of knowledge.

In the final scene, however, Pearl is not sportive, but responds when the minister calls to her as he mounts the scaffold, referring to her as "my" Pearl. Once she freely kisses him, it "developed all her sympathies."² His acknowledgment of Pearl not only admits his relationship to sin but also leads to a human ordering of Pearl. In the alternative interpretations of the scene of acknowledgement, there are

¹Ibid., VI, 351.

²Ibid., VI, 371.

several discrepancies. Some affirm the minister placed a red letter on his breast; others affirm Roger Chillingworth placed it there with magic and drugs; others saw it as caused by the "active tooth of remorse," and still others denied any mark on the minister's breast other than what one would find on a "new born infant's."¹ The master irony lies in the last alternative, for it supports the whole thesis of the doctrine of human depravity and Hawthorne's interpretation of original sin. One can find the Scarlet Letter on the breast of every newborn infant.

If Pearl is the "victim of an unusually faulty moral inheritance" but originally innocent,² so is all mankind such a victim. What is man's faulty moral inheritance but original sin? Man, however, is not originally innocent for Hawthorne; he is originally guilty. If man accepts the concept of guilt, he has little to fear in working out his human predicament. If he denies the guilt, he moves ever nearer actual sin, but the man who admits his humanity need not fear even the unpardonable sin. Man's accepting of original guilt gives him a "common bond and destiny" with all humanity.³

¹Ibid., VI, 373-374.

²Garlitz, p. 699.

³Edwin Fussell, "Hawthorne, James and 'The Common Doom,'" American Quarterly, X (Winter, 1958), 441.

Hawthorne had a vision of mankind as suffering, and it is this suffering that gives to mankind equality, and, paradoxically, its greatest "distinction."¹ His attitude toward children, then, was not sentimental but was one that proclaimed perverse traits as evidence of the human inheritance of sin. Pearl demonstrates all the perversity of her inheritance. She also demonstrates the "freedom of a broken law," which is perversity tenfold. She cannot bring order to her own being; it is outside her nature, for in her fallen state there is little she can do for herself. Like man, she must wait upon outside grace--the sorrow and suffering of Dimmesdale--to save her. None of his good works over the years helped her overcome perversity, but his one act of faith redeemed her. Hawthorne closes the tale with the Calvinistic thesis that all man can do for himself is to acknowledge his sinful nature; then in sorrow he may be acknowledged by God.

Like The Scarlet Letter, The House of Seven Gables is under the spell of the older days. The spell in the later novel, however, is the spell that Maule put on the Pyncheon family when he cursed Colonel Pyncheon for his sin of greed and prophetically threatened, "'God would give him blood to drink'!" Thomas Maule, whose father supposedly was a wizard, built the house of seven gables for the Pyncheons. When the current story

¹Ibid., p. 445.

begins with Hepzibah's plight of being reduced to opening a cent shop, there seems now to exist only little pride and less Fyncheon blood. There are only Hepzibah, Clifford, Phoebe, the Judge, a few cousins, and the judge's dying son. Judge Pyncheon is probably the greatest citizen of the town, smiling benevolently, but not truly liked or trusted. Hepzibah and Clifford fear him and his schemes. Phoebe, a cousin of Hepzibah's, and Holgrave, Hepzibah's roomer, meet and fall in love. Phoebe, however, who is the only light in the house, must return to her farm home, and the ugly darkness of the past pervades the house again. Clifford, home from the penitentiary, fears and avoids the judge, who forces his presence on the inhabitants of the old house. Hepzibah tries to protect the failing Clifford from seeing the judge, who had him imprisoned falsely. The judge forcibly enters and seats himself in the ancient ancestral armchair while Hepzibah searches for Clifford. The judge dies in the chair from apparent apoplexy, and Hepzibah and Clifford flee the house. In the morning, visitors come to the shop, but can arouse no one. Holgrave is there when Phoebe returns. He leads her in and tells her of the death of the judge. At this moment of dubious gloom, Holgrave also confesses his love for Phoebe, and then Hepzibah and Clifford return. Because of the death of the judge, the remaining relatives all become wealthy and move into the judge's country home. Holgrave discovers the missing title deeds in the old house, and finally informs Phoebe

that he is really a descendant of the wizard Maule. Phoebe forgives his keeping such a secret, and they all leave together.

In the preface to the story, Hawthorne writes, "Not to be deficient, in this particular, the author has provided himself with a moral,--the truth, namely, that the wrongdoing of one generation lives into successive ones, and, divesting itself of every temporary advantage, becomes a pure and uncomfortable mischief."¹ However, when it seems that Hawthorne has corrected the situation in any story, it is time to be most careful; look again and discover the "telltale blemish," the "sign of imperfection."²

Wrongdoing succeeding itself in successive generations, then, is one theme of The House of Seven Gables. Wrongdoing or its cause is an aspect of moral theology. Man's relation to sin may be through a deliberate act, or it may be through inheritance--a state of being. The inheritance is both universal and particular, passing on to man and to individual men; it may come from untold numbers of ancestors or may be transmitted by immediate parents, but the process seems thorough:

It implied that the weaknesses and defects, the bad passions, the mean tendencies, and the moral diseases which lead to crime are handed down from one generation to another, by a far surer process of transmission than

¹Works, VII, xxii.

²Randall Stewart, "Hawthorne and Faulkner," College English, XVII (February, 1956), 260.

human law has been able to establish in respect to the riches and honors which it seeks to entail upon posterity.¹

Many establish legal processes to ensure inheritances, and the plans go astray; Hawthorne relies on the "far surer process" to transmit his theme of inherited evil. Neg Higgins, who is not immediately related to the Pyncheon family, but who is of the proper species, homo sapiens, comes within the focus for the study of inherited depravity in the literary children of Hawthorne, even though he has been defined as a "symbol of devouring time."²

This remarkable urchin, in truth, was the very emblem of old Father Time, both in respect of his all-devouring appetite for men and things, and because he, as well as Time, after ingulfing thus much of creation, looked almost as youthful as if he had been just that moment made.³

This is Ned only as symbol. Pearl, too, has been analyzed as only symbol, but both characters are more. Hawthorne takes real traits and characteristics of humanity and transforms them into symbol by giving Ned a few characteristics of a child, but he magnifies only those characteristics that support the inherited greed and vices of Jaffrey Pyncheon's personality. Thus the magnified characteristics, the overstatements, become symbol.

¹Works, VII, 171.

²Maurice Beebe, "The Fall of the House of Pyncheon," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XI (June, 1956), 8.

³Works, VII, 165-166.

Since Ned is grounded in humanity, however, he still is able to support characteristics for the thesis of depravity or for any other human trait that Hawthorne would care to emphasize. Ned is thus support for universalizing the theme of depravity beyond the Pyncheons. Depravity in the form of personal greed existed in the past, in the Pyncheon ancestors. Presently it exists in Jaffrey Pyncheon, and will not die because he has no personal heir, because Ned Higgins lives and supports Jaffrey's particular depravity into the future.

When Hepzibah opens her cent shop and is arranging her window, one of her first roles is that of a temptress for urchins like Higgins: ". . . that she should go on perplexing her stiff and sombre intellect with the question how to tempt little boys into her premises!"¹ In the role of temptress she upsets a tumbler of marbles, and must give up being an aristocratic lady and get to her knees to retrieve the bait. The roles of lady and economic temptress are not compatible. How successful a temptress she will be is debatable, since Hawthorne remarks: "A modern child could teach old Hepzibah more than Hepzibah could teach the child."² Ned Higgins is a modern child.

Holgrave first enters the shop, and Hepzibah, desiring to remain a lady, will not sell him the biscuits he selects, but

¹Ibid., VII, 49.

²Ibid., VII, 52.

gives them to him; consequently, his purchase is not her first business transaction. When the bell rings again, it is more than "ugly and spiteful," as Hawthorne describes it when Holgrave enters, for now:

the shop-bell, right over her head, tinkled as if it were bewitched. The old gentlewoman's heart seemed to be attached to the same steel spring, for it went through a series of sharp jerks, in unison with the sound. The door was thrust open, although no human form was perceptible on the other side of the half-window. Hepzibah, nevertheless, stood at a gaze, with her hands clasped, looking very much as if she had summoned up an evil spirit, and were afraid, yet resolved, to hazard the encounter.¹

The bewitched bell seems to summon up no human form but an evil spirit, and Hepzibah ejaculates, "Heaven help me!" "Forcing" his way into the shop, however, is a "square and sturdy little urchin." The urchin, "holding" out a cent, chooses a "Jim Crow," "the one that has not a broken foot!"² He is wise enough not to be cheated. Hepzibah, not wise to the ways of the streets, also gives him his purchase, as she did Holgrave, and pushes him out: "No sooner had he reached the sidewalk (little cannibal that he was!) than Jim Crow's head was in his mouth."³ After his act of "cannibalism," his appetite is whetted and he "forcibly" returns.⁴ Hepzibah, however, is learning from the

¹Ibid., VII, 67-68.

²Ibid., VII, 69.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., VII, 69-70.

modern generation, and requests from this "true-born yankee" his coin: "Where is the cent?"¹

Hawthorne's attitude toward the young and rising nineteenth-century industrialization and business is evident. In this scene with Ned and his insatiable appetite, industry and business are the uncontrolled mischiefs that can be inherited, and one for which the yankee temperament has a strong propensity. The Pyncheon family is a representation of the greedy talent freely developed, especially in Judge Pyncheon. Hawthorne elaborately describes Judge Pyncheon as complaisant, benevolent, but also as hiding some inner acridity and disagreeableness; however, as the judge is about to enter the shop, he is anticipated by Ned Higgins:

In fact, he wheeled wholly round, and commenced a step or two, as if designing to enter the shop; but, as it chanced, his purpose was anticipated by Hepzibah's first customer, the little cannibal of Jim Crow, who, staring up at the window, was irresistibly attracted by an elephant of gingerbread.²

In comparing the two figures, one finds Judge Pyncheon stopping in the street "with his eyes fixed on the shop-window." Then there is Hepzibah's first customer, "the little cannibal of Jim Crow" who is also "staring at the window," and "irresistibly attracted by an elephant of gingerbread."³ Ned's appetite is a

¹Ibid., VII, 70.

²Ibid., VII, 80-81.

³Ibid., VII, 81.

reflection of the greed of Judge Pyncheon; it would take an elephant to satisfy the judge, an elephant that lies hidden somewhere in the house of seven gables. He will not be satisfied until he has the house and the hidden papers to the Pyncheon land holdings. The proximity of the appearance of these two characters suggests a comparison between them and their qualities, especially since Hawthorne pursues the close resemblance of the two.

Hepzibah's first day in business opens with Ned Higgins and closes with Ned,¹ again drawing attention to his prodigious appetite. By this time, Hawthorne has dropped Ned's name and assigns him the pseudonym of "devourer of Jim Crow and the elephant."² Hawthorne also pursues this description, and in addition to the title of "devourer," Ned is described as "omnivorous."³

Money and appetite may be associated with Ned and the judge, but the collection of money is beneath the deportment of a lady. There is definitely something unsavory and unclean about money, for Hepzibah draws on a pair of silk gloves to go over the "sordid accumulation of copper coin, not without silver intermixed."⁴ Yet money itself, all of it, can never satisfy the appetite of Cousin Jaffrey.

¹Ibid., VII, 95.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., VII, 116.

⁴Ibid.

Appetite is not the only human characteristic in the text, but appetite can characterize humanity. When man's animal nature is without control, even the most delicately refined man gives himself over to sensuous voracity. Hawthorne describes Clifford, a man of keen sensitivities and fine discriminations, at his first meal since his release from the penitentiary:

It was a look of appetite. He ate food with what might almost be termed voracity; and seemed to forget himself, Hepzibah, the young girl, and everything else around him, in the sensual enjoyment which the bountifully spread table afforded. In his natural system, though high-wrought and delicately refined, a sensibility to the delights of the palate was probably inherent.¹

Thus, through appetite, the "coarser expression of Clifford becomes evident" because there was "nothing intellectual to temper it."² Judge Pyncheon's appetite is voracious, and though his intellect is not feeble, it has been devoted to satisfying his appetite. When the "charm of wonderful beauty"³ is denied to Clifford, the coarser human appetite becomes evident. Then it is obvious that every man and child has an appetite that must be controlled, an instinct of birth that must be tempered. The fallen nature of man rises most readily from subconscious appetites.

It is not long before Ned is hungry, and Hawthorne introduces him as "the familiar face of the little devourer,"

¹Ibid., VII, 153-154.

²Ibid., VII, 153.

³Ibid.

and provides an index to his growing list of accomplishments: Jim Crow, elephant, camel, dromedaries, and a locomotive (people, animals, things). He is temporarily without assets and on an errand; therefore, Phoebe provides him with a whale, no less.

Throughout Hawthorne's novels and tales, one of his favorite descriptive words for children is "shrewd," reminding the reader of Robin's shrewdness and the shrewdness of the foulhearted villain in "The Gentle Boy." Hawthorne comments unfavorably on Ned's shrewdness in a scene with Phoebe. Ned asks Phoebe about Clifford's release from prison. He receives no answers from her because she is ignorant of the whole situation. Then:

The little boy only put his thumb to his broad snub-nose, with that look of shrewdness which a child, spending much of his time in the street, so soon learns to throw over his features, however unintelligent in themselves.¹

Following this, Ned descends the steps of the shop, and Judge Pyncheon ascends them. Again, Ned has just anticipated the judge, and it is now that Hawthorne gives us the full evidence of Pyncheon animality, reflecting this animality also in Ned.

The judge has a "square countenance,"² and Ned has a "square figure."³ The judge possesses a "shaggy depth of eyebrow,"⁴ and Ned possesses "frizzles of curly hair."⁵ About

¹Ibid., VII, 166.

²Ibid., VII, 167.

³Ibid., VII, 68.

⁴Ibid., VII, 167.

⁵Ibid., VII, 68.

the judge's face is a "massive accumulation of animal substance,"¹ and there are the "crumbs and discoloration of the cannibal feast . . . visible about Ned's mouth."² The animal of the judge cannot be smoothed even with the help of a razor.³ Further, the full-fed physiognomy of the judge suggests Ned's sending his collection of gingerbread items into his own face to appease his appetite. The judge, indeed, may pass on his all-devouring appetite by a "far surer process of transmission than human law has been able to establish."⁴ Hawthorne's relating the judge to Ned also transcends physical looks and appetites. Judge Pyncheon's first impertinent question to Phoebe concerns the arrival of Clifford; Ned Higgins' last question upon leaving the shop immediately before the judge's arrival was his inquiry about Hepzibah's brother. When Ned first came to the cent shop, he "forced" his entrance into the store, making the bell sound bewitched. In turn, the judge sets Phoebe "forcibly" aside to enter the parlor.⁵ And as Ned set the "vibrations" of the bell, startling Hepzibah, later the "vibrations" of the judge's voice reach Hepzibah, bringing her into the store to greet, not the "first" customer, but the "first" citizen of the town.⁶ Hepzibah greets the judge as fearfully as she greeted Ned.

¹Ibid., VII, 167.

²Ibid., VII, 70.

³Ibid., VII, 170.

⁴Ibid., VII, 171.

⁵Ibid., VII, 182.

⁶Ibid.

Ned leaves with his shrewd look passing over his face, but the judge's purpose and intentions have matured and are demonstrated by more than a shrewd look:

It was not pity that restrained him, for, at the first sound of the enfeebled voice /Clifford's/, a red fire kindled in his eyes, and he made a quick pace forward, with something inexpressibly fierce and grim darkening forth, as it were, out of the whole man.¹

This is more than a shrewd look passing over his face. Indeed, it is not "pity" that stops him but the knowledge that, if he forces the interview, Clifford might lose his mind, and the secret of the hidden title papers would also be lost forever. Hawthorne has described the hatred of Judge Pyncheon as if the judge were a bull; furthermore, he notes that the fire in the eyes comes from the whole man. This fire of greed has devoured all of the judge. His animal appetite will eventually consume itself.

The judge and Ned are both shrewd, developing their inheritance in the world and in the street, and it is in the street that the monkey, without the cover of humanity, grabs for coins. He demonstrates as much humanity as the judge demonstrates animality: Their manners are similar and meaningless; both doff their hats, bowing and scraping, but their ultimate goal is money. The monkey symbolizes the grossest form of love of money. Raise the symbol to a human form, and Judge Pyncheon

¹Ibid., VII, 186-187.

is produced. The monkey turns over the money he solicits to his keeper and petitions for more; the judge turns money over to the bank and petitions for more. Ned devours Jim Crow and immediately extends his palm, monkey-like, for more. Greed is a manifestation of human depravity, and Hawthorne wrote:

More than one New Englander--or, let him be of what country he might, it is as likely to be the case--passed by, and threw a look at the monkey, and went on, without imagining how nearly his own moral condition was here exemplified.¹

Besides calling the monkey a "covetous devil," Hawthorne calls him an "imp who has a shocking ugliness, spiritual as well as physical,"² not forgetting that the monkey "exemplified" the "moral condition" of many who passed by. Clifford's emotional response to the ugliness of the monkey, therefore, corresponds to Hepzibah's fear of Judge Pyncheon and his greed.

Hawthorne also introduces Uncle Venner into the animal imagery, but he enters with a woodhorse and a beaver hat. These two animals (horse and beaver) are known, of course, for their hard work. Although Uncle Venner keeps a pig with a huge appetite, he intends to share the pork of the pig with the neighborhood that has fed the animal. Uncle Venner's future, however, is precarious in terms of Ned's appetite, since the good old man will be living in a "gingerbread cottage" on the estate of Judge Pyncheon!

¹Ibid., VII, 237.

²Ibid., VII.

After the two owls, Clifford and Hepzibah, take flight from the house in which the judge dies, his schedule reveals a list of appointments and greedy aspirations. The judge's ambitious appetite for the governorship would also have been revealed at a political dinner he was to attend. Hawthorne sums up the dinner and appetite in the following statement:

The Judge, had he done nothing else, would have achieved wonders with his knife and fork. It was he, you know, of whom it used to be said, in reference to his ogre-like appetite, that his Creator made him a great animal, but that the dinner hour made him a great beast.¹

When the estate of the judge is settled upon the remaining Pyncheons, Hepzibah gives Ned "silver enough to people the Domdaniel cavern of his interior with as various a procession of quadrupeds as passed into the ark."² This cavern of Ned's cannot be filled any more easily than could the cavern of Judge Pyncheon's heart. Ned's obtaining the silver is another version of Holgrave's and Phoebe's living on the Judge's estate. The seven-gabled mansion belonged to Holgrave as a descendant of the original Maule who lay buried under it. The curse is lifted, but how many Maules or Browns or Smiths had a portion of money wrested from their hands to build the judge's country house and fortune? How many curses of blood rest upon the country home of the judge, into which Holgrave and Phoebe move? As the central

¹Ibid., VII, 400-401.

²Ibid., VII, 466.

characters accept a corrupted estate, so Ned Higgins accepts a portion of that silver to begin the impossible task of satisfying the inherited appetite of man. Melville, who saw "the power of blackness" in Hawthorne, wrote in a letter: "If you pass Hepzibah's cent-shop, buy me a Jim Crow (fresh) and send it to me by Ned Higgins."¹

The final text for examination is the lengthy but undeveloped Doctor Grimshawe's Secret, published posthumously in 1883. The text does show that Hawthorne remained interested in the shadowy nature of man and child. Structurally, the book can be divided into two sections, American and English. As a story it is complete but lacks "balance and proportion," for some characters are fully developed in detail, others only sketched.² Interpreting the intentions of the story would be conjecture rather than explication; however, at least one statement demonstrates Hawthorne's removal from philosophical optimism about the nature of man:

"Whence did you come? Whence did any of us come? Out of the darkness and mystery; out of nothingness; out of a kingdom of shadows; out of dust, clay, mud, I think, and to return to it again. Out of a former state of being, whence we have brought a good many shadowy revelations, purporting that it was no very pleasant one. Out of a former life, of which the present one is the hell!--And why are you come? Faith, Ned, he must be a wiser man than Doctor Grim who can tell why you or any

¹ Julian Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife (New York, 1884), I, 389.

² Works, XV, xi.

other mortal came hither; only one thing I am well aware of,--it was not to be happy. To toil and moil and hope and fear; and to love in a shadowy, doubtful sort of way, and to hate in bitter earnest,--that is what you came for!"¹

In relation to children, Hawthorne once again introduces a group of street urchins who attack Doctor Grimshawe. Their adverse conduct is undoubtedly a result of their exposure to the society of the streets; yet, within the narration of the attack, Hawthorne describes one boy as an "urchin," which also has the definition of "elf" or "sprite," and he continues by calling the boy a little villain and compliments Doctor Grimshawe for giving "him his merited chastisement."² More interestingly, Hawthorne thinks the Doctor was correct for "giving him at once the whole whipping which he had deserved every day of his life, and not a stroke of which he had yet received."³ The intention of Hawthorne may be only half humorous. More apropos to the thesis, however, are Doctor Grimshawe's reflections on the nature of little Elsie:

Then, too, there were unutterably painful reminiscences and thoughts, that made him gasp for breath, that turned his blood sour, that tormented his dreams with nightmares and hellish phantoms; all of which were connected with this innocent and happy child; so that, cheerful and pleasant as she was, there was to the grim Doctor a little fiend playing about his floor and throwing a lurid light on the wall, as the shadow of

¹Ibid., XV, 21-22.

²Ibid., XV, 61.

³Ibid., XV, 62.

this sun-flickering child. It is certain that there was always a pain and horror mixed with his feelings toward Elsie; he had to forget himself, as it were, and all that was connected with the causes why she came to be, before he could love her.¹

There is no way to judge this statement separately from the characterization of Doctor Grimshawe, who is a warped and tormented man. This is not necessarily Elsie; it is Elsie as the doctor sees her. One interpretation can be that Doctor Grimshawe is Elsie's grandfather, who apparently bears a strong hatred toward the family of Elsie's father. It is this hatred that has encouraged in him the sin of revenge, and to fulfill his passion he will encroach upon and develop the pride and ambition of Ned, the almshouse boy who has the bearing of a nobleman.²

Ned and Elsie are difficult characters to analyze because Doctor Grimshawe complicates their personalities, "half-consciously throwing seeds of evil passions into the minds of these children."³ Additionally, he "forcibly" keeps the legend of the bloody footprint in their memories.⁴ These two children are flesh and blood⁵ and have strengths and weaknesses; however,

¹Ibid., XV, 53-54.

²The boy Ned was modeled on the "scurvy-faced child" whom Hawthorne had seen in a workhouse. Randall Stewart, ed. English Notebooks (New York, 1941), pp. 275-276.

³Works, XV, 30.

⁴Ibid., XV, 38.

⁵Ibid., XV, Notes, 386.

since Doctor Grimshawe is such a strong external force on them and since Hawthorne did not finish the work, it would be unwise to attempt to explicate his final intentions. The best summary from Hawthorne of the nature of children comes when he states: "Little devils they are, harder to deal with than man."¹

It was Hawthorne who brought the moral drama of man to its fullness in American fiction; however, there is argument about Hawthorne's own philosophy of man's nature, as well as of man's moral position. Stein feels there is no conviction of human depravity in Hawthorne's philosophy because Hawthorne once stated: "In truth, there is no such thing in man's nature as a settled resolve, either for good or evil, except at the moment of execution."² Stein interprets the passage as meaning "neither human depravity nor original sin but rather the pressure of circumstances and the confusion of purpose operate to promote the commission of sin."³

This interpretation of Hawthorne's statement is in error because the remark is not about original sin or about human depravity. Theologically, sin is a rebellious transgression, a deliberate act of the will, and the "confusion of purpose" throws the whole statement out of such consideration. Sin is not committed under pressure or confusion. Full consent of man's

¹Ibid., XV, 73.

²Stein, p. 81.

³Ibid.

will and sufficient reflection are necessities that would have to be suspended for man to commit sin under circumstances of doubt and pressure. If there is a moral conclusion in the statement, it refers to the doctrine of freedom of the will, not to the evil inherent in man's nature. It is possible to debate Hawthorne's position on freedom of the will within the statement, but any debate on this statement as a denial of Hawthorne's acceptance of the doctrine of original sin or of human depravity is irrelevant.

Just how does Hawthorne permit man to work out his destiny? How much of man's destiny does he consider predetermined? Even though Chillingworth speaks of all as a dark necessity, there are also further considerations within that full statement:

"By thy first step awry thou didst plant the germ of evil; but since that moment, it has all been a dark necessity."¹

Mankind, therefore, took the first step, and freely so, before there was a dark necessity. Is this first step awry the Fall? Is Hawthorne saying that man had free will before the Fall to make the first step, but that since then he has committed his destiny to the working out of that sin?

All men, all children commit sin; it is the great human equalizer. Sin is man's heritage. Hawthorne does not preach Calvinism, yet he does dramatize its tenets. Hawthorne's religion, based on faith, not on established institutions of

¹Works, VI, 250.

religion, carries him close to the two great doctrines of Calvinism: the sovereignty of God and the depravity of man. Hawthorne saw man's salvation, the salvation of the whole world, in man's admitting to what he is and depending on God for the rest. Such religion is not a system of theology; it is a religion of faith.

Hawthorne's children are not innocent of guilt, but they are frequently ignorant of their Adamic heritage. Robin's guilt and ignorance become evident in each worldly encounter, but Pearl is the best example of guilt because her immediate guilty heritage is so stressed. Her circumstance, like Robin's encounters, does not allow the sin to remain latent. Each day carries her closer to the truth of her being. She cannot accept the fullness of a commitment to humanity because she is the result of a broken law, and moral development calls for order, organic or structural, but Pearl has none. Only Dimmesdale's confession adds "human sympathies" to her rebellious nature. Dimmesdale's actual sin and the actual sin of man are followed by suffering. Pearl, however, does not commit actual sin, and her state is not one of acute suffering in isolation, but is an alienation of disorder from society, which she recognizes. She seeks to overcome her disorientation by obtaining the truth from her mother and recognition from her father. The close of the novel dramatizes Dimmesdale's confession of sin and the ordering

of Pearl's nature, but within the closing lines there is nothing that can be interpreted as a promise for eternity.

How, then, is the original sin of the Pyncheon family worked out? They change locale, but all the accumulation of wealth passes to the living generation. They have the heritage of the sinning ancestors, all of it, including the accumulated greed of Judge Pyncheon, who was able to deceive even himself. Like Dimmesdale, he is a Puritanical hypocrite, but without conscience and without confession. If the new generation inherits the "riches and honors" of the house of Pyncheon, what is to prevent their inheriting by a "far surer process of transmission than human law" the "weaknesses and defects, the bad passions, the mean tendencies, and the moral diseases"?¹ The restitution for the crimes of the judge still remains to the family and must be worked out.

Hawthorne held sin to be a stain on the soul. Nowhere does he say that the stain can be removed. He merely acknowledges its presence and then hopes. His art, however, is not directed to resolving the problem of sin in the world or in discussing why it is exhibited in man's acts of perversion. Hawthorne's position is to recognize sin as a reality and to get it accepted as the basis of human nature. If the children in Hawthorne's tales and novels were innocent, then the nature and

¹Ibid., VII, 171.

circumstances of his adults and children would be very different. Reformation then would start with the immediate environment and with the reform of established institutions that bring innocent children into the knowledge of evil, but Hawthorne's philosophy is that reformation starts in the human heart and moves into the world--if at all!

Psychologists accept the fact that "Dimmesdale's moral enemy is the forbidden impulse, while his psychological enemy is guilt; but there is no practical difference between the two, for they always appear together."¹ Twenty years before this psychological statement, Fulton J. Sheen wrote:

The Frustrated Man is one who has within himself some radical tension or dialectic--who is groaning for some kind of sublimation or deliverance. The Frustrated Man is the Old Testament without the New, the Fall without Redemption, the tragedy of man without the hope of Calvary. From a theological point of view, the concept presents the rediscovery of the doctrine of Original Sin.²

There is sufficient evidence to establish a working ground for Hawthorne's knowledge and familiarity with Puritan dogma and culture; there is sufficient study to prove that a theological interpretation of the characterization in his fiction is not only possible but probable; and there is sufficient evidence that he accepts not only the reality of actual sin but the

¹Frederic Crews, The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne's Psychological Themes (New York, 1966), p. 138.

²Fulton J. Sheen, Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1948), p. 348.

doctrine of original sin. The acceptance of the doctrine includes the concept of universal sin and of moral depravity, which is a state of being as well as an effect involving the nature of man from conception to death. Hawthorne, then, like Calvin, Wigglesworth, Mather, and Edwards, includes the child as sinner when he analyzes or exposes human moral nature.

CHAPTER IV

"WOONG THEIR VICTIMS FORTH"--HENRY JAMES

Henry James continued to present the American attitude toward the human adventure. James may have been influenced in his attitude by American history or philosophy, but he was most definitely influenced literarily by Hawthorne. This influence of Hawthorne on James is not a question of James' artistic debt to Hawthorne, but one "of a fundamental reassertion of kinship in moral values, which defied for both writers any merely realistic presentation."¹ It must be remembered that Hawthorne is more interested in the effects of evil than in the act of evil, and James is most explicit about his own position regarding evil in the preface to The Turn of the Screw:

Only make the reader's general vision of evil intense enough, I said to myself . . . and his own experience, his own imagination, his own sympathy (with the children) and horror (of their false friends) will supply him sufficiently with all the particulars. Make him think the evil, make him think it for himself, and you are released from weak specifications.²

¹Matthiessen, American Renaissance, p. 294.

²Novels and Tales of Henry James, 24 vols. (New York, 1906-1908), XII, xxi-xxii. All subsequent references to works of James will be from this edition unless otherwise indicated and will be referred to as Novels and Tales.

Evil is a reality for James. How, then, does he define his moral vision? First of all, James "had absorbed from his father at least a vague apprehension of the difference between morality and moralism, so that his work was singularly free from any touch of flagrant moralism."¹ Additionally, in the writings of Henry James, morality is "conceived to be an intellectual quality, meaning that it was rooted in man's philosophical view of the world."² Specifically, the important point is that:

to Henry James morality is not innocence of evil nor is it to be achieved by ignoring evil. The thing is to get it properly located "at its source, deep in the human consciousness" as Hawthorne, for example, had done; and if to splash and flounder in the moral complexities of life was based on the inadequate sense of life, on a flaw in the artist's intellectual development, it follows that morally acceptable art is the product of wholeness and soundness.³

James, therefore, is interested, not in reducing life to a simple instinctive state, but in the complexities and wholeness of the human nature. More explicitly, James affirms a view of conscious morality when he denounces the belief that man is a slave of his instincts, "the subject of unaccountable attractions and repulsions, loathings and yearnings."⁴ Burstein,

¹C. Hartley Grattan, The Three Jameses (New York, 1962), p. 231.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 232.

⁴Henry James, Notes and Reviews, ed. Pierre de Chaignon la Rose (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1921), p. 176.

consequently, sees James not as many of his contemporaries saw him but as "tough minded," unrepelled by the "somber Puritan view of human nature."¹ If James is unrepelled by the Puritan view, it must be stated that the Puritan view as a "system of thought was dead," so that James is "unrepelled" by what would be referred to as the Puritan "temperament," called "the Puritan conscience;" therefore, James should recognize as valuable duty, effort, and self-inspection.²

It follows, then, that the types of evil to be looked for in James's novels and tales should be concerned with distortion of the intellect or emotions of man: pride and vanity, demand of proof, fear of ridicule, stupid innocence, obsessions, passivity and cowardice, vindictiveness, love denied and too abundantly given, using others, indifference, irresponsibility, jealousy, meddling, living by theory.³ All these evils are found in the characters of Hawthorne, and all of them stem from a disordered human nature. Most of the evils listed here will be found in the children James created for his fiction, as will be demonstrated specifically throughout this chapter. It will also be readily seen that James accepts human

¹Frances Brownell Burstein, "The Picture of New England Puritanism Presented in the Fiction of Henry James," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1964), p. 35.

²Stow Persons, American Minds: A History of Ideas (New York, 1958), pp. 40-41.

³Martha Banta, "Henry James and 'The Others,'" New England Quarterly, XXXVII (June, 1964), p. 179.

fallibility, as did Hawthorne. Even though his characters are, for the most part, more cultivated than were Hawthorne's people, James's fiction still reveals man's innate capacity for evil.

Since James accepts moral art only as a product of "wholeness" and "soundness," he obviously was conscious of any human dimension that would add more depth to his characters. Religion as a human experience with its effects on the human personality would thus be of interest to James as a writer. In fact, Burstein discovers that James was "interested" in and "acquainted" with major religious issues and with the several denominations, not excluding Puritanism.¹ More specifically, in a letter to Charles Eliot Norton (March 31, [1873]) James wrote:

But the religious passion has always struck me as the strongest of man's heart, and when one thinks of the scanty fare . . . on which it has always fed, and of the nevertheless powerful current continually setting towards all religious hypotheses, it is hard not to believe that some application of the supernatural ideas should not be an essential part of our life.²

James certainly did not discount religion, which he described in superlative terms as "the strongest passion" and an "essential part of our life." Again, this is not to construe James as being personally or devotedly attached to any creed or doctrine. It establishes, however, the possibility of interpreting the good and evil acts of James's characters as having metaphysical as well as psychological importance.

¹Burstein, p. 91.

²The Selected Letters of Henry James, ed. Leon Edel (New York, 1955), p. 42.

It now becomes essential to examine specifically James's general attitude toward man and to see how he establishes man's possibilities for moral involvement and how this moral involvement reflects the American-Puritan heritage. Since James was interested in all dimensions of human nature and all its possible complexities, it is reasonable to assume that his child characters will demonstrate all the inherent possibilities of mankind.

Watch and Ward (1871)¹ was James's first extended attempt at fiction. Although he revised it for book form in 1878, he did not include it in the New York Edition of his works. The novel has an American setting, centering on Roger Lawrence, wealthy, young, and recently refused in his proposal of marriage to Miss Morton. In his depressed state, Lawrence meets another man who appeals to him for financial help but refuses to be specific about his problem. Later the same evening, the man shoots himself, abandoning his twelve-year-old daughter. Lawrence, with some guilt feelings, adopts the child, rearing her with the intention of later marrying her. Even though she is an unattractive child, Nora, under Lawrence's guidance, grows into a pleasant young woman. She travels with Miss Morton, who is now the widowed Mrs. Keith. A worthless cousin of Nora's, George Fenton, finds her, and Lawrence's own cousin, Parson

¹Henry James, Watch and Ward (London, 1960). All subsequent references will be to this edition.

Hubert Lawrence, also shows a romantic interest in Nora. Roger then decides to send Nora to Rome with Mrs. Keith. While the women are in Rome, Roger contracts an illness, and Nora, who returns from abroad, cares for him. Roger now unsuccessfully proposes to Nora, and in her confusion she runs to her worthless cousin Fenton. In a pretense of sheltering her, Fenton tries to extort money from Roger for her safe return. Nora escapes Fenton and proceeds to Roger's cousin, Hubert, who now reveals his fiancée to Nora. Nora again leaves, happy to find Roger coming for her. The value of the book lies in its foreshadowing of later themes and characters, but on the whole it is melodramatic. However, the character to be considered is Nora, twelve years of age and an orphan.

Roger's intentions regarding Nora seem complex. Since he has been rejected twice by Miss Morton, he now decides to design his own wife. Obviously, he wants her innocent, but he also wants her wise to the ways of the world. By placing her under the care of Mrs. Keith, he is perhaps hoping for some indirect identification between Nora and Mrs. Keith; then he will in some way win Mrs. Keith through Nora. Additionally, if Nora has worldly knowledge, she will seem older, and psychologically the eighteen years between their ages will be eased for Roger.

Nora should innately have the sensibility to refuse both Fenton and Hubert.¹ This criticism seems especially true after she has had the experience of being socially tutored by Mrs. Keith and after traveling in Europe; however, she turns first to one and then the other before accepting Roger. This is actually a criticism of Nora's human nature. She has an unappropriated love to bestow, and innately she is attracted to both Fenton and Hubert. Roger realizes such a human possibility in Nora's character, even when she is a child, for "she was an unknown quantity."² Her "nature, her heritage, her good and bad possibilities were an unsolved problem."³

Nora is not merely an unknown quantity because of her being an orphan or a stranger. Her immediate heritage is weak--her mother was an actress; her father was a financial failure and moral coward. Time, exposure, and experience are the only realities that can solve the problem of her real nature:

Evidently she had sprung from a horribly vulgar soil; she was a brand snatched from the burning. She uttered various impolite words with the most guileless accent and glance, and was as yet equally unsuspecting of the grammar and Catechism.⁴

¹Oscar Cargill, Novels of Henry James (New York, 1961), p. 13.

²Watch and Ward, p. 36.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 42.

Nora's nature is that which most concerned both Mather and Edwards. Hers is the nature in need of "grammar" (education), and "catechism" (religion). Nora lacks the parts of language and religion that concern rules and regulations; therefore, she has not been exposed to formal learning and, whatever else she is, she is natural. Nora is a foreshadowing, in her guileless nature, of Daisy Miller. This "innocence" is, however, the soft core of humanity needing direction.

Nora is not unacquainted with, nor is she repelled by, her natural heritage, for she wants for one hour "'to be myself and feel how little that is, to be my miserable father's daughter.'"¹ She acknowledges that she is "'not too young. I am old for my age. I ought to be!'"² The "old" appearance of children is an image that James was to use frequently. Hawthorne used the image to suggest forbidden or worldly knowledge in children, and, of course, generally, throughout witchlore there are references to a child's appearing old when he has "forbidden knowledge" or knowledge that should come only with maturity. It is not environmental exposure that Nora refers to, for she again says, "'But I give you notice that I am not a lovely girl. I have it in me to be, under provocation, anything but a lovely girl.'"³ "Provocation" more specifically

¹Ibid., p. 65.

²Ibid., p. 73.

³Ibid., pp. 85-86.

means "calling forth" or "arousing," and Nora obviously is speaking of the latent possibilities of her own nature. Artistically, James is preparing the reader for Nora's unhappy experiences with Fenton and Hubert. Nora resents Roger as authority, and her first impulse, "provoked" by his proposal, is to escape from or rebel against his attentions rather than to submit to his authority, even in marriage; but, like the prodigal, she will have second thoughts following worldly exposure.

Nora later exemplifies the confession that she is not a "lovely girl": "Her fancy followed him [George Fenton] forth into the world with a sense of comradeship."¹ Nora, however, does not identify herself with Fenton romantically; the identification with the alleged cousin is one of comradeship, and they are intimate in nature. Her identification with Fenton is more evident when he tells Nora that he is a "'poor devil who is your natural protector.'"² Since James has raised serious doubt throughout the book that George Fenton is any true relative of Nora's, the irony here is that he is the protector of the "nature" which she has called "miserable," "the nature that springs from a horribly vulgar soil," which only the devil would protect in the sense of its being evil. She is guilty of humanity, which is corruption, and refinement is not part of her naturally:

¹Ibid., p. 101.

²Ibid., p. 192.

When, to fill her time, she stopped before the window of some small shop, the objects within seemed in their ugliness, to mock at her unnatural refinement. (Italics added.)¹

Nora actually does not reason about her nature, but feels it to be the "old Bohemian" when she runs away from Roger and decides, "She was once more her father's daughter."² The "Bohemian" nature comes, then, by inheritance from her father and is revealed to her by instinct through the sense of "feeling." James, however, like Hawthorne, does not limit man to corruption, nor does he deny it. He merely acknowledges human nature in all its facets. The difference between the "comrades" lies in life's trial. Nora, unlike Fenton, "had been refined by life; he had been vulgarized."³ Nora has the qualities to be a Fenton and is morally attracted to him. In fact, the only reason given for her turning to Roger at all is that he is "safe" for her. Nora's virtue lies in the fact that she recognizes her "miserable" nature and also recognizes that Roger can give stability to it. It is not that Nora's nature is good, but that her choice of a protector is wise.

In 1871 James also wrote "Master Eustace," but in this selection he changes the child character. Instead of being abandoned like Nora, Eustace Garnyer is the overindulged son of

¹Ibid., p. 195.

²Ibid., pp. 193-194.

³Ibid., p. 204.

a widow. Raised by his mother and tutored by the narrator of the tale, Eustace at seventeen goes to Europe, encouraged by Mr. Cope. Cope, who has just returned from India, marries Eustace's mother while the boy is away. Eustace raises objections to the marriage, partly through his own immature selfishness and partly because he idolizes his deceased father. Mr. Cope, under Eustace's unreasonable objections to the marriage, admits to being the boy's father. Eustace then attempts to take his own life, but Mr. Cope prevents this; however, Eustace's mother dies of shock and a broken heart because of the boy's attempt at suicide and his refusal to understand her marriage to Mr. Cope.

Eustace is, of course, a difficult character to analyze because of the sheltering maternal influence on the boy; however, Eustace displays traits of character that have no basis in his training and no example in his environment, for his governess comments:

The boy from his early childhood presented himself as a little man who would take a line of his own. He was not one who would ever wait for things, good or evil; he would snatch boldly at the one sort and snap his fingers at the other. He had a pale, dark skin, not altogether healthy in tone; a mass of fine brown hair, which seemed given him just to emphasize by its dancing sweep the petulant little nods and shakes of his head; and a deep, wilful, malicious eye.¹

Since Eustace "takes a line of his own," it is possible to analyze his character as at least somewhat removed from overt

¹The Complete Tales of Henry James, 8 vols.; Leon Edel (ed.). (New York, 1962), II, 343. All references to "Master Eustace" will be taken from this edition, which will be referred to as Complete Tales.

maternal influence. In fact, it is possible to show that Eustace's inherited traits are of sufficient strength to express themselves above and beyond his mother's tender hand. His mother is, of course, foolishly idealistic: "'Eustace can't turn out wrong; it's impossible; it would be too cruel. You must not say it nor hint it.'"¹ James presents the boy's character apart from the mother's blind wishes. He is most explicit about the boy's "convictions," "prerogatives," "sense of justice," "jealousies," and "arrogance," and also he explains that Eustace's "will was as sharp as a steel spring, and it was vain to attempt to bend it or break it."² The problem, therefore, is not that Eustace is the victim of a doting mother, but that in reality Eustace forces all associates to conform to his will. Like many others of James's children, he has a "precocious instinct, he knew tinsel from gold."³ The precociousness, however, seems to have removed him from the realm of human emotions, because if anyone cried, Eustace showed no compassion, but did show "contempt" and "cynical disgust."⁴ This attitude reflects the flaw in the character of the boy, for his responses to others are all based in the cardinal sin of human pride. The

¹Ibid., II, 344.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., II, 346.

⁴Ibid.

interpretation that his flaws are integral to his character and not imposed by a permissive and indulgent parent gains support when James writes:

And yet he had a better angel as well as a worse, and it was a marvel to see how this superior spirit (a sort of human conscience) tussled with the fiend and, in spite of bruises and ruffled pinions, returned again and again to the onset.¹

James does not make the boy a pawn. He is a living person with flaws, conscience, and conflicts. Thus, Eustace is not a victim of fate any more than he is a victim of his mother's doting. Eustace, like all humanity, is in conflict and will succeed or fail only in struggling.

The precocity of Eustace assists him in analyzing maternal love and its many possible motives. James describes Mrs. Garnyer's love for her child as based on "penance" or a "pledge"; Eustace intuitively detects in her some deeper motive than "common motherhood," and this arouses in him a "sense of something to forgive" on her part.² This insight that Eustace has into his mother's devotion recalls the insight of Pearl into Hester's conduct and her insight about the scarlet letter. Mrs. Garnyer is guilty of a misplaced love because of her child's illegitimacy, and this love rises to a religious devotion. James describes her love in terms of "ecstasy," or a "perfect humility

¹Ibid., II, 351.

²Ibid., II, 353.

of devotion," but questions whether she seeks "pardon for the past or impunity for the future."¹

Along with being idolized by his mother, the boy himself has a false god, an imaginative picture of his pleasure-loving father, and he in turn gathers some of his father's effects and places them on "his mantel-shelf like relics on a high altar."² Following this, he seeks for what he really wants: "What I want is knowledge of the world"³--knowledge that will enable him to imitate his pleasure-loving false god.

Eustace knows he holds the position of a god for his mother, and he is a jealous god, refusing to relinquish what is his: "'But, mother, you are not to be too cheerful, of mind. You are not to forget me an instant. If you do, I will never forgive you. I insist on being missed. There's little enough merit in loving me when I am here; I wish to be loved in my absence.'"⁴ Although the foolish mother has not taught her child evil, her devotion to him and her tolerance of his weaknesses have permitted all that is base and unworthy to develop without restraint. Eustace has received love and kindness; yet his response to all this is jealousy, possessiveness, and cruelty. Although the mother has not taught him evil, she has not curbed

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., II, 354.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., II, 356.

the "natural" or "worldly" qualities suggested to Eustace by the character of his alleged father, and the boy has become an emotional monster. His is the sin of pride, the chief quality of a false god. Eustace is false; not only is he illegitimate, but his love for others is merely possessiveness. Placed against the real, enduring love between Mr. Cope and Mrs. Garnyer, the true nature of Eustace reveals itself to his mother. He is, however, a god, no matter how false, and demands the ultimate sacrifice from his devotee--her life. When he learns that his mother has married during his absence in Europe to "attain worldly knowledge," he returns home in a rage, calling the marriage a "betrayal."¹ Ironically he calls the marriage "the devil's game," and considers it a personal insult "with a concentrated rancour of vanity."² Thus the sin of pride looms forward again. Pride, the sin of the devil, the sin that causes man to lose his sense of reason, becomes full-blown in Eustace because of a "sweeping torrent of unreason."³ James takes Eustace beyond reason. Writing like both Mather and Edwards, James sees that man without reason, natural man, is close to the animal state. In Eustace "there was something almost insane in his resentment; he seemed absolutely rabid."⁴ James, however,

¹Ibid., II, 366.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., II, 367.

⁴Ibid.

never moves far from the real base of the boy's flaw; when confronting his mother, Eustace again reveals it:

"I am not your son!" said the boy, in a voice half stifled with passion; "I give you up! You are not my mother! Don't touch me! You have cheated me--betrayed me--dishonoured me!" In this mad peal of imprecation it was still the note of vanity which rang clearest.¹ (*Italics added.*)

The mother's verbal response to his outburst foreshadows the climax of the story: "'He has killed me!'"² Before she dies, she realizes what her son is: "'He's hard--he's hard. He's cruel. He has no heart. He is blind with vanity and egotism.'"³ This knowledge is the real "blow" she receives, but she also realizes that in her foolish devotion she has contributed to Eustace's hardness. James seems to provide an example in Eustace for Mather's statement to parents, for Mather advises parents how to "restrain and rescue children from the 'paths of the destroyer' and fortify them against their peculiar temptation."⁴ Too late, Mr. Cope, Eustace's true father, reveals the illegitimacy and attacks the boy's false sense of pride: "'Young as you are, you are rotten with arrogance and pride. What would you say if I were to tell you that, least of men, you have reason to

¹Ibid., II, pp. 368-369.

²Ibid., II, 369.

³Ibid., II, 370.

⁴Mather, Essays to do Good, p. 182.

be proud?"¹ Mr. Cope knows that the young are not exempt from the flaws of humanity and that, even though they are young, they can be "rotten" within their own characters.

In his suicide attempt, the vain boy misses with the bullet and ironically shatters his mirror. Eustace fails to rise to the level of a man and forgive. His mother sees his character correctly and on her deathbed says, "'He has shown his character--isn't it his character? It's bad.'"²

Although James did not include Watch and Ward or "Master Eustace" in the edition of his works that he supervised, he did include Daisy Miller, the story which gave him an immense popularity. Daisy, independent and pretty, meets Frederick Winterbourne at Vevey. Daisy is not approved of socially by the American circle in Italy because she is considered bold and uncouth in her actions. She adds to criticism of herself by going with Winterbourne on an excursion, and, further, she agrees to meet him the next winter in Italy. Winterbourne does meet Daisy in Rome at the home of an American, Mrs. Walker. He accompanies Daisy on a walk to meet her Italian friend Giovanelli. Mrs. Walker objects to Daisy's strolling about with young men, but Daisy rejects her advice and is most casual about social criticism or its consequences. Later, Daisy, who is most

¹Complete Tales, II, 372.

²Ibid., II, 370.

interested in Winterbourne, rejects his advice about her social behavior and continues to see Giovanelli. This conduct makes Winterbourne suspicious about her morals, and it makes her socially unacceptable to the American group in Rome. Daisy's mother confuses the issue more when she tells Winterbourne that she believes Daisy is engaged to Giovanelli. Finally, Winterbourne makes a conclusion about Daisy when he accidentally sees her and Giovanelli strolling about the Colosseum at midnight. Daisy flouts the idea that she may catch Roman fever in the night air; however, a few days after her night visit to the Colosseum, she dies of the fever. Giovanelli later meets Winterbourne at Daisy's grave, and the Italian explains that Daisy would never have married him, for he understood her to be a unique personality. Only then does Winterbourne understand her to be innocent, and only then does he realize he should have loved Daisy, not judged her.

James proclaimed the innocence of Daisy, even excusing her from being a flirt, but he created a fallible human being whose error was incaution. It is her inexperience in a cultivated world that victimizes Daisy. In seeking independence, Daisy refuses to listen to advice or to recognize the consequences of disobedience. In one sense James does condemn the American society in Rome, for "the harsh social conventions . . . are a recognition of the existence of evil and not mere tradition."¹

¹Charles G. Hoffman, The Short Novels of Henry James (New York /1957), p. 19.

Daisy Miller, fallible human being, can not escape suffering because "one's yearning for experience inevitably meets circumstantial restraints."¹ Daisy's fallibility unquestionably is demonstrated and supported, bringing her closer and closer to danger; she fails in Rome in a worldly sense, but she is no more corrupted at the end of the story than she was at the beginning, for unlike Nora, she fails to understand her "miserable" nature.

A character who is equally as fallible but much more worldly, much more knowledgeable in a precocious manner, is Daisy's younger brother Randolph. Randolph displays the same independence that Daisy does, but he does not have Daisy's beauty or natural charm. Randolph displays the aggressiveness that an affluent society and a permissive home encourage and evoke in a nine-year-old child:

Presently a small boy came walking along the path--an urchin of nine or ten. The child, who was diminutive for his years, had an aged expression of countenance, a pale complexion, and sharp little features. He was dressed in knickerbockers, with red stockings that displayed his poor little spindleshanks; he also wore a brilliant red cravat. He carried in his hand a long elpenstock, the sharp point of which he thrust into everything that he approached--the flower-beds, the garden-benches, the trains of the ladies' dresses.²

Again, as in Watch and Ward, James employs the appearance of age to suggest something unhealthy or unnatural in a child. Randolph

¹Walter F. Wright, The Madness of Art: A Study of Henry James (Lincoln, Nebraska /1962/), p. 81.

²Novels and Tales, XVIII, 5-6.

has the physical appearance of a dwarf or elf: "diminutive for his years, [he] had an aged expression of countenance, a pale complexion, and sharp little features." Obviously, there is nothing appealing about the child; he contrasts with his sister in every way. His use of the alpenstock reveals the aggression in the nine-year-old, as he thrusts it into everything or at anyone. James carries this image of aggression further into the inner character of the child, for when the boy pauses before Winterbourne, he looks at the older man with a "pair of penetrating little eyes."¹ Intellectually he is as penetrating as he is aggressive in appearance. He does not address Winterbourne with any civil salutation, but asks for something-- a lump of sugar--and proceeds to take three. To complete and support the objectionable nature of the child, James has him speak in a "short, hard voice--a voice immature, and yet, somehow not young."² Daisy frequently accuses Winterbourne of being "cold" or stiff, and he, too, wonders if as a child he resembled Randolph, since he came to Europe at approximately the same age.³ These two characters are additionally identified when Winterbourne "paternally" advises Randolph against too many sweets.⁴ Randolph has indulged his appetite for sweets until it

¹Ibid., XVIII, 6.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XVIII, 7.

⁴Ibid., XVIII, 6.

has ruined or corrupted his teeth, an image of decay suggesting internal corruption as well as age, for he has only seven teeth left.¹ Randolph, actually, is not too far removed in character from Hawthorne's Ned Higgins. They are both introduced as "urchins"; both have insatiable appetites for sweets; both can be identified with an adult character who fails to love, the one identifies with Judge Pyncheon and the other with Frederic Winterbourne; and both have worldly knowledge--Ned's comes from the street, but the source of Randolph's knowledge is questionable because of his precociousness.

Daisy is a martyr to Roman "law," but Randolph, with his alpenstock, will cross the Alps like a general, since he is identified by Winterbourne as an "Infant Hannibal"; however, he immediately responds, "'No I ain't like any infant!'"² Indeed, as Daisy reveals, he is no infant: "'She wanted to know why I didn't give Randolph lessons--give him instruction, she called it. I guess he could give me more instruction than I could give him. He's very smart.'"³ Like Hannibal, he is precocious and hates Rome. Since Hannibal committed suicide by poison, one wonders about Randolph's appetite for sweets. Randolph lives the life of an adult: He takes advice from no one, he stays up until late hours or all night in the public parlor, not making

¹Ibid., XVIII, 6.

²Ibid., XVIII, 49-50.

³Ibid., XVIII, 14.

up the sleep during the day. To the natural Daisy he is unnatural, ambitious, and aggressive to the point of being "tiresome."¹

All these adverse traits are obvious in Randolph's evaluation of Mrs. Walker's rooms: "'We've got a bigger place than this. . . . It's all gold on the walls.'"² His sense of observation rests with material things and especially with monetary things.³ Yet in some things Randolph is ironically prophetic. He considers Rome "plaguey dark," recognizing the death image of Rome. The romanticism of Rome certainly has no appeal for him, since he says one cannot see in Rome "'without the moon's right up.'"⁴ This is of little assistance since, "'In America they don't go round by the moon.'"⁵ Randolph is a character from the new world with no appreciation for the old. If he succumbs to Rome, it will be only after attack, not from the plague. Randolph exemplifies a side of human nature unknown to Daisy. If Daisy is naturally innocent and also naturally

¹Ibid., XVIII, 33.

²Ibid., XVIII, 48.

³Ward analyzes the relationship of gold to evil in the works of James (J. A. Ward, The Imagination of Disaster: Evil in the Fiction of Henry James /Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961/, pp. 148-151). Stephen Spender sees gold as the release from worldly labor but he also sees it as the symbol of the damned (The Destructive Element: A Study of Modern Writers and Beliefs /London, 1935/), pp. 60-62.

⁴Novels and Tales, XVIII, 90.

⁵Ibid.

ignorant, Randolph is naturally aggressive, naturally the attacker. He and Daisy demonstrate James's complex view of man's nature. They are of the same family, both demonstrating man's desire for independence, but one is beautiful and vulnerable, while the other is ugly and aggressive. Through his own aggressiveness, not from his loss of respect for tradition, Randolph may fall. Unlike Daisy's fall, his fall will be by his own hand, for Randolph is the image of the "infant Hannibal."

In 1891 James wrote "The Pupil," in which he presents another child character who is as morally fallible as Randolph, but who lacks the aggression necessary to face the "beastly" world. Briefly, the plot of "The Pupil" is that at Nice, Pemberton, an indigent American student from Oxford, obtains a tutorial position with an American family, the Moreens. Pemberton is to tutor Morgan, the sickly but precocious young son in the family. Ostensibly, the young tutor dislikes all members of the Moreen family except Morgan. Because he is extremely fond of his eleven-year-old charge, he stays on with the nomadic family, moving about most of the capitals of Europe. Pemberton receives no pay for his services until he demands some money from Mrs. Moreen. After Pemberton has been with the family for about three years, Morgan suggests he leave; Pemberton, however, will not leave the boy and even refuses salary. Morgan not only wants Pemberton to leave, but also wants to leave with him. The tutor then accepts a lucrative position in England,

reasoning that he may later persuade Morgan's parents to send the boy to him. The family fortune worsens, and Morgan, now fifteen, becomes ill. Mrs. Moreen telegraphs Pemberton to come at once to Paris. The fortunes of the Moreens have now collapsed, and Mrs. Moreen offers to let Pemberton take the boy. Pemberton hesitates in his acceptance of her offer, and the boy dies of a heart attack.

There is a definite relation between Hawthorne's "Gentle Boy" and James's "The Pupil." Ilbrahim's parents are Quakers, outcasts of a society oriented to Puritanism; Morgan's parents are "social pariahs." With the coming of each social season the members of the family force themselves upon "names" and locales, but their whole course of social existence continuously deteriorates. As Hawthorne places Ilbrahim, a sensitive child, in the plight of his dissenter parents, James places Morgan, sensitive and precocious, in the very humiliating plight of his socially defunct parents.

Ilbrahim longs for love and bestows his own "unappropriated love" on the "foul-hearted little villain" he chooses as friend. Morgan, intellectually and emotionally the superior of his own family, longs for a personal relationship, and when Pemberton shows himself to be intelligent and honest, the boy soon wants to bestow his "unappropriated love" on his youthful tutor. Although Morgan, at eleven years of age, has no problem in seeing that his parents are emotionally incapable of

real love, he fails to see the same shortcoming in Pemberton, whom he has turned into an idol and with whom he identifies because he believes Pemberton, like himself, is above the mercenary conduct of his family. Though Morgan cannot see it, Pemberton may have an awareness of his own identification with the other Moreens.¹ Unfortunately, he is blind to his own human nature and destroys the child.

James's concern with Morgan, Maisie, and Nanda is their personal relation to knowledge, and their first knowledge of evil comes through the conduct of their parents.² None of these children, however, love their parents to the extent of identifying with them personally. Morgan's predicament differs from Maisie's and Nanda's. Substituting Pemberton for a parent figure, he identifies wholly with the tutor, the object of his "unappropriated love." When Pemberton hesitates in fully accepting the boy, the sensitive part of Morgan is destroyed. Love turned back on the giver has the opposite effect to that of love freely bestowed and accepted, and both Ilbrahim and Morgan die when the very reason for living, to love someone, is denied their natures. Morgan, like Ilbrahim, lets his desire to love and to be loved destroy his reason, and like Ilbrahim, Morgan

¹Wright, p. 161.

²Lotus Snow, "Some Stray Fragrance of an Ideal: Henry James's Imagery for Youth's Discovery of Evil," Harvard Library Bulletin, XIV (Winter, 1960), 109.

demonstrates a weakened judgment in choosing an object for his love--a condition of fallen human nature.

Morgan, as first described by Pemberton, is not young; there is "the air in his elderly shoulders of a boy who didn't play."¹ Preceding this description of age, Morgan hears the lie his mother tells to Pemberton about the tutor's salary. The appearance of age is an effect on the boy of his exposure to evil. Morgan has seen and heard his mother's lies before this, and his sensitive nature suffers because he precociously understands the lie she tells is not just an expedient measure for the immediate situation; he understands the lie as reflecting her moral depravity. He has the ability to sense the nature of and the reasons behind parental deviousness:

but looked with intelligent innocent eyes at Pemberton, who had already had time to notice that from one moment to the other, his small satiric face seemed to change its time of life. At this moment it was infantine, yet it appeared also to be under the influence of curious intuitions and knowledges.²

Even at his early age, Morgan has intuitively a partial picture of evil. He senses it to be within his parents; therefore, for him, the complete vision of evil will be at the moment he identifies Pemberton's hesitation as giving the lie to the plans he and his tutor had for being together. He then cannot identify with Pemberton. Since he is emotionally isolated, he dies. The

¹Novels and Tales, XI, 513.

²Ibid., XI, 514.

weakened heart of the boy and its final attack may suggest "the tremendous lack of love that has always been his lot."¹ Like little Ilbrahim, he dies broken by disappointment, dismayed at the failure of love. Morgan is developed carefully enough to be a fully human character and to render the human predicament:

Morgan was scrappy and surprising, deficient in many properties supposed common to the genus and abounding in others that were the portion only of the super-naturally clever.²

If Morgan can be found deficient in some things "common to the genus and abounding in others," the same may be said of the other Moreens. James characterizes them as "adventurers not merely because they didn't pay their debts, . . . but because their whole view of life, dim and confused and instinctive, like that of clever colour-blind animals was speculative and rapacious and mean."³ This characterization of the Moreens by Pemberton is appropriate, although he is too short-sighted to apply to himself the indictment he has made of them.

The application of these words to Pemberton's character, however, is dramatized by James when he has Mrs. Moreen go to Pemberton's room to argue salary with him. There is a certain intimacy of personality suggested by his receiving her in his

¹Terence Martin, "James's 'The Pupil'; The Art of Seeing Through," Modern Fiction Studies, IV (Winter, 1959), 340.

²Novels and Tales, XI, 523.

³Ibid., XI, 534.

room between the bed and the tub, and by her seating herself on the bed because his clothes are on the chair. Neither is embarrassed by the setting; neither is embarrassed by the cutting remarks of the other. Pemberton manages to win this argument, but in so doing he has revealed that he can stoop to Mrs. Moreen's level or that he is not really above her level, for they engage in a subtle blackmailing of each other.¹ Pemberton agrees to stay if Mrs. Moreen makes his "footing" known to Morgan. This, of course, would reveal the true character of the mother and father and would reveal that Pemberton was staying because of his love for Morgan and his willingness to make the financial sacrifice for him. If Mrs. Moreen agrees, she must reveal to the child what he has always suspected, and that is that they are a "household of Bohemians who wanted tremendously to be Philistines."² Consequently, Pemberton is using the boy to win against Mrs. Moreen, just as she is using Pemberton's concern for the boy to keep him without salary. She thus accuses him:

"And you talk of blackmail!"

"You can easily prevent it," said Pemberton.

"And you talk of practicing on fears!" She bravely pushed on.

"Yes, there's no doubt I'm a great scoundrel."³

The irony is that Pemberton has accused himself rightly and inadvertently makes successive admissions about his own nature, although Morgan continues to cast him in the role of hero.

¹ Ibid., XI, 541.

² Ibid., XI, 521.

³ Ibid., XI, 543.

Pemberton does not have Morgan's acute sense of the nature of the elder Moreens, perhaps because of his own natural weakness, for on several occasions, Pemberton comments on the charm of the Moreens: "'except for the little matter we speak of, they're charming people.'"¹ And he again says: "'Except for that, they are charming people.'"² The exception of which he speaks so lightly is their lying and their cheating. Morgan sees the exception in evil terms; Pemberton sees the exception as "saving and managing and turning his [Mr. Moreen's] means to the best account."³ When the time comes for Pemberton to assume the role of parent, the role of true responsibility, he too will hesitate to accept, and Morgan immediately and intuitively will sense the affinity of Pemberton's nature to that of his parents and will withdraw into death.

What is it that Morgan hates most about his parents? By his own admission, the boy proclaims that he hates their "beastly" worldliness the most. In spite of his accurate analysis of his parents, Morgan is blinded by his love for Pemberton and is unable to see that Pemberton enjoys the irresponsibility of his role in the family. Morgan accuses his parents of lying down before "nice" people and of being "trampled on."⁴ Yet that is exactly what Pemberton does before the

¹Ibid., XI, 546.

²Ibid., XI, 548.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

Moreens. Somehow the boy senses this and sends Pemberton away from his job as tutor, hoping to join him later. There is no indication that the boy perceives that Pemberton is any real danger to him, because Morgan, of course, loves Pemberton. He wants Pemberton away from his parents, not because he sees him as being corrupted by them, but because he sees the image of his idol being trampled on by them.

A dialogue between Pemberton and Morgan ironically reveals Pemberton's role of destroyer. He will eventually complete the vision of evil to which Morgan's parents have introduced the child. Specifically, in conversation, "'You had better let me finish you,'" Pemberton urged lending himself to the child's strange superiority.¹

"'Finish me? he echoed.'"²

Morgan later corrects Pemberton's phraseology of doing credit or giving credit. Pemberton's ironic conclusion is, "'My dear fellow, you're too clever to live.'"³ At the end of another dialogue with Morgan, the boy accuses Pemberton of keeping things back, of not being "straight."⁴ Unfortunately, Pemberton lacks enough understanding of his own nature to see that he is not "straight" with the boy. The close of the conversation foreshadows the tragic conclusion of the story:

¹Ibid., XI, 550.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XI.

⁴Ibid., XI, 551.

"You are too clever to live!" Pemberton repeated.
 ". . . But I shall punish you by the way I hang on."
 "Look out or I'll poison you!" Pemberton laughed.¹

In examining the reasons for the fallibility of the Moreens, Henry James points up a reason that does not have its cause in social environment or in psychological exposure or influences. The cause is a principle in human nature, and it can be applied to Pemberton as well as to the Moreens--a principle recognized by the Puritans:

What the boy couldn't get over was the fact that this particular blight seemed, in a tradition of self-respect, so undeserved and so arbitrary. No doubt people had a right to take the line they liked; but why should his people have liked the line of pushing and toadying and lying and cheating? What had their forefathers--all decent folk, so far as he knew--done to them, or what had he done to them?²

Indeed, what have presumably decent forefathers passed on to their progeny? Long before Morgan, men called the effects of original sin "undeserved and arbitrary." But then few are of the elect. James, like the Puritan, does not analyze the cause of the fallibility of human nature. Man must accept it, not reason it away. Pemberton makes his identification with the fallible nature of the Moreens and supplies himself with the necessary qualities to play the Judas role to the love and faith of Morgan. He admits to having a "sneaking kindness for them--they were so out of the workaday world and kept him so out of it."³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XI, 553.

³Ibid., XI, 555.

Morgan, in his blind love for Pemberton, will place responsibility on him. Pemberton is foredoomed to failure in such a role and, by necessity, will betray the love of Morgan. Ilbrahim asked overt friendship from his less subtle friend and was brutally denied it; Morgan, too, asks for an overt display of Pemberton's love, and Pemberton morally fails the challenge.

Actually, in one sense the Moreens are less dangerous than Pemberton, for they are "repulsive," and he is not. Morgan, extraordinary, precocious, clever, and sensitive, fails because he is too human to sense the danger of a false friend. When Morgan finally offers his life to Pemberton as a gift and is refused, he becomes a sacrificial victim--a role the fraudulent parents could not have forced upon the boy. Pemberton's error or sin is dramatized in the conclusion when "he pulled him [Morgan] half out of his mother's hands."¹ Love calls for his taking the boy fully or not at all. Morgan's exposure is a result of his adult knowledge of good and evil. His alternatives are two: acceptance of this world and a compromise with principle, or death.

Morgan has a weakened will where judgment of character is required of him. Love has blinded Morgan's moral growth or distorted it. He does have a vision of the possibility of evil through his precocious understanding of his parents; however, he does not see the vision of evil as universal. He cannot believe

¹Ibid., XI, 577.

that where he loved he should look for evil; he has only faith. Ilbrahim and Morgan have both set aside the theoretical knowledge they had of the world and failed to evaluate the lack of morality in the object of their love; they have failed in the practical "beastly" world.

Pemberton, also, does not recognize his inability to develop morally. "The valid test for understanding self requires action."¹ Until Pemberton removes himself from the dependent position in the Moreen family and becomes independent, a position calling for decision and action, he will never realize the shortcoming in his own moral posture. The failure of Pemberton is not a result of any external force; it lies in the egocentricity of his personality."² If there is a social failure involved in Pemberton's act, it is the failure to be concerned for the needs and desires he has aroused in another. Part of Pemberton's difficulty is the same as that of many of James's characters, and that is that "all refined consciousness" is not good, and further that differences in people do not always "lie in levels of consciousness" but in the will.³ Differences in people, therefore, must be explained by a morality as well as by a psychology.

¹George Monteiro, "Hawthorne, James and the Destructive Self," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, XIX (Spring, 1962), 70.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 70-71.

Later in 1891, James also wrote "The Marriages," which presents the character of a child considerably different from Morgan Moreen in accepting universal depravity within her family. Adela Chart fears that her father Colonel Chart, a widower, will remarry; therefore, she visits the wealthy Mrs. Churchley, her father's fiancée, and vilifies his character in the hope of discouraging the marriage. Adela's brother Godfrey, who is preparing for foreign service, reveals to Adela his anxiety over the delayed marriage, and also reveals that Mrs. Churchley was to help him out of a financial difficulty. While Adela is at the family's country home, Godfrey's shrewish and secret wife visits and blackmails Colonel Chart, saying that money alone will keep her from exposing the marriage and destroying Godfrey's career. Following this incident, Adela goes to her brother and admits to having visited Mrs. Churchley with the intention of ruining her father's second marriage. Mrs. Churchley explains she knew Adela's intentions and that she had not believed her but had asked the Colonel to send Adela away. The intended marriage was broken off when the Colonel refused to do this. Now Adela sees her father in all his loneliness.

Robert Louis Stevenson "relished" this little tale:

I pore on you, dote on you, clasp you to heart,
I laud, love, and laugh at you, Adela Chart,
And thank my dear maker the while I admire ¹
That I can be neither your husband nor sire.

¹Complete Tales, VIII, 9-10.

Adela is suffering from the loss of her mother, whom she still idolizes, and she sees Mrs. Churchley as a rather crude intruder into the life of her family:

Everything in her composition, for Adela Chart, was enormous. She had big eyes, big teeth, big shoulders, big hands, big rings and bracelets, big jewels of every sort and many of them. The train of her crimson dress was longer than any other; her house was huge, her drawing-room, especially now that the company had left it, looked vast, and it offered to the girl's eyes a collection of the largest sofas and chairs, pictures, mirrors, and clocks that she had ever beheld. Was Mrs. Churchley's fortune also large, to account for so many immensities?¹

Adela obviously prefers the small world of the family circle and resents any extension as an impropriety. She is also precocious in sensing a flirtation between her father and Mrs. Churchley and resents that.² By reflecting on her mother, she causes her resentment to increase:

How, in the old days, her mother, her incomparable mother, so clever, so unerring, so perfect, how in the precious days her mother had practiced that art! Oh, her mother, her irrecoverable mother.³

Adela, however, begins to catalogue what she considers small slights from her father: her father's reticence in speaking of the marriage, his failure for the first time to kiss her goodnight, and her assurance that her father will speak to Godfrey of the marriage and not to her.⁴ Her intention, then,

¹Novels and Tales, XVIII, 257.

²Ibid., XVIII, 258.

³Ibid., XVIII, 260.

⁴Ibid., XVIII, 261-262.

is to solicit the aid of Godfrey in getting their father to go no further toward marriage. Godfrey, however, tries to ignore her wailings because he has committed himself to a clandestine marriage that has turned out badly. His advice is that she not make herself miserable until she is certain.¹ Her observations during the following weeks give her all the assurance she needs.

James characterizes this confident child in her passion as a young priestess at the profaned altar of a deceased mother.² Adela's passionate nature has led her into fanaticism. What she does not see she senses:

What convinced her was the sense of her changed relation with him--of there being between them something unexpressed, something she was aware of as she would have been of an open wound.³

James accounts for her actions, not by a failure of family love or even discipline, but because of her nature. She is a "strenuous, ardent, observant girl . . . with secreties of sentiment and dim originalities of attitudes."⁴ Adela is emotionally the feminine counterpart of Master Eustace, who is an overindulged child and whose possessiveness destroys his mother. Adela's possessiveness, however, extends beyond her parent and includes even her sisters:

¹Ibid., XVIII, 265.

²Ibid., XVIII, 266.

³Ibid., XVIII, 268.

⁴Ibid., XVIII, 269.

She was to be their mother, a direct deputy and representative. Before the vision of that other woman parading in such a character, she felt capable of ingenuities, or deep diplomacies. The essence of these, indeed, was tremulously to watch her father.¹

Godfrey is a free agent, so far as Adela's possessiveness is concerned. Conversations with him, however, reveal that Adela's resentment of Mrs. Churchley has progressed to hatred and that she takes the liberty of speaking for others when she discusses Godfrey's recent visit to Mrs. Churchley:

"Like her!" the girl shrieked.

"She's very kind, very good."

"To thrust herself upon us when we hate her? Is that what you call kind? Is that what you call decent?"

"Oh, I don't hate her," and he turned away as if she bored him.²

Smoldering with this hatred, Adela decides to visit Mrs. Churchley, and lies to her about her father's character in the hope that she can destroy his relationship with the older woman. Adela reinforces the same unpleasant impression she previously had about Mrs. Churchley:

She was as undomestic as a shop-front and as out of tune as a parrot. She would make them live in the streets, or bring the streets into their life--it was the same thing.³

The girl recognizes now that she herself has "an uncompromising spirit."⁴ Yet, when her father attempts to explain, Adela feels

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., XVIII, 270.

³ Ibid., XVIII, 271.

⁴ Ibid., XVIII, 273.

only that they will never be alone with him again, that there will be public dishonor to her mother's name, and that he "shouldn't do as he wished."¹ She obviously feels that her father is the one who should compromise.

Just as Adela attempted to get Godfrey to agree with her, she now plays on the emotions of the younger girls, "talking to them about their mother, playing on their memory of her, making them cry, making them laugh, reminding them of blest hours of their early childhood, and telling them anecdotes of her own."² When all this does not succeed in turning the girls her way, Adela defames her father's character to attain her fantastic desire to keep him:

It was a joy to her to feel later that this was the way Mrs. Churchley found her; not confused, not stammering, nor prevaricating, only a little amazed at her own courage, conscious of the immense responsibility of her step and wonderfully older than her years.³

"Wonderfully older than her years," Adela has had no evil example, no instruction, and no encouragement in deceit. The act is not that of a frightened child wanting to save her parent. It is the responsible act of a matured will. When Mrs. Churchley bursts into tears at Adela's statement, Adela too cries, but "with the secret happiness of believing they were saved."⁴ The

¹Ibid., XVIII, 275.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XVIII, 279.

⁴Ibid.

"child" is clever enough to exact the promise from Mrs. Churchley that Colonel Chart will never know of this visit.¹ Adela has planned, has acted, and now covers all traces. Godfrey, however, meets her as she leaves, and later, when the marriage has been postponed, he questions her as to the nature of her visit to Mrs. Churchley. She insolently informs him that "'what I did was my own business.'"² He correctly characterizes this with an abrupt outbreak, "'Damn your own business.'"³ But Adela cleverly turns the conversation to his business with Mrs. Churchley. His visit was for money to buy his way out of a marriage, and was as selfish as hers, for he was using his father's relationship to Mrs. Churchley to assist himself and was also compromising his father.

When the marriage has been completely dropped, Godfrey again questions Adela: "'What infernal thing did you do?'"⁴ Again, inadvertently, he has characterized the evil nature of her act, and she defends it as right: "'It wasn't infernal; it was right. I told her Mamma had been wretched.'"⁵ Adela has fallen into the religious error of self-righteousness. Godfrey's immediate response is that she is responsible for her

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XVIII, 280.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., XVIII, 288.

⁵Ibid.

act. He replies, "'You invented such a tissue of falsities and calumnies, and you talk about your conscience? You stand there in your senses and proclaim your crime?'"¹ Adela is not intimidated by this, but reveals the depths of her possessive nature: "'I'd have committed any crime that would have rescued us.'"² Obviously, she has a sense of right and wrong. She sees her action as a crime but is without any sense of repentance or sorrow until Godfrey informs her he will tell. Then she again reveals her self-righteous attitude:

"I did right--I did right!" she vehemently declared. "I went down on my knees to pray for guidance, and saved mamma's memory from outrage. But if I hadn't, if I hadn't"--she faltered for an instant--"I'm not worse than you, and I'm not so bad, for you've done something that you're ashamed to tell me."³

It is only after this speech that Godfrey sees her as a "'raving maniac!'"⁴ Even this diagnosis, however, does not excuse Adela morally. Cleckley has stated most clearly that all wrongdoing is not disease and all conduct cannot be "evaluated at a level at which good and evil are non-existent."⁵ Adela's possessiveness has not destroyed her sense of morality. She knows her action to be wrong. Her aggressive conduct fits also into the cases

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XVIII, 289.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Cleckley, p. 458.

studied by Burlingham and Anna Freud, and their conclusion was "that horror and atrocities are not strange to children, but children must be safe-guarded by education at the decisive stage of their development to overcome and estrange themselves from the primitive and atrocious weakness of their infantile natures."¹ Adela has obviously reached a "decisive stage" and has reverted to a "primitive" impulse to save "her family." Adela states she would commit any crime to save her father, and when she discovers that her father has postponed the marriage rather than send her away, as Mrs. Churchley requested him to do, she gloats in the fact that "'Papa gave her up, as it were, for me. Fancy the Angel, and fancy what I must try to be to him for the rest of his life!'"²

She then goes on to commit a crime worse than her attempt to defame her father. Adela pictures her future when she speaks of her mother's garden and flowers:

This made her see in the far future a little garden of her own, under a hill, full of rare and exquisite things, where she would spend most of her old age on her knees, with an apron and stout gloves, with a pair of shears and a trowel, steeped in the comfort of being thought mad.³

Adela would have felt at home with the girls of the Salem witch trials. She would have been willing to pass herself off as

¹Freud and Burlingham, pp. 22-23.

²Novels and Tales, XVIII, 303.

³Ibid., XVIII, 303.

possessed without remorse or repentance. Adela is willing to continue "being thought mad" because such a judgment will give her the assurance of knowing her father will never seek to remarry or to send her away. For Adela there is a diabolical comfort in "madness."

In 1897 James created Maisie Farange for his tale What Maisie Knew. Maisie has an attitude toward her parents quite different from Adela Chart's. Maisie's parents are also unlike Colonel Chart in that they easily reject Maisie. According to the plot, Maisie's parents divorce, and Maisie's life is torn between living part of the time with one parent and part with the other. Beale, Maisie's father, marries Miss Overmore, who has been hired as a nurse for Maisie. Ida, Maisie's mother, marries Sir Claude and employs dowdy Mrs. Wix to be Maisie's nurse when the youngster comes to stay with her and Sir Claude. Maisie's stepfather, Sir Claude, soon falls in love with Beale's second wife, Miss Overmore. Ida will not be outdone in the field of romance and begins a sequence of affairs. Ida then abandons Maisie to Sir Claude and Mrs. Wix. Maisie prefers her new parents to her original parents, even though her nurse, Mrs. Wix, objects to the lack of morality in the new arrangement. Beale accidentally meets Maisie and takes her to the apartment of his "countess." During the interview Maisie soon discovers that her father is trying to get rid of her as a responsibility. Claude takes Maisie to France, and they are joined by Mrs. Wix.

Claude returns to England to bring Beale's wife to France. In the interim, Mrs. Wix convinces Maisie of the immorality of their situation. Miss Overmore, now called Mrs. Beale, however, almost convinces Mrs. Wix that there has been a moral improvement in the situation, since she and Claude will marry as soon as they are both divorced from their respective partners. Claude and Mrs. Beale, however, take up as before, and Claude asks Maisie to accompany him and Mrs. Beale to southern France for a while, leaving Mrs. Wix behind. Maisie, however, in a four-way confrontation, decides to leave with Mrs. Wix for England. The question running through the novel, and even into the conclusion, is whether Maisie has ever had or ever develops a moral sense.

Undoubtedly Maisie differs from Adela, who fears she will become the victim of a second marriage. Maisie is the shuttle between the two separated parents, and such a position, of course, allows her to see much, to observe much, and to deduce much about life. These deductions appear more allied to reason because no one doubts Maisie's "sensibility," but to grant Maisie an innate sense of morality is suspect. In fact, Wright openly denies her a "cloak of innate morality," suggesting that the point of the story is not to judge "what Maisie did" but to determine "what did Maisie know?"¹ This suggestion then requires a clarification of the effect of knowledge on innocence, and raises the question whether a worldly child can be innocent.

¹Wright, p. 162.

Some of Maisie's precociousness suggests that of Hawthorne's Pearl. Both Maisie and Pearl are exposed to the sins of adults, primarily adultery (an image of original sin). The Puritan ministers agreed that Hester as an adulteress was morally destroying little Pearl; however, Dimmesdale defended the relation between Hester and Pearl as having an "awful sacredness about it."¹ In James's text, Mrs. Wix attacks the relation between Sir Claude and Maisie, asserting that it is destroying Maisie's budding morality. Sir Claude defends the association, stating he has killed nothing, but "'on the contrary I think I've produced life. I don't know what to call it-- . . . it's exquisite, it's sacred.'"² Consequently, the analysis of Maisie should not concern itself with Maisie's actions, but with Maisie's understanding of the relation of immorality to human nature, and how well she absorbs the understanding of such knowledge into her own associations with others. Anderson concludes that Maisie can be like other children who are "like angels if they are filled by love; devils if they are filled with hate."³

At the beginning of the novel James clarifies the fact that Maisie is not influenced by the instruction of her elders,

¹Hawthorne, Works, VI, pp. 161-162.

²Novels and Tales, XI, 354.

³Quentin Anderson, The American Henry James (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1957), pp. 145-146.

but she is exposed to their conduct, and the consequence of such an exposure is an end to childhood:

"Poor little monkey!" she at last exclaimed; and the words were an epitaph for the tomb of Maisie's childhood. She was abandoned to her fate.¹

And what is this fate? James clarifies this concept also by explaining:

It was to be the fate of this patient little girl to see much more than she at first understood, but also even at first to understand much more than any little girl, however patient, had perhaps understood before.²

James thus establishes quite clearly that the action of the story, the guilt or innocence, lies within the understanding of this world by Maisie. The basis for any morality will lie within what she understands of this world. To understand Maisie's final decision and to judge the morality of that decision is to understand what Maisie knows.

Maisie's intellect is a very practical one and accommodates itself to her worldly situation more readily than is at first realized. As soon as she discovers that she is a "tool" of her parents' emotions, she deduces a practical way for escaping that predicament. Her position in the battle of the sexes rests upon her ability to observe and report; therefore, she ironically "appeared not to take things in."³ She receives

¹Novels and Tales, XI, 5.

²Ibid., XI, 9.

³Ibid., XI, 15.

much personal satisfaction in "the successful application of her system,"¹ perhaps because "she spoiled their fun, but she added practically to her own. She saw more and more; she saw too much."² Later, the second Mrs. Farange also testifies to this: "'There's nothing she hasn't heard. But it doesn't matter--it hasn't spoiled her.'"³ Miss Overmore, now Mrs. Beale, probably has in mind Maisie's conduct toward her elders, not Maisie's moral condition.

Even when Maisie switches households, she still knows enough to be sufficiently worldly and to protect herself:

It was her affections, Maisie could easily see, that led Ida to break out into questions as to what had passed at the other house between that horrible woman and Sir Claude; but it was also just here that the little girl was able to recall the effect with which in earlier days she had practised the pacific art of stupidity.⁴

James increasingly emphasizes that it is not what Maisie does that admits her into the unregenerate world of her elders. It is what Maisie knows. However, James has not told us whether she knows the right and wrong of anything, or if she knows why the world at large judges something to be wrong. Maisie knows many things, perhaps everything, but does she know these things in relation to moral responsibility? Can she possibly know them

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XI, 15-16.

³Ibid., XI, 63.

⁴Ibid., XI, 69.

in relation to the development of herself as a person? James describes her situation: "It may indeed be said these days [with Ida and Sir Claude] brought on a high quickening of Maisie's direct perceptions, of her sense of freedom to make out things for herself."¹ Maisie is thus influenced by the adult world because she is fully exposed to it. She, however, must interpret it from her own sensitivity, without much assistance, until Mrs. Wix begins to comment. The degree of Mrs. Wix's influence is also open to interpretation, since Maisie denies Mrs. Wix is anybody when it comes to choosing. She would choose Sir Claude or nobody, and classifies Mrs. Wix as nobody.² Thus, if Mrs. Wix is morality or respectability, Maisie's decisions do not rest upon such an influence.

The important scenes for analysis here, since they require some kind of moral conclusion or decision, are Maisie's confrontations with Sir Claude. It is only he that really presents a danger to Maisie. Sir Claude himself recognizes such a possibility when he and Maisie are having tea and buns at the hotel. Claude confesses that he is attracted to women who are attracted to him, even though he fears them. He is perfectly aware that Maisie is attracted to him, but momentarily feels her youth is a protection for her.³ Maisie's adoration of Claude

¹Ibid., XI, 99.

²Ibid., XI, 309.

³Ibid., XI, 115.

influences her whole attitude toward anything he does. When she discovers that he has lied to her about his seeing Mrs. Beale, she refuses to confront him because he would be embarrassed when he discovers she does know he lied. She merely says, "'Oh I didn't mind!'"¹ Maisie, however, does mind and cries over the matter. She is on the horns of a moral dilemma. If she doesn't mind the lie, her sense of morality is either dull or not developing with Claude as its guide, or she does mind but is capable of denying that she does; therefore, she lies. It is a small matter, but does show that Maisie's judgment or knowledge of wrongdoing is blurred. Maisie's knowledge sets her apart, and she soon realizes this, for in the garden where she and Sir Claude accidentally meet her mother, Maisie becomes aware of the pleasure connected with knowing. "We have already learned that she had come to like people's liking her to 'know.'"² In other words, Maisie enjoys her connection with the adult world, and she knows that that connection is through her forbidden knowledge. Maisie prizes the knowledge she has, and when Sir Claude, the object of her adoration, asks her about her interview in the garden with Ida Beale's latest gentleman, she denies having given him her attention.³ Maisie's small lie does not amount to

¹Ibid., XI, 125.

²Ibid., XI, 144-145.

³Ibid., XI, 157.

a moral catastrophe, but it does reveal that she has become worldly enough to prefer the expedient to the conscientious.

Claude, however, wishes to maintain some sense of dignity before Maisie. He may have a weak will, but he does have a finer conscience than the women. He does express the care he has for Maisie by saying that he does not want her mixed up.¹ Mrs. Beale's callous reply is that Maisie could not be "any more mixed."² And Maisie confesses that she doesn't mind being mixed and Sir Claude shouldn't mind.³

Shortly after this Maisie is taken by her father, Beale Farange, to the apartment of his latest mistress, Mrs. Cudden. During this interview, James makes an assertion about Maisie that rather summarizes her moral status:

What there was no effective record of indeed was the small strange pathos on the child's part of an innocence,⁴ so saturated with knowledge and so directed to diplomacy.

Maisie's innocence will become so saturated during the next year or two that it must turn to depravity or virtue. Additionally, the "art of stupidity" that she learned so early in life has become a diplomacy, an artful management of her knowledge. Diplomacy also suggests that she has a skill in handling others,

¹Ibid., XI, 167.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XI, 168-69.

⁴Ibid., XI, 182-183.

usually attaining what she wants without giving offense. Maisie's innocence, then, even at so early an age, suggests a worldliness, or, again, the qualification of expedience. This interpretation of Maisie's character is demonstrated in the interview that immediately follows with her father. He desires to have Maisie abandon him or refuse to be with him, thus freeing him of her and freeing his conscience. Maisie, however, recognizes his intention, and during the execution of his plan she is careful not to reveal that she knows his intention is to rid himself "nobly" of her. Beale finally labels her a "'deep little devil!'"¹

In trying to protect himself, he turns to criticizing his second wife and Sir Claude, explaining clearly to Maisie that they are "the worst people," the "greatest criminals," and that Maisie is a "pretext" for their game, but Maisie makes no attempt to defend her friends by denying the charges; for she seems to accept the charges as true and responds, "'I don't care--not a bit!'"² Beale explains that her attitude makes her also a monster and that her friends will eventually "chuck" her. Again, Maisie does not deny being a monster, but does deny that they will chuck her.³

¹Ibid., XI, 188.

²Ibid., XI, 189.

³Ibid., XI, 190.

Maisie's indifference to the immorality of her situation cannot be explained under the guise of pure innocence, for when Maisie sits down to reflect upon the relation between her stepmother and Sir Claude, she discerns:

that he was the lover of her stepmother and that the lover of her stepmother could scarce logically pretend to a superior right to look after her. Maisie had by this time embraced the implication of a kind of natural divergence between lovers and little girls.¹

The "natural divergence" has no effect on her feeling for Claude or on her wanting to be with him. In fact, there will be several scenes demonstrating his moral weakness to Maisie, none of which causes her to "diverge" from him.

The scenes demonstrating Claude's moral weakness must be taken cumulatively before significant interpretation is possible. To begin with, Claude has "rescued" Maisie after the "flight of her mother." Maisie has now been abandoned by both parents. Claude escorts Maisie into the hotel at Folkestone to listen to her story, but his attention is diverted:

Sir Claude was now looking at a young woman with black hair, a red frock and a tiny terrier tucked under her elbow. She swept past them on her way to the dining room, leaving an impression of a strong scent which mingled, amid the clatter of the place, with the hot aroma of food. He had become a little graver; he still stopped to talk. "I see--I see."²

Following his attention to this guest and others whom he was "not too grave to notice," he proclaims he is "free," free

¹Ibid., XI, 204.

²Ibid., XI, 227.

because Ida is leaving the country, and he now intends to take Maisie to France. The small sequence of events is important as a commentary on the whole situation: First he freely notices the woman guest, then he speaks of his freedom, and finally his decision to go to France suggests that he will be more free there. Again, the next morning, when he is in conversation with Maisie about her mother, there occurs another instance: "He finally stopped looking at the fishwife--he met his companion's enquiry. 'Oh you know!'"¹ This is the second instance of his divided attention before a precocious child who, of course, misses nothing. Indeed, Maisie does know. She knows his weakness if she knows nothing else. To know his weakness is to know immorality, evil. Her attitude toward his weakness becomes important because it will be difficult for her to parallel his weakness with evil. Her love for Claude is an obstacle for such a young mind. It is unlikely that she can see Claude as evil; it is equally unlikely that she can see evil in his actions. If Maisie accepts Claude, she embraces immorality; if she rejects Claude, she loses the only love she has ever known. Evil is most frequently presented to the weakened human nature as a form of good, and Maisie's knowledge forces her to face this adult challenge.

This challenge is brought to a climax in the scene at the railroad station. Claude and Maisie are at the station,

¹Ibid., XI, 236.

presumably to buy papers. Maisie, however, asks Claude about the destination of the train. He answers, "'To Paris, Fancy!'"¹ Claude then purchases pink and yellow books for Maisie:

He had told her the pink were for herself and the yellow one for Mrs. Beale, implying in an interesting way that these were the natural divisions in France of literature for the young and for the old.²

Maisie is both a child and an adult, symbolized by the books she holds, and Claude must decide this for himself when she puts the next statement to him: "'I wish we could go. Won't you take me?'"³ It is Claude who hesitates, however. Maisie interprets the hesitation as fear, and the train pulls out without them.⁴ Maisie is now both child and woman. Claude loves her for being the one and fears her for being the other. Maisie knows Claude's weakness, his attraction for women he loves and fears. Maisie is saved by Claude's fear, not by her innocence or by her virtue. She knowingly puts the proposition to him, suggesting he abandon Mrs. Beale and she abandon Mrs. Wix. Thus, the situation for Claude would be worse. Although Claude would break an illicit liaison with Mrs. Beale, Maisie would leave behind the only moral influence on her in the form of Mrs. Wix. Claude's predicament worsens because he will still have his

¹Ibid., XI, 343.

²Ibid., XI, 344.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., XI, 345.

natural weakness or attraction, but he will also have Maisie in Paris. This responsibility frightens Claude.

Before returning to the hotel, Maisie repeats the offer to go with him if he leaves Mrs. Beale, and she offers to wait for him on the bench "where you see the gold virgin."¹ Perhaps this is a bargain with Claude; her virginity for Mrs. Beale.² She is not offering Claude a new way of life, for she knows his weakness, she loves him as he is and would not expect him to change. As she accepts Claude, she knowingly accepts his actions.

When both Mrs. Beale and Mrs. Wix claim Maisie for selfish reasons, Claude pulls her "free to make her decision."³ Maisie's decision to go with Mrs. Wix is for a very practical reason. Maisie "knows" Claude and knows he is afraid because he returned to Mrs. Beale. Maisie wants love and security, and Claude cannot give her both. Once they return to the hotel, Claude looks for a way out of the situation, but Mrs. Wix will not compromise and fights her way through the situation. It must be remembered that Mrs. Wix takes Maisie even when the older woman knows, finally, that such a gesture will not bring Claude. It is Maisie, however, who fully accepts this after

¹Ibid., XI, 348.

²Harris Wilson, "What Did Maisie Know?" College English, XVII (February, 1956), 280.

³Novels and Tales, XI, 356.

their departure. Mrs. Wix expects Claude to wave at least, but it is Maisie who expects nothing. She expects nothing because she has known his weakness for a long time and in the role of a woman she has tested him and found him wanting. Maisie's love would force a moral responsibility on Claude that he fears, and his fears leave her without the security she needs. Maisie rejects Claude, not as a gesture of virtue, but because she has enough knowledge to know and to accept the "natural divergence" between lovers and little girls who seek security.

Although Maisie has been a popular child with the critics, her fame does not approach that of Flora and Miles, James's children in The Turn of the Screw. Most of the criticism surrounding this tale has been concerned with interpreting it in one of two ways: that the deceased servants really haunt the two children, or that the governess is psychologically possessed and evokes the ghosts from her own depraved imagination. The task of this thesis is not to become involved in this dispute but to choose that school allied to supporting the thesis; however, the following brief statement will demonstrate why the particular school of interpretation has been chosen and why it seems more likely to be the correct one.

Although James may present evil as a "social aspect of moral human conduct," in this tale, the "problem of innocence and evil is the central conflict and theme of the story rather

than an aspect of social conduct."¹ Not only literary criticism but also modern psychiatry sees The Turn of the Screw as presenting a conflict between good and evil rather than as developing a psychological abnormality.

. . . Those very different children Henry James gives us in "The Turn of the Screw" suggest an incapacity for normal feeling, an unalterable, subtle, and sinister resistance to human approach that might be compared to the callousness of the psychopath. Both authors [Henry James and Richard Hughes] seem to be more concerned with general aspects of life or evil, however, than with a personality disorder.²

Cleckley further states that, as a psychiatrist, he is of the opinion "that some of the popular methods pursued to discover what is in the unconscious cannot be counted upon as reliable methods of obtaining evidence," for they often involve "symbolism and analogy" in a way that can be interpreted indiscriminately.³

Another limitation of the Freudian view is that it is tautological. Hoffman points out that, if the governess is a psychopath, her view cannot be trusted, and thus, why she says something becomes more important than what she says, and the why seems caused by sexual repression and, therefore, she cannot be trusted and what she says is of little importance."⁴ A view

¹Charles G. Hoffman, "Innocence and Evil in James' The Turn of the Screw," University of Kansas City Review, XX (Winter, 1953), 97.

²Cleckley, p. 355.

³Ibid., p. 447.

⁴Hoffman, Short Novels, p. 71.

of man's struggle within the frame of good and evil, of course, does not create such a circuitous limitation. In fact, such an interpretation of good and evil suggests James as a courageous writer in the nineteenth century, for on a radio broadcast Katherine Anne Porter commented: "I think that during the nineteenth century, when the perfectibility of man was an accepted doctrine, James was one of the few who had the genuine knowledge of good and evil, and the courage to take it as his theme."¹ Finally, a possibility for ambiguity in the story rests with James's method rather than with the tale. The "method . . . quickened the dross of the conventional ghost story into a terrifying yarn of the supernatural."² Further, in his notebooks, James outlines his intention for the ghost tale:

Saturday, January 12, 1895. Note here the ghost-story told me at Addington (evening of Thursday 10th), by Archbishop of Canterbury: the mere vague, undetailed, faint sketch of it--being all he had been told (very badly and imperfectly), by a lady who had no art of relation, and no clearness: the story of the young children (indefinite number and age) left to care of servants in an old country-house, through the death, presumably, of parents. The servants, wicked and depraved, corrupt and deprave the children; the children are bad, full of evil, to a sinister degree. The servants die (the story vague about the way of it) and

¹"James: 'The Turn of the Screw,' a Radio Symposium: Katherine Anne Porter, Allen Tate, Mark Van Doren," broadcast May 3, 1942, as "Invitation to Learning." Reprinted in A Casebook on Henry James's The Turn of the Screw, ed. Gerald Willen (New York, 1960), p. 169.

²Krishna Baldev Vaid, Technique in the Tales of Henry James (Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1964), p. 122.

their apparitions, figures, return to haunt the house and children, to whom they seem to beckon, whom they invite and solicit, from across dangerous places, the deep ditch of a sunk fence, etc.--so that the children may destroy themselves, lose themselves, by responding, by getting into their power. So long as the children are kept from them, they are not lost; but they try and try and try, these evil presences, to get hold of them. It is a question of the children "coming over to where they are." It is all obscure and imperfect, the picture, the story, but there is a suggestion of strangely gruesome effect in it. The story to be told--tolerably obviously--by outside spectator, observer.¹

Also supporting The Turn of the Screw as a ghost tale, James, in the preface to the tale, says:

The good, the really effective and heart-shaking ghost-stories (roughly so to term them) appeared all to have been told, and neither new crop nor new type in any quarter awaited us. The new type indeed, the mere modern "psychical" case, washed clean of all queerness as by exposure to a flowing laboratory tap, and equipped with credentials vouching for this--the new type clearly promised little, for the more it was respectably certified the less it seemed of a nature to rouse the dear old sacred terror.²

James was not silent on the characters of the ghosts; of them he says:

This is to say, I recognize again, that Peter Quint and Miss Jessel are not "ghosts" at all, as we know the ghost, but goblins, elves, imps, demons as loosely constructed as those of the old trials for witchcraft; if not more pleasingly, fairies of the legendary order, wooing their victims forth to see them dance under the moon.³

¹Notebooks of Henry James (eds.) F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock (New York, 1961), pp. 178-179.

²Novels and Tales, XII, xv.

³Ibid., XII, xx.

The following summary statement about the character of the governess seems to support best James's own intention of her as a "spectator, observer," and to understand the children as corrupted by "wicked and depraved" servants:

The character of the governess in "The Turn of the Screw" has just the right note of limited common sense and propriety to furnish the necessary foil to the other and unnatural note of impropriety and horror in Miss Jessel, Peter Quint, Flora and little Miles. Elaborate psychoanalysis of the governess would turn her into a creature who spoils the point of the story and we have James' own word for the way to take her.¹

If James is the consummate artist that even the Freudian critics claim him to be, then he should not only know his intentions but also should be able to communicate them to his readers.

Following is a brief plot outline of the completed "potboiler" with a probe into some of its meanings:

Douglas reads a manuscript to a gathering of Griffin's guests. The manuscript begins shortly after the narrator of the text, a young governess, arrives at the country house at Bly. She is to have full authority over her employer's nephew and niece, Miles and Flora. She encounters the ghost of Peter Quint, the deceased valet, and then the ghost of a former governess, Miss Jessel. Mrs. Grose, the housekeeper, identifies Quint for the governess, and suggests an intimate relation between Quint and Miss Jessel and between the deceased servants and the children. The governess becomes more distraught when

¹E. Stevenson, The Crooked Corridor: A Study of Henry James (New York, 1949), p. 139.

she begins to believe that the children know the ghosts are present but never admit to such knowledge. The governess encounters Quint on the stairs and causes him to retreat before her. Returning to the bedroom, she finds Flora at the window. Later she awakens to find Flora again at the window, and she sees Miles down on the lawn. Following these instances, the governess informs Mrs. Grose that she believes Quint and Miss Jessel are still corrupting the children. Mrs. Grose's only solution is to advise the employer of this. Miles also presses to be allowed to return to school, which he was forced to leave because of conduct injurious to others. The governess wants him where she believes Quint cannot get to him. After an encounter with Miles over a stolen letter, the governess then discusses Flora's visit at the Lake with Miss Jessel. She frightens Flora, who runs to Mrs. Grose for protection. The plan is then for Mrs. Grose to take Flora to the uncle. The governess, alone with Miles, tries to force the boy into confessing that he stole the letter and that he is wicked. Quint appears at the window during the interview. Miles confesses that he took the letter and that he misbehaved at school, but under the strain of the questions and of his attempt to see Quint, he dies in the arms of the governess.

James works carefully to isolate the young twenty-year-old governess from all outside assistance. He provides her with only one confidante, and she is more functional for James than

helpful to the governess; however, there must be someone in the tale to whom the progress of the plot may be slowly revealed, someone to add complication, even inadvertently. The very first impression the governess has of being lost is in Harley Street, London. After accepting the position at Bly, she again feels as one "lost on a ship with her strangely at the helm."¹ She is young and inexperienced and finds herself with authority and the responsibility that a position of authority brings.

Mrs. Grose has had charge of the children, and it cannot be ignored that she is relieved to pass this authority and its responsibility on to the governess. Although Mrs. Grose's name may establish her intellectually, she is also guilty of moral errors. She does not acquaint the governess with important background material that will assist the young woman in her responsibility as governess. The philosophy of the housekeeper seems to be that of ignoring things, hoping that they will improve or merely disappear. She "turns" from the governess several times, and, in so doing, turns the screw of torture a little more. For instance, when Mrs. Grose learns of Miles's dismissal from school, she covers a look with "quick blankness."² The governess, in a normal situation, should have been provided with the exact reason for dismissal, the uncle should have made himself available for consultation, and

¹Novels and Tales, XII, 164.

²Ibid., XII, 165.

Mrs. Grose should have supported the dismissal with the information that Miles is a child capable of both good and bad conduct. The headmaster, however, chooses to give her only partial knowledge, the uncle chooses to ignore the knowledge of the letter, and Mrs. Grose chooses to withhold her knowledge. Everyone involved, therefore, again "turns" away from the reality, hoping it is only an accidental situation and would end with the boy's return home. Even the governess chooses to wait and "attack the missive before going to bed,"¹ not realizing that the letter represents one of the first "attacks" on the apparent innocence at Bly.

To supplement the idea that Mrs. Grose is capable of deceiving the inexperienced governess, James has her not only omit things she should tell, but also has her lie to cover up her first slip of the tongue about Quint. When the governess asks about her predecessor, Mrs. Grose informs her that Miss Jessel was "'also young and pretty.'"² The response of the governess is, "'He seems to like us young and pretty!'"³ Her reference, of course, must be to the master, since he is the only man she has met, but Mrs. Grose's response is in the past tense: "'Oh, he did.'" Mrs. Grose asserted: 'it was the way he

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XII, 169.

³Ibid.

liked every one!"¹ Both verbs are in the past tense. If Mrs. Grose were referring to the master, who is very much alive, she would use the present tense. She tries to cover her blunder by referring specifically to the master, but the impression of another "he" has been made.

Not only is the governess given partial knowledge about the children and the background of Bly, but James also suggests that because of her inexperience she is "carried away in Harley Street,"² and she is carried away again at Bly. To begin with, James describes the young woman as being "under a charm."³ Additionally, Flora is described as a "creature too charming,"⁴ and the governess next discovers the "charm"⁵ of Miles. Indeed, the summer itself was charming.⁶ The whole tone of charm is summarized in: "Oh it was a trap--not designed but deep--to my imagination, to my delicacy, perhaps to my vanity; to whatever in me was most excitable."⁷ There is no design to charm; charm plays on what is most susceptible in its victim. Here, in the case of the young governess, the charm plays on her "imagination,"

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XII, 162.

³Ibid., XII, 172.

⁴Ibid., XII, 159.

⁵Ibid., XII, 172.

⁶Ibid., XII, 173.

⁷Ibid.

"delicacy" of feelings, and "excitability." There is no doubt for whom the trap is set; she is put "off guard" by the appearance of things. James is, of course, using one of his favorite devices--appearance versus reality. Evans explains that even "supernatural possession" and "sexual impropriety" do not account for all the horror, for "lambs can be tigers and children can be as old as evil itself."¹

The preparation by "charm" is, of course, the "charm of stillness--that hush in which something gathers or crouches. The change was actually like the spring of a beast."² It is also worth noting that "enchanted" and "bewitched" are synonyms for "charm," especially when a spell is involved. The irony, or the spring of the beast, comes forth in the climactic scene in the garden when the governess reflects, "It would be as charming as a charming story suddenly to meet some one."³ Peter Quint, however, is not the one she has in mind; at the moment she is thinking of personal approval from the master. One of the faults of the governess' character is, not sex repression as the Freudians see it, but pride in her personal accomplishment at Bly. Lydenberg sees her as functioning much more in the tradition of human frailty, suffering not only from the sin of

¹Oliver Evans, "James's Air of Evil: The Turn of the Screw," Partisan Review, XVI (February, 1949), 186.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 174.

³Ibid., XII, 175.

pride but also as a false savior with a martyr complex who twists the Christian myth into an anti-religious statement.¹

Quint, however, does appear, but never in the new section of the house. He first appears on the top of the tower in the old section to which Flora has conducted the governess.² James supports the tower image by the vocabulary of warfare, suggesting that Quint as a force and the governess as an opposing force will do battle: "This tower was one of a pair--square, incongruous, crenellated structures--that were distinguished, for some reason, though I could see little difference, as the new and the old."³ James further describes the house as "flanked" by the towers at opposite ends, completing the description by giving them the "grandeur of their actual battlements."⁴

The idea that the governess is doing battle against an opposing force is again brought out by the setting the first time she sees Miss Jessel. Flora, again, precipitates the confrontation, but this time it is not between Quint and the governess but between Miss Jessel and the governess. Flora and the governess are beside the pond at Bly. They have been doing

¹John Lydenberg, "The Governess Turns the Screw," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XII (June, 1957), p. 41.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 175.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., XII, 175-176.

a lesson and making a game of it. The pond at Bly becomes the "Sea of Azov." It must be remembered that when Quint was first seen, he was on the tower, reflecting a battle between an entrenched force and an outside force. When Miss Jessel is first seen, Flora and the governess are playing the game that the pond is the "Sea of Azov." Azov, in reality, is a shallow sea; however, more importantly, at the mouth of the Don and the Sea of Azov is a fortress city and, until late in the eighteenth century, there was a strategic fortress there. Thus, both ghosts are associated with the idea of a siege and of a fortress. Additionally, Hoffman, following James's intention, interprets the ghosts not as the "'chain clanking' variety, thrilling and frightening," for their presence is to create an atmosphere and an evil effect.¹ The effect here is not only that there is a perverse, supernatural presence but also that it is present in an atmosphere of battle, waging whatever opposition is necessary to attain its goal.

Miss Jessel, like Quint, first appears at a distance, Quint high on a tower and Miss Jessel across the lake.² As Miss Jessel is a spectator watching Flora, so Flora watches the governess; however, Flora "turns" away from Miss Jessel and toward the governess. Flora's "turning the screw" on the governess is supported by the image of her playing with the

¹Hoffman, Short Novels, p. 75.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 201.

small piece of wood in which she fixes another fragment to form a mast.¹ Late in the fall of the year, Flora will further turn the screw on the governess. Then, she will take a real boat and cross the pond to meet Miss Jessel. The Freudians interpret the two small pieces of wood as sexual imagery, based on the imagination of the governess; however, it is Flora, not the governess, who constructs the wooden boat and who later takes the rowboat across the lake; at no time does the governess enter upon the water. The governess, thus, in the initial encounter with both Quint and Jessel is put into an environment of violent opposition. The ambiguity for her is that she does not know with certainty what she opposes. The ambiguity creates suspense and interest for the reader and keeps those interested "who are not easily caught."²

The governess is one who is easily caught, not only in Harley Street but by the children at Bly. Flora is the first of the two children she meets, and it is easily determined that she is unable fully to appreciate the cleverness of the small child. Mrs. Grose and the young governess discuss the timidity of Flora. In the "oddest way" Flora permits her "timidity" to be openly discussed.³ Flora's attitude throws questionable light

¹Ibid., XII, 202.

²"To catch those not easily caught means to catch those not easily caught in the "vice of horror and mystification," Glenn A. Reed, "Another Turn on James's 'Turn of the Screw,'" American Literature, XX (January, 1949), 413-423, reprinted in a Casebook on Turn of the Screw, pp. 193-194.

³Novels and Tales, XII, 161.

on the sincerity of her timidity. No child who is truly timid responds as Flora does: she is "frank" and "brave" without a sign of "uncomfortable consciousness."¹ Any truly timid child, when he is conscious of his being the center of conversation, is "uncomfortable." A bold child, however, enjoys not only the attention but also the impression he creates with an assumed timidity.

It is Flora who first conducts the governess on a tour of Bly; it is Flora with whom she first has supper and whom she describes as "one of Raphael's holy infants";² however, on the tour of Bly, Flora becomes "droll" as she reveals Bly "secret by secret."³ As Flora "leads" the governess on, the child again shows a bold, fearless nature, a "confidence and courage,"⁴ where even the governess hesitates:

Young as she was I was struck, throughout our little tour, with her confidence and courage, with the way, in empty chambers and dull corridors, on crooked staircases that made me pause and even on the summit of an old machicolated square tower that made me dizzy, her morning music, her disposition to tell me so many more things than she asked, rang out and led me on.⁵

A machicolated tower is one with openings to cast missiles on the enemy beneath. Flora takes the governess to the tower, but

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XII, 163.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

only the governess becomes dizzy. She is not prepared for the enemy or for battle. Flora, then, is not the essence of timidity, and it is she who first takes the governess to the tower, where the governess does become dizzy, but more importantly, where the governess will first see Quint. During this tour, Flora's timidity fails to the point that she "tells" more than she "asks." Even in this early scene, Flora demonstrates that she knows more than does the governess. Later, Miles will demonstrate that he, too, is more sophisticated in knowledge than is the governess. In fact, Krook suggests that the knowledge of the children exceeds any they could derive from experience at their age, and that it suggests the "presence of a corrupt element."¹

The picture of Flora dancing "round corners" and pattering "down passageways" with her "hair of gold" and "frock of blue"² recalls Hawthorne's description of Pearl. This reference to Pearl seems especially true because the governess equates Flora with a "rosy sprite," and one gets the picture of Pearl dancing along in the role of an "elf-child" leading Hester. James, however, does not treat the character of Flora in the same detail as he does the character of Miles; therefore, it is necessary to return to the important scene at the lake to

¹Dorothea Krook, The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James (Cambridge, England: 1962), p. 109.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 163.

see fully the other side of Flora's dual character, which James has suggested from the beginning of the tale.¹

When the governess first sees Miss Jessel at the lake, Flora makes no overt acknowledgment of the presence of Miss Jessel. In fact, her name is never mentioned to the child, nor does Flora ever mention the name of her former governess. It seems strange and unnatural for a child to avoid mentioning the name of her former teacher and companion. Flora is sophisticated enough to select topics of information for conversation. Additionally, the children must think it strange that the governess never asks them about her predecessor. There is a standoff, another of the many games being played at Bly.

Later in the fall of the year, Flora will take the flat-bottomed boat across the lake and hide it, and this earlier scene at the lake, when Flora makes a small boat from the flat piece of wood, foreshadows the climactic battle that the governess will lose to Miss Jessel. Flora, an eight-year-old child, will manage to row a flat-bottomed boat across the lake and to hide it: "I recognized, as I looked at the pair of short thick oars, quite safely drawn up, the prodigious character of the feat for a little girl."² The boat is drawn up where the

¹Robert Heilman, "'The Turn of the Screw' as a Poem," University of Kansas City Review, XIV (Summer, 1948), 174-188. Reprinted in Casebook, p. 177. Heilman sees the real subject as the dual nature of man, p. 177.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 276.

governess supposes it will be, and Flora is where the governess supposes her to be. James suggests by these two correct conclusions that the intuition of the governess can be trusted. Further, the presence of the supernatural is suggested in Flora's strength.¹ To add to the feeling of the presence of something not easily explained, James introduces the image of decay, the withered weed in the hand of Flora.² With the image of "weed," opposed to "flora" as flower or life, James suggests the duality in the child's nature and the forces in opposition here at the lake. Even these changes of imagery are not the most remarkable, however, because the greatest change is seen in the attitude of Flora toward the governess, for whom she has professed so much love and friendship. The only thing the governess does that causes Flora to drop her assumed gaiety is to mention, for the first time, the name of Miss Jessel. This alone causes Flora to drop all pretenses and "turn" on the governess. The open acknowledgment of the ghost suggests to Flora that the governess knows the real game, and Flora responds with hate, as if she were the offended one. This child, obviously, has never loved the governess but has been capable of great deceit and pretense. Flora now reveals the falseness of her timidity and the falseness of her seeming to be

¹Supernatural strength is listed as an indication of possession by a witch. Robbins, p. 397.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 276.

a "holy infant" of Raphael. She is at most a child with a dual nature, good and evil. At worst she is a reprobate.

Flora makes no oral response to the governess until Mrs. Grose assures the child that no one is there, that it is all a joke, and offers to take her home.¹ Then Flora speaks out without evasion, condemning herself by a slip in her denial of any other presence. Now her childish beauty has vanished, and she has the hard, old look so often associated with evil or forbidden knowledge. She says: "'I don't know what you mean. I see nobody. I see nothing. I never have. I think you're cruel. I don't like you!'"² No one has accused her of ever seeing anyone or anything before this moment. The name of Miss Jessel has never been mentioned. Why should the child deny an accusation that has not been made? She implies that she has either seen someone before this occasion or has been accused of seeing someone. Since there has been no accusation before this, she inadvertently admits that she has seen someone before and errs in her use of "'I never have.'"

The "old" imagery that the governess reports in her description of Flora is supported by Mrs. Grose's report the following morning: "'It has made her, every inch of her, quite old.'"³ Trachtenberg concludes that Flora is eventually damned

¹Ibid., XII, 281.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., XII, 285.

and symbolically dies an old woman, and that her guilt is exposed involuntarily; however, he concludes that Miles, on the other hand, wants to expose his guilt but lacks the courage.¹

Even though Mrs. Grose has been unable to see Miss Jessel, she does confirm the immediate aging of Flora, and, additionally, she adds what she has heard:

She shook her head with dignity. "I've heard--!"
"Heard?"

"From that child--horrors! There!" She sighed with tragic relief. "On my honor, Miss, she says things--!"²

Mrs. Grose remembers that she has heard Flora's "appalling language" before.³ Also, it was what Miles said to others at school that caused his dismissal. Ironically, both children reveal their corruption through their speech. In the revealing of Flora's nature, however, the relief for Mrs. Grose and the justification of the governess are indeed correctly termed tragic because of the condemnation of the children that such relief and justification establishes. Flora is lost to the governess, but Miles, who is the leader of the two, may yet be saved.

One of the first questions to be asked about Miles by the governess is whether he is bad. Her first problem with Miles is his dismissal from school because "he's been an injury

¹Stanley Trachtenberg, "The Return of the Screw," Modern Fiction Studies, XI (Summer, 1965), 181.

²Novels and Tales, XII, 290.

³Ibid.

to others."¹ The headmaster may be a bore to the bachelor uncle, but undoubtedly the man has had much experience with boys, and to dismiss a child of some social standing with little or no explanation must have been the most discreet way of handling the problem. Mrs. Grose, unfortunately, confuses the situation by her trust in the children. She, however, comments wisely if she is read ironically: "'See him, Miss, first, then believe it!'"² In fact, Mrs. Grose comes to accept the corruption of the children after she hears the horrible language of Flora, and she herself says, "'I believe.'"³

Mrs. Grose does not deny that Miles, on occasion, has been naughty, but both women are willing to accept such conduct. In fact, they prefer it in a boy.⁴ Miles's appearance gives the lie to the "horrible" letter which is a summary of his true conduct, and James is again using the device of appearance versus reality. To add to the strangeness of the dismissal, Miles never alludes to it.⁵ The report of his conduct at school is a judgment about him from outside Bly, and it, too, suggests a serious wrong. Miles is aware of his dismissal, but makes no explanation; therefore, as an intellectually superior child, he

¹Ibid., XII, 166.

²Ibid., XII, 167.

³Ibid., XII, 290.

⁴Ibid., XII, 168.

⁵Ibid., XII, 183.

must be satisfied that he was justly dismissed. It must also be remembered that he never alludes to Quint or to his friendship with Quint,¹ which Mrs. Grose described as intimate. Mrs. Grose declares that it was Quint's fancy to play with him, spoil him, and to be too free with him.² She later states that Quint and Miles had been "perpetually" together.³ But Miles denies certain occasions when he has been with Quint.⁴ In addition to his lying about this, Miles calls Mrs. Grose a menial for her criticism of Quint.⁵ It is thoroughly unnatural for the boy to be perpetually with a companion and then not to mention it unless he understands that it is wrong. Miles, therefore, treats Quint and the friendship with him as he treats the misconduct at school, by never alluding to them.

Mrs. Grose has described Quint as "clever" and "deep."⁶ Miles demonstrates a "perpetually striking show of cleverness."⁷ In fact, "he was under some influence operating in his small intellectual life as a tremendous excitement."⁸

¹Ibid., XII, 195.

²Ibid., XII, 196.

³Ibid., XII, 212.

⁴Ibid., XII, 213.

⁵Ibid., XII, 215.

⁶Ibid., 197.

⁷Ibid., XII, 219.

⁸Ibid.

Miles is so clever that he can afford openly to ask the governess to think of him as bad.¹ He admits that he and Flora have planned the midnight escapade to upset the governess. How clever to turn this into a prank and confess to a misdemeanor rather than to an evil plot! If Miles had only meant to disturb the governess, why was he motionless on the lawn, staring up at the old tower? Why should the tower have special meaning for him? If Flora had been meant to awaken the governess, why did she not arouse her in some way? Why did Flora pull the curtain round her own bed, giving the appearance that she was still asleep?² Miles's story is clever, but it does not bear out the midnight actions of these children under the moon.

The governess, of course, loses in her second confrontation, in Miles's room. It is Miles who invites her in, and this time it is he who extends his "friendly old hand" that is firm and cool.³ The hand is old and friendly to one who is adult and should understand what Miles is trying to convey in this scene, for it is Miles who is in control of the conversation and who is the adult. It is the governess who does not understand what the "old" implies, and it is Miles who cleverly but knowingly evades answering the governess specifically by saying,

¹Ibid., XII, 234.

²Ibid., XII, 226.

³Ibid., XII, 263.

"'Oh you know, you know!'"¹ Obviously he knows what he means, and the implication is that any adult should know. He repeats that she knows what a boy wants.² He wants to be free and away, and he suggests that his uncle come to Bly to settle everything. Within this suggestion is a threat to the governess that she will have to tell the uncle how she has let the matter of his schooling drop: "'You'll have to tell him a tremendous lot!'"³ Miles has no feeling for the school he has left. He declares he does not want to go back; he wants "a new field."⁴ This is open rebellion; not only does he want freedom at ten years of age, he also threatens the position of the governess, the representative of authority, to get his freedom. Also, to tell a "tremendous lot" could be a challenge to tell what she suspects about the corruption at Bly. Tonight Miles is probing to find out by threat or indirect questions what the governess does know.

When Miles is put under question as to what happened at school, or even before that time, the governess senses a gleam of consciousness in him. Falling on her knees, she tells the child she wants to save him. She uses the term in opposition to

¹Ibid., XII, 264.

²Ibid., XII, 265.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

"abandon" or "lose."¹ There is no indication that she is using the term in the sense of a Freudian possessiveness. She continues to address him as a child, referring to him as "little Miles," and is aware that he is in a precarious position for a child. At this point she, too, is fallible and goes too far. She is making Miles aware of something more, as she will do in the final scene. Quint does not appear at this time. Miles has the situation well enough under control and terminates the interview. James introduces all the claptrap of witchcraft: the extreme coldness of the room, the gust of wind in a sealed room, the extinction of the candle, and finally Miles's shriek before he admits that "'it was I who blew it, dear!'"²

The next day the governess sees Flora with Miss Jessel, and she realizes that Quint is with Miles. When she explains the cleverness of the ruse to Mrs. Grose, the governess calls the little plan of the children "divine." When Mrs. Grose questions the use of "divine," the governess changes it to "infernal."³ Thus the dual nature of the children is again expressed. Corrupted man lies somewhere between the divine and the infernal, being turned this way and that.

Miles is aware that the governess must make a move one way or another. He himself has forced this position upon her.

¹Ibid., XII, 266.

²Ibid., XII, 267.

³Ibid., XII, 271.

Thus, when she does write the uncle for an interview, Miles steals the letter to see if she has revealed to the uncle a "tremendous lot" that he knows she suspects. He must know she is aware of more than superficial appearances, and consequently he steals the letter.¹ Ostensibly, the children have committed only small acts of disobedience. What can the governess say in the letter that would frighten Miles to the extent of making him steal? It could very possibly be that he thinks the governess might write what she senses and feels to be true--that would be "tremendous."

Again, during the last evening, Miles takes the initiative. Immediately after dinner, he announces to the governess, "'Well--so we're alone!'" The governess quickly reminds Miles that "'we've the others.'"² By reminding him of the presence of others in the house, household help, she suggests that she is not seeking a romantic aloneness with the boy.³ Miles, however, stresses the fact that, if they are alone, it is she who is "'most alone.'"⁴ It is not the governess who stresses the awkwardness of her position, but the boy who reminds her. When she suggests that now would be a good time

¹Ibid.

²Banta, p. 173. James was aware of his brother's interest in "communication with the dead or others as Henry called them."

³Novels and Tales, XII, 298.

⁴Ibid., XII, 300.

for them to talk, Miles becomes frightened and wants to escape the interview, promising her, "'I'll tell you everything,' Miles said--'I mean I'll tell you anything you like. You'll stay on with me, and we shall both be all right, and I will tell you-- I will. But not now,'"¹

Miles now makes his first slip. "'I'll tell you everything. . .'" What is there to tell unless what the governess suspects is true? Then he corrects it to "'anything,'" which is an afterthought suggesting he will confess to no more than what will be required by her. Twice he emphasizes that he "'will tell.'"² If the boy were merely confused or frightened, he would be asking to know what she wished of him. He would not be rationalizing that he would tell everything, and then correcting it to anything.

The governess, of course, lacks any skill in handling the situation. Now that she has Miles in a confessing mood, she presses for a report about his stealing the letter.³ Quint appears immediately at the window, but Miles, with his back to it, is unaware of the presence; however, just as Quint appears with his "white face of damnation,"⁴ Miles's face becomes "as white as the face against the glass."⁵ Just as the governess

¹Ibid., XII, 302.

²Ibid.

³Krook, p. 119. The letter has been interpreted by Krook as a bridge to the evil that "possesses" him, and for this reason the governess risks the "brutal" interview.

⁴Novels and Tales, XII, 308.

⁵Ibid., XII, 304.

and Mrs. Grose both turned white from fear, Miles, too, facing his confession turns white with fear, a fear Flora never felt. Quint wheels, a form of turning, away from the window, like a "baffled beast."¹ When Miles becomes confused in seeking to see Quint, he will make a movement like a "baffled dog" and go into a "white rage."² There is an identification between Quint and Miles, but given over to the power of evil, man is less than human.

It is within the climactic scene of disorder that man shows his fallibility most. There is little deceit where there is much confusion. Miles, therefore, reveals that he knows about the presence of Miss Jessel, even though he has not been left alone with Flora to discuss anything since the major encounter at the lake. Yet he not only knows about Miss Jessel, he believes she could be present. If Flora had never seen anyone, as she insisted, Miles would not ask, "'Is she here?'"³ He might have asked the governess if she thought she saw someone, but his question suggests that he believes in the presences. Also, when he is informed that a presence is bearing down on them, he turns, trying to see it; therefore, he admits to the presence. He asks: "'It's he?'"⁴ No one has mentioned

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., XII, 309.

³Ibid., XII, 308.

⁴Ibid., XII, 309.

Quint's name until this moment, however. The first to name the presence is Miles with his question. He knows that the governess has seen Quint, or he would not assume that she would know whom he meant by "he." Miles's identification of Peter Quint as the devil follows in the scene. "'Peter Quint--you devil!'" This usage is frequent in James--that is, he frequently uses the dash to separate appositive terms.¹

Into this final scene James has incorporated many of the trappings of witchlore: First Miles feels he has something to confess; there is then a sense of guilt; then an interrogation and a self-condemning answer; and finally an attempt by the devil to thwart the confession. The governess, like the judges at the witch trials, is a victim of her own limitations. When she realizes that she has won a victory, she pushes on to a defeat, for the "effect that was to have brought him so much nearer was already that of added separation."² Finally, James uses an old device: if the guilty person repeats the name of

¹Within this edition of the tale there are innumerable examples of the dash used to connect appositives; for example: "We had then a young woman--a nurse maid," p. 170; "This tower was one of a pair--square incongruous crenellated structures," p. 175; "He was the same--he was the same," p. 184; and "Peter Quint--his own man, his valet," p. 191. Additionally, the dash may be used in place of "namely," or it frequently substitutes as a colon. A careful writer like James would not use it as a substitute for a comma, for unlike the comma, the dash pushes on to what follows, and it suggests a closer relationship between units than does the comma.

²Ibid., XII, 306.

the devil who tortures him, he can escape his persecution. Miles speaks the name of Quint, and his heart becomes "dispossessed."¹

The children are not villains. They do not pursue the destruction of others for selfish motives. These children are the victims of corrupted humanity, reflecting simultaneously the tragedy of what man could have been and what man is. The governess foolishly tries to keep the children from presenting both sides of their natures, and, like Hawthorne's artist in "The Birth Mark," she removes their blemish of humanity and destroys their very natures.

James creates a Puritan character in the governess, not a sexually suppressed spinster of twenty years of age. In a Puritan sense "her incessant vigilance, unrelenting persistence, selfless submission, and refusal to compromise in any manner with evil are entirely proper and necessary in the unremitting struggle with evil."² James's attack on the Puritan strain here is as sharp as any that has been made directly. Indeed, the human agent for good is fallible here and becomes destructive by seeking out perfection in this world. The real dilemma for the governess is ambiguity; she does not realize that she cannot force full knowledge from Miles.³

¹Ibid., XII, 309.

²Lydenberg, p. 58.

³Krook, p. 125.

Her mistake is that she thinks she can make angels of human children. Quint and Jessel welcomed them to the communion of their race, tempting their humanity, but the governess sees their humanity as corruption and in her ignorance destroys them.

The darkening of the human mind, the indifference of those who should have known better, and the total ignorance of all the characters are other ways of spelling out the dogma of original sin with all its primitive effects:

Even if a child "was born as clear of natural prejudice or damage as Adam before his sin," Bushnell remarked, "spiritual education . . . would still involve an experiment of evil, therefore, a fall and a bondage under the laws of evil." The drama of human life "involves a struggle with evil, a fall and a rescue"; maturity involved a "double experience . . . the bitterness of evil and the worth of good."¹

When James wrote The Awkward Age, he took the drama of human life and the education of his fictional children into the drawing room. Nanda Brookenham, the heroine of The Awkward Age, is not unlike Maisie Farange in being exposed to knowledge of immorality in the adult world. Nanda's parents, however, are responsible for her exposure to an evil environment, even though they do not abandon her physically, as Maisie's parents do her.

Briefly, Nanda's situation should be reviewed by reference to the general plot of the novel. The story begins with Mr. Longdon's love for Lady Julia, who has married another man and whose daughter, Mrs. Brookenham (Mrs. Brook), now has

¹R. W. B. Lewis, The American Adam (Chicago, 1955), p. 70.

two children, Nanda and Harold. Nanda is approaching the marriageable age, and hers is a mature grasp of worldly knowledge, especially sexual knowledge. Harold, Nanda's young brother, is effete and generally corrupt; his overtly evil behavior contrasts with the sedate conduct of Nanda. Vanderbank, a prominent member of Mrs. Brook's circle, discusses Lady Julia, Mrs. Brook, and Nanda with Mr. Longdon. Vanderbank is obviously an admirer of both Nanda and her mother, Mrs. Brook.

Duchess Jane, a cousin to Nanda's father, introduces her daughter to the circle, but shelters her socially until she is assured of a wealthy marriage for the girl. A major portion of the novel centers upon discussing prospects of marriage for the girls. At first Mitchett, who is wealthy but without social recognition, is not acceptable for Aggie, the daughter of the Duchess, but he might do for Nanda; but then Vanderbank might be interested in Nanda. Nanda's reputation is shadowed by her mother's permitting her to visit Tishy Grendon, whose sister Carrie Donner is supposedly too familiar with Cashmore, whose wife is the sister of Lord Petherton, who lives by the generosity of Mitchett! Obviously, with such interweaving of relationships, the chief "sport" of the "circle" is gossip about one another.

Mr. Longdon develops an immediate attachment for Nanda because of her resemblance to her grandmother, Lady Julia. He urges Nanda to marry and avoid loneliness. The situation becomes more complicated when the Duchess informs Longdon that

she now wants Mitchett for Aggie, but Mrs. Brook opposes the match because Mitchett's being available causes Vanderbank to be uncertain about Nanda.

Vanderbank does admit his love for Nanda, but he is not financially able to marry. Longdon offers to provide Nanda with a dowry, but Mrs. Brook complicates the whole issue by backing Mitchett for her daughter, selfishly keeping Vanderbank in her own circle. Mitchett, however, sees that Vanderbank wants him to marry Aggie, and he does so. Later, at a party, after the marriage of Mitchett and Aggie, Mrs. Brook reveals her anger at the loss of Mitchett to Aggie. Vanderbank does not commit himself toward Nanda because of the gossip about her freedom. The crisis comes when Petherton chases Aggie from room to room for a morally questionable book which Nanda admits to having read. Following this, the group seems to lose its closeness. Nanda has graduated to adult society; Mitchett has marital problems. Nanda, however, is unhappy, but reveals her unselfishness when she asks both Mitchett and Vanderbank to be kind to her mother. Nanda tearfully denies her love for Vanderbank to Mr. Longdon, who thinks that perhaps Van should have married Aggie and Nanda should have married the generous but worldly Mitchy. The immediate conclusion of the story is that Nanda plans to make an early visit to Mr. Longdon's estate.

One way of analyzing the novel would be to evaluate the knowledge of the world that Nanda has and determine whether

"forbidden" knowledge contributes to maturity and whether maturity means a "struggle with evil, a fall and a rescue."¹ Nanda comments about the effects of such knowledge on herself when she explains Vanderbank's rejection of her to Mr. Longdon. She begins by saying that she is as Vanderbank thinks she is. Nanda's conduct has been impeccable, yet she realizes that corruption comes through knowledge, and she has all worldly knowledge. To understand human nature, "to know," is to be corrupted; however, this corruption is not damnation in James's theology. It is merely being human; it is the human condition. It is not to be rejected nor denied; it must be accepted. This is why Nanda says, "'I am like that.'" This is what Mr. Longdon has come to understand, and this is why he accepts Nanda, who recognizes the real communion of mankind.

In his understanding of man's nature, James resembles Hawthorne. Nanda is a sophisticated and cultured presentation of the young wife in Hawthorne's "Young Goodman Brown." Nanda, like Faith, the young wife, accepts human nature fully, even in its corrupted state. Although Brown rejects his wife when he returns from the sabbath, she runs into the street to embrace him publicly. Nanda knows that Vanderbank is a sophisticated and worldly man, but she accepts him as almost perfect. Brown rejects his wife on the suspicion that she has attained

¹Lewis, p. 70.

"forbidden knowledge," knowledge of the secret sins of others, and by this knowledge, he feels she is corrupted. Vanderbank, similarly, rejects Nanda because she has been exposed to gossip about the worldly conduct of the social circle. As Faith was exposed to the circle of witches at the midnight sabbath, Nanda is exposed to the circle of "friends" at the tea table. Since there is never any doubt in the text about what Nanda knows, it is not necessary to analyze her reaction to various experiences to prove that she comprehends all the immoral implications. Harold and Aggie, however, reveal not only corrupted intellects, but also corrupted conduct. Nanda's knowing has been an act of courage, "which constitutes the only basis for truly moral action."¹ Harold's and Aggie's knowing has been a basis for truly immoral actions. These youthful characters bear out the thesis of man's propensity for evil, for they never struggle against it. In fact, their propensity toward evil comes near to the "tenfold" perverseness that Hawthorne allotted to little Pearl.

In a sense, at least, the social comedy of James can be termed a tragedy. The tragedy is a girl's exposure to the world and the understanding she obtains of human nature. Nanda's overt sins are her being exposed to gossip, acquaintances with young married women, reading French novels, and visiting a

¹Mildred Hartsock, "The Exposed Mind: A View of The Awkward Age," The Critical Quarterly, IX (Spring, 1967), 49.

young man's room.¹ However, she cannot rid herself of love for a man who has contributed to making the drawing room a place of intrigue, and she permits herself to be made unhappy by his rejection of her on no other basis than an artificial social criterion; Van "lacks the delicate mind and soul,"² and for this she loves him. "This is the bond between them."³ Nanda cannot rid herself of Van because of a "hereditary prejudice" she is unable to resist.⁴ She, too, like young Ilbrahim, has an "unappropriated" love to bestow, but, because she is human, she errs in choosing an object for that love. Unlike Ilbrahim or even Morgan Moreen, however, she has courage in "knowing" and survives.

Nanda Brookenham's brother is an excellent example of a young profligate. Harold knows much of the world, and he especially knows how to get what he wants from his worldly mother. His insight into her world is a frightening challenge to her, and she summarizes his effect on her: "'I don't know what it is, but you give me sometimes a kind of terror.'"⁵ To this Mrs. Brookenham adds that Harold is selfish and sickening.⁶

¹Wright, p. 151.

²Krook, pp. 161-162.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Novels and Tales, IX, p. 41.

⁶Ibid.

He is then described physically:

He was small and had a slight stoop which somehow gave him character--character of the insidious sort carried out in the acuteness, difficult to trace to a source, of his smooth fair face, where the lines were all curves and the expression all needles. He had the voice of a man of forty and was dressed--as if markedly not for London with an air of experience that seemed to match it.¹

In this description of Harold, James remains deliberately general and merely suggests evil. He ascribes an "insidious character" to Harold, but fails to support the source of the defect, complaining that it is "difficult to trace the source." Additionally, instead of the note of solemnity or gravity that knowledge brings to Nanda, Harold's knowledge gives him the appearance of age, suggesting that knowledge, a two-edged sword, can corrupt as well as provide a basis for solemn wisdom.

Even though James prefers to leave the source of Harold's insidiousness unstated, Geismar describes the effects of the source as causing Harold to become a liar, grafter, thief, and gigolo, adding that Harold himself attributes all his depravity to his ancestry, to the "selfishness and sublime indifference" of his mother.² Of all the things that can be said of Harold, hypocrite is not one of them, for as the novel approaches its crisis in the scene where everyone is discussing

¹Ibid.

²Maxwell Geismar, Henry James and the Jacobites (Boston: 1963), p. 172.

Aggie, Petherton, and the suggestive novel, Harold interrupts with this commentary:

London, upon my honour, is quite too awful for girls, and any big house in the country is as much worse--with the promiscuities and opportunities and all that--as you know for yourselves.¹

He continues by including the present company:

"Ah my brave old Van," the youth returned, "don't speak as if you had illusions. I know," he pursued to the ladies, "just where some of Van's must have perished, and some of the places I've in mind are just where he has left his tracks. A man must be wedded to sweet superstitions nowadays to have to open his eyes."²

Harold admits to his depraved character, and he clarifies Vanderbank's hypocritical position, for it is he who is so critical of Nanda's knowledge, and yet he is so responsible for contributing to it. Harold is, thus, not only a critic of his mother but also a critic of the individual members of her circle. Harold is a social delinquent and the end result of his mother's educational theory. Nanda has been exposed to the same theory, and has lost her ignorance and innocence as a result, but she has not overtly corrupted herself. Harold, on the other hand, has found the moral freedom. He has been granted an opportunity to indulge his natural propensity for evil.

Aggie, however, is the product of an entirely different educational policy. Aggie is the niece of Mr. Brookenham's cousin, the Duchess. She has been exposed to a continental

¹Novels and Tales, IX, 392.

²Ibid.

education, with all its restrictions and limitations. The Duchess heartily condemns the policy of Mrs. Brook and consequently disapproves of Nanda:

"I think little girls should live with little girls and young femmes du monde so immensely initiated should--well," said the Duchess with a toss of her head, "let them alone."¹

Accordingly, little Aggie is introduced into the tale exuding purity and innocence:

That young lady, in this relation, was certainly a figure to have offered a foundation for the highest hopes. As slight and white, as delicately lovely, as a gathered garden lily, her admirable training appeared to hold her out to them all as with precautionary finger-tips. She presumed, however, so little on any introduction that, shyly and submissively, waiting for the word of direction, she stopped short in the centre of the general friendliness till Mrs. Brookenham fairly became, to meet her, also a shy little girl--put out a timid hand with wonderstruck innocent eyes that hesitated whether a kiss of greeting might be dared.²

The Duchess begs Aggie not to "understand" the talk of the drawing room with all its innuendoes. This is the circle from which the Duchess wants to protect Aggie until the girl is safely married. Yet, like Vanderbank, the Duchess makes her immoral contribution to society. Although the Duchess is opposed to the wealthy Mitchett for Aggie, she thinks he will do quite well for Nanda. As for Lord Petherton, she herself has a questionable relationship with him. Mitchett, however, does marry Aggie and, ten weeks after her marriage, Aggie is again

¹Ibid., IX, 57.

²Ibid., IX, 93.

ushered into the story. This is the same Aggie who was exposed to nothing, who was protected from every suggestion, who was educated finely and delicately. Aggie has come out "with a bound--into the arena."¹ The man she first chooses in the arena is the intimate of both her aunt and her husband; and Aggie is now in a separate room with him, playing hide and seek over a suggestive novel. Each member of the circle wittily contributes to discussing Aggie, but it is Harold who sums up the incident morally:

"Well, she has gone at a pace--if Mitchy doesn't mind," Harold interposed in the tone of tact and taste. "But then don't they always--I mean when they're like Aggie and they once get loose--go at a pace?"²

When Aggie is first introduced, the Duchess solicits the help of Mr. Longdon in censoring her reading matter and then checks the book again.³ The crisis of the novel centers around a small yellow book. Nanda has censored the book for Tishy and does not recommend it. The source of the book, however, is Vanderbank, who had earlier loaned it to Mrs. Brook. The suggestive book seems to be a bond connecting the characters of the circle. Nanda has the knowledge to judge the contents of the book, not innocently, but virtuously. Aggie, who once knew "not the least little tittle of anything,"⁴ reveals her easy

¹Ibid., IX, 386.

²Ibid., IX, 427.

³Ibid., IX, 243.

⁴Ibid., IX, 356.

corruption by her immature handling of the contents. All the "proper" education and protection did not prepare Aggie for experience, nor could they save a human child with natural impulses for corruption. There is no reason for Aggie's immorality, except that she prefers it.

Nanda is exposed to forbidden knowledge, knows evil theoretically and, thus, is corrupted theoretically, but chooses virtuous conduct. Harold is exposed to evil and chooses it as he grows into more and more opportunity. Aggie is protected intellectually and morally from evil and any suggestion of it, but readily accepts it as her way of life once she experiences forbidden knowledge. Man has no choice but to be exposed to evil, which is the result of his original fall; however, he does not have to commit himself to evil as a way of life. If he accepts his fallen nature, with its weaknesses, as Nanda does, he can have some measure of happiness. James has taken Hawthorne's approach to human nature and applied it to a comedy of manners, giving it social sophistication but not changing the moral conclusion proposed by Hawthorne. Man can know himself only from experience, only by being both the head and the heart. Nanda is the only solemn character in the novel, the only character who realizes the necessity of human corruption and thus the only one who can rise above it. Longdon's acceptance of Nanda is a sign of her "purity."¹ Nanda's purity, however,

¹Cargill, p. 272.

must be qualified by her human condition. Longdon's acceptance of Nanda is James's way of saying that forbidden knowledge may corrupt man, but it does not condemn him to a depraved life. Man must accept his nature and grow on its possibilities, rather than reject life for its limitations.

In conclusion, James seems to attack life through the weaknesses of his child characters, but he obviously had respect for the human principle, especially for the inner life of man. He may have learned this respect for the inner life from Hawthorne:

The fine thing in Hawthorne is that he cared for the deeper psychology, and that, in his way, he tried to become familiar with it. This natural, yet fanciful, familiarity with it; this air, on the author's part, of being a confirmed habitué of a region of mysteries and subtleties, constitutes the originality of his tales. And then they have the further merit of seeming, for what they are, to spring up so freely and lightly. The author has all the ease, indeed, of a regular dweller in the moral, psychological realm; he goes to and fro in it, as a man who knows his way. His tread is a light and modest one, but he keeps the key in his pocket.¹

James, too, became a "dweller in the moral, psychological realm," and if subtleties constituted the originality of Hawthorne's talent, they also provided James with the originality of his own tales. Perhaps James' interest in Hawthorne made him conscious of the American heritage, for the interest in the inner life had been spread throughout New England even earlier by Jonathan Edwards.

¹Henry James, Hawthorne (New York: [n.d.]), p. 59.

Since Hawthorne's influence on James's artistry is most evident, it is safe to assume that Hawthorne also influenced James's moral attitude, for James especially noted the moral heritage which Hawthorne expresses so clearly and intensely: "He had ample cognizance of the Puritan conscience; it was his natural heritage; it was reproduced in him; looking into his soul, he found it there."¹ Perhaps James looked into his own soul and found the heritage reproduced once more. Perhaps this was Hawthorne's great appeal for him. Evidently the men had not only an artistic similarity but also a moral affinity. Indeed, James was one of the first American artists who not only understood how Hawthorne used his somewhat thin artistic heritage, but also understood Hawthorne's attitude toward morality:

Hawthorne's way was the best; for he contrived, by an exquisite process, best known to himself, to transmute this heavy moral burden into the very substance of the imagination, to make it evaporate in the light and charming fumes of artistic production.²

If James thought Hawthorne's way was the best, there is little doubt that he tried to apply the best method to those moral convictions he presented in his own productions. Beyond method, he sensed the deepness of Puritan convictions on conscience and the "consciousness of sin" in Hawthorne.³ He sensed this

¹Ibid., p. 54.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 16.

because his own consciousness of evil was also intense, extending to the child character. Although James had an absence of religious conviction toward Puritanism, the influence of the system is present. In James can be found the examination of conscience, moral failure through pride and vanity, and, most importantly, the moral isolation of the individual in this world who sees only evil in others, refusing human relationships with any of mankind.

The investigation of James's fictional children bears out the conclusion that he did not create these children for this world; in the final analysis, they must be "gauged in spiritual or moral terms," for the "only earthly existence available to them is corrupt, demanding a total commitment to a false god."¹ If the children are to find more than a "false god," they must go beyond their earthly existence, for at no time does James present society or its individual members as rising above depravity.

The types of evil James presents in his child characters have to do with intellectuality, or, more correctly, the evil has to do with the distortion of intellectuality. It is this possible distortion that destroys the "wholeness and soundness" of man. James may have learned his interest in man's "normal" deviation from Hawthorne, or he may have learned it, as Hawthorne did, from his heritage. He, however, applied this interest in

¹Masback, p. 184.

man's intellectual and moral distortion to his child characters, and each child capably presents his Adamic inheritance. The presentation of the child character in a superior culture seems to outline more clearly the myth of childhood innocence. Man or child, regardless of his station in life, can be corrupted. Obviously, then, James suggests that man brings with him a propensity for evil and develops this tendency within any environmental frame. In Watch and Ward Roger cannot keep Nora, even by education and culture, from seeking to be her "miserable" self. In "Daisy Miller" affluence seems to hurry Randolph on his way, and in "Master Eustace" the young boy develops his own cruel will, regardless of an overindulgence in tenderness. Morgan Moreen in "The Pupil" permits human love to blind him and, as a consequence, he feels the lash of his false god. In The Turn of the Screw Miles is like Hawthorne's Ilbrahim in that he is too weak morally to face the disaster of evil in this world. Finally, Maisie Farange and Nanda Brookenham, the two children who seemingly succeed, are the ones who come to terms with the nature of worldly existence. Through Maisie's corruption she sees that human love does not bring her security, and Nanda learns that all mankind, including herself, is generally corrupt. This is the fact of life that mankind must accept. This is a solemn wisdom, but it is the tune even the children hear in this life when they "dance under the moon."

CHAPTER V

PROJECTION: THE DEPRAVED CHILD STILL AT LARGE

The primary purpose of this final chapter of the thesis is only to suggest that modern writers still adhere to viewing man from the principle that the human heritage of sin persists even in the child. This chapter in no way attempts an extensive investigation of the writings of the moderns, but merely presents two works of two authors as cases in point. These selections both demonstrate and support the projection of the thesis statement into modern literature. It is hoped, not only that such a projection will confirm the fact that serious and important writers on the contemporary scene view man as depraved, but also that such a projection of the theme into the modern literary world may encourage a further and broader study of the moderns and their use of the concept that man's nature is innately depraved.

Among the first writers from England to influence the American divines' ideas of the nature of man were Baxter and Sibbes. The theme has now come full circle and returns to England with a brief investigation of a text by William Golding, who has been selected because he has been most explicit about

his attitude when writing about the nature of man:

Man is a fallen being. He is gripped by original sin. His nature is sinful and his state perilous. I accept the theology and admit the triteness; but what is trite is true; and a truism can become more than a truism when it is a belief passionately held. I looked round me for some convenient form in which this thesis might be worked out, and found it in the play of children.¹

From observation, then, Golding has taken the view that man's moral nature, including that of children, is anything but innocent.

"The Beast in Us"--William Golding

In The Lord of the Flies William Golding treats the same theme as Ballantyne in his Coral Island (1858), but Golding inverts the nature of the boys presented by Ballantyne.

Ballantyne followed the romantic notion of childhood innocence, but Golding is much more realistic.

Golding's characters are English schoolboys whose plane has been shot down over some uninhabited island. There are no adults surviving from the crash, and the boys feel totally free at first. They elect one of their number, Ralph, as leader, and following his direction agree to building a signal fire to aid in a rescue. They also agree to assemblies that are to be called by anyone blowing on a conch, and to let the boy holding the conch address the assembly. It is agreed that shelters should be built by some, and that others should explore. Piggy,

¹William Golding, The Hot Gates and Other Occasional Pieces (New York /1961/), p. 88.

a fat, asthmatic boy, agrees to help Ralph build the shelter, while Jack Merridew will lead a group of explorers.

Formerly, Jack had been the leader of a group of choirboys. He envies Ralph's elected position of leader, but he is pacified by being permitted to hunt wild pigs. He additionally volunteers the service of his group as lookouts and fire watchers. These latter duties, however, soon bore Jack, and he and his group become solely hunters.

Because the choirboys have let the fire go out, the first ship that approaches the island passes without seeing the boys. Soon the solidarity of the group is broken, and fear and terror are introduced. Ralph sees what is happening, but is unable to rally the hunters, who leave the assembly. Some of the boys choose individually to leave the leadership of Ralph; others are captured by the hunters.

The hunters revert to a tribal society, painting themselves and living in a natural fortress on one end of the island. They hunt the pigs, and on the sharpened end of a stick, they leave the head of a pig as a propitiatory offering to the beast that they feel haunts the island. Jack becomes even more cruel and controls the boys in a totalitarian way.

During a hunting dance, Simon, the mystical boy, is brutally slain when he tries to tell the other boys there is no beast on the island. Later Piggy, while holding the conch, is murdered by Roger. Finally, the boys are aroused sufficiently

to hunt down Ralph. Their intention is to capture and decapitate him, placing his head on the sharpened end of a stick. They set the island on fire to drive him out into the open, but just as they are about to capture him, a cruiser sights the smoke and rescues Ralph.

A discussion of The Lord of the Flies as Calvinistic does not necessarily rest on the author's religious beliefs, on the conduct of the boys, or even on the "pessimistic" conclusion. The significance to Calvinism lies in the question: Does the novel present man as depraved in relation to God and to nature? Further, the text seems to present the Calvinistic view because "man alone introduces evil into the world."¹ Additionally, the text "gives a grim endorsement to the child as father to the man."² By isolating the boys, Golding proves he is not here primarily concerned with "man in relation to society but man in relation to himself and to the universe."³

This concern for man and his relation to God and nature is, of course, of primary interest in the Calvinistic system, but it is first essential to see man's own nature. In revealing

¹Peter Green, "The World of William Golding," Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature, XXXII (1963), 40.

²Ian Gregor and Mark Kinkead-Weekes, "Strange Case of Mr. Golding and His Critics," The Twentieth Century, CLXVII (February, 1960), 117.

³Samuel Hynes, "Novels of a Religious Man," Commonweal, LXXI (March 18, 1960), 673.

man's nature, Golding is not interested in individual eccentricities; he is a modern spokesman on the nature of man, in which the Puritan divines were so interested during the earlier centuries of American history. Golding, like these earlier spokesmen, is interested in human guilt, love, and the horrors that man alone can create for himself. He wants man to know the duties and responsibilities he has in the world, and he, like the Puritans, attaches great significance to man's actions. His attitude, in general, is both religious and humanistic, because his subject is man, but he stresses the same aspects of that subject that were of great interest to the Calvinists. To study the nature of evil is to study both man's nature and his actions.

Although Golding's novel is respected for its complexities and multilevels of meaning, in this chapter the investigation of the text will be limited only to a sufficient number of scenes to establish adequately that Golding's attitude toward man's nature reveals a belief in innate depravity.

Ironically, Golding's first demonstration of man's failure to move far from his primitive nature is introduced by Piggy, the representative of modern science. Piggy's call to Ralph resembles the "witch-like cry" of a wild bird and, like the wild pigs, he backs out of undergrowth, wearing a "greasy windbreaker," probably pigskin.¹ After asking Ralph his name,

¹William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, eds., James R. Baker and Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. (New York, 1954/), p. 5. All subsequent references will be taken from this edition of the novel.

Piggy proceeds immediately to eat. Even Ralph is not excused from the animal relationship, for when the heat gets too intense, he strips off his clothes, including the snake clasp of his belt. These images may be only the externals of animal existence, but do they suggest that internally there are residuals of a primitive nature? It is more than a suggestion, for Ralph immediately derides Piggy about his name and then imitates an airplane machine-gunning Piggy.¹

It is Ralph, however, who first assembles the boys by blowing on the conch, and they arrive half clothed, panting like dogs, or casting shadows resembling black bats.² The boys do not actually regress to the animal level.³ They always have it with them; they are born with it. In a much more artistic way than Mather, Golding is saying that children are "but the wild Asses Colt!"⁴

During the first few days on the island, the boys restrain their impulses, for Jack is unable to stick a pig,⁵ although his first impulse is to kill. Roger throws stones at

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²Ibid., pp. 15-17.

³"Retgression (Lord of the Flies) and progression (The Inheritors) meet and lead to the same fall." Bernard S. Oldsey and Stanley Weintraub, The Art of William Golding (Bloomington, Indiana [1965]), p. 45.

⁴Mather, Family Well Ordered, p. 12.

⁵Golding, Lord of the Flies, p. 27.

little Henry, but there are restraints that keep him from coming too close. In fact, it is felt by Mueller that the novel "delineates" the "unconditioning" of Roger's arm.¹ Later, however, Roger will throw the stone that strikes Piggy, knocking him over the cliff and onto the pink granite.

Violence, or rather the idea of violence, and evil are not introduced onto the island by the older boys. The boy who first suggests something evil is the small child with the birthmark on his face, and it is he who first asks about the "snakething" or "beastie," as he calls it.² The moment evil is mentioned, the breeze grows cold and the boys sense a darkness.³ The parallel to the condition of nature in the Garden of Eden when man commits sin for the first time is quite evident in the description here. Ralph, however, keeps insisting to the younger boys that there is no beast; Jack says they will hunt it.⁴ It is Ralph alone, however, who feels he is facing something "ungraspable."⁵ This same feeling comes to Ralph again after the boys start their first fire with Piggy's glasses and the fire accidentally gets out of control. Ralph again has

¹William R. Mueller, "An Old Story Well Told," Christian Century, LXXX (October 2, 1963), 1203.

²Golding, Lord of the Flies, p. 31.

³Ibid., p. 31.

⁴Ibid., p. 32.

⁵Ibid.

some recognition of the potential evil in man's nature:

Startled, Ralph realized that the boys were falling still and silent, feeling the beginnings of awe at the power set free below them. The knowledge and the awe made him savage.¹

It is Piggy, however, who summarizes the boys' rash behavior for them, for they have acted without reason, bringing death to the small boy with the birthmark and creating their first hell:

A tree exploded in the fire like a bomb. Tall swathes of creepers rose for a moment into view, agonized and went down again. The little boys screamed at them.

"Snakes! Snakes! Look at the snakes!"

In the west, and unheeded, the sun lay only an inch or two above the sea. Their faces were lit redly from beneath. Piggy fell against a rock and clutched it with both hands.²

Following this conflagration, Jack seems to be the boy who reveals not only the most animal-like characteristics, but also the most unpleasant of animal characteristics. He is "down like a sprinter" and seeming "nearly mad," and he breathes with a "hiss" and is a "furtive thing."³ He is not like a pleasant, domestic animal, but is the image of a cruel savage animal. He has some recognition of a possible compulsion when he confesses to Ralph that while hunting: "'You can feel as if you're not hunting but--being hunted, as if something's behind you all the time in the jungle.'"⁴

¹Ibid., p. 39.

²Ibid., p. 41.

³Ibid., p. 44.

⁴Ibid., p. 47.

Simon has no such feelings of animality; he crawls into the underbrush sensing only butterflies, bees, birds, and candlebuds. It is not crawling into the bush that makes the boys savage animals; it is their internal reason for crawling into the bush. Simon builds for the boys, feeds them, and cares for them. Not only is he a Christ figure, but also he is what the Calvinist would term "the visible saint." He is not a denial of man's nature; he is a confirmation of the concept of the elect or of what man should be.

The "littluns" may have started the talk about the beastie,¹ but it is the "biguns" who start overt and deliberate destruction: Roger and Maurice first swamp the sand castles of Henry, Johnny, and Percival.² Maurice recalls being punished for such conduct and hurries away. Roger, however, follows Henry, who enjoys trapping tiny transparencies that live in the sea (as Hawthorne's Pearl did by the shore). "He became absorbed beyond mere happiness as he felt himself exercising control over living things."³ Watching Henry closely, Roger begins throwing stones at him: "Yet there was a space round Henry, perhaps six yards in diameter, into which he dare not

¹"Once the word 'beast' is mentioned, the menace of the irrational becomes overt; name and thing become one." Claire Rosenfield, "Men of a Smaller Growth: A Psychological Analysis of William Golding's Lord of the Flies," Literature and Psychology, XI (Autumn, 1961), 95.

²Lord of the Flies, p. 55.

³Ibid., p. 56.

throw. Here, invisible yet strong, was the taboo of old life. Round the squatting child was the protection of parents and school and policeman and the law. Roger's arm was conditioned by a civilization that knew nothing of him and was in ruins."¹ Roger will lose the condition developed by even a ruined civilization, and in the confrontation between Ralph and the boys as a tribe, he will forget or overcome any and all conditioning:

High overhead, Roger, with a sense of delirious abandonment, leaned all his weight on the lever.

Ralph heard the rock long before he saw it. He was aware of a jolt in the earth that came to him through the soles of his feet, and the breaking sound of stones at the top of the cliff. Then the monstrous red thing bounded across the neck and he flung himself flat while the tribe shrieked.

The rock struck Piggy a glancing blow from chin to knee; the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist.²

Reason and self-control are gone. Tribal society banding together and calling for blood rises to power before Ralph, and he follows man's other instinct of fear and runs. Ralph learns man has only his own nature to fear; nothing wills to destroy him but man. It is evident throughout the entire novel that evil is not hypostatized in any dimension other than human nature.³

¹Ibid., p. 57.

²Ibid., p. 167.

³John Peter, "The Fables of William Golding," Kenyon Review, XIX (Autumn, 1957), 583.

Immediately following this incident where Roger first throws stones, Jack creates a mask of clay for himself:¹

"'For hunting. . . . Like things trying to look like something else--' He twisted in the urgency of telling."² The irony is, of course, that civilization has been the mask, and now Jack no longer looks like something else; he openly becomes what he has always been. However, Ralph is not immune to wearing the mask of civilization, for he, too, enjoys criticizing and humiliating Piggy in the form of teasing:

but there was always a little pleasure to be got out of pulling his leg, even if one did it by accident.³

Ralph has yet to learn that one doesn't "tease" by accident. He, too, has been touched by man's fallen nature, but Golding has made each boy an individual, and each responds to his fallen state in his own way. Simon has also been affected by his fallen nature and, in the most critical moment of his life, he is unable to communicate with his fellow creatures. He, as a fictional character, recalls Ibrahim, Hawthorne's "gentle boy," who is beaten by the "brood of baby fiends," and also James's Morgan Moreen in "The Pupil," who is victimized because no one understands his sensitivity, and he does not understand that others will use him. The bond between all men must be knowledge

¹The clay, of course, is the real substance of man. Jack is not putting on a mask; he is taking one off. By putting on the clay, he reveals what Swift called "primeval savagery and greed which civilization only masks in modern man." Oldsey and Weintraub, p. 17.

²Lord of the Flies, p. 57.

³Ibid., p. 59.

of their common nature. This knowledge does not frighten Simon, but, unfortunately, he does not realize that it will frighten the other boys. His human error, therefore, is in thinking that man will readily accept guilt for the evil that exists in the world.

At the beginning of the novel, when Simon walks with Ralph and Jack, Ralph suggests that Simon walk between them and they can then talk over his head.¹ "This means that every now and then Simon had to do a double shuffle to catch up with the others."² Morally Simon is ages ahead of other boys; physically he cannot keep up and, again, like Ilbrahim and Morgan, he is destroyed by those he loves and wants to help.

Although Ralph does not always understand Simon or Piggy, he does know that he is not sufficient in himself. He needs boys to help with the fire, and he needs help to build shelters. Also, Ralph realizes at times that he needs more than human help. At the moment when the boys have neglected the signal and the first ship passes the island, Ralph, "balanced on a high peak of need, agonized by indecision," cries out, 'Oh God, oh God!'"³ Ralph is looking beyond man's nature for help.

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 62. It is interesting to note that Oldsey and Weintraub (p. 29) say there is no reference to the Deity in the novel. If one reads carefully, he will find three supplications to God by Ralph: one noted above; the second invocation (p. 145) when Ralph says, "'Oh God I want to go home,'" and the third time (p. 175), when he calls on God after the boys have ostracized him and he is alone and without food--"'Oh God I'm hungry.'"

He has the ability to learn from experience, and he will later know fully what man's insufficiencies mean and what man has really lost. There is no indication of such learning potential in the other boys. Even Piggy does not look beyond human rationality for help. The Calvinists might approve of Ralph as one of the elect. He will err and commit sin, but he will also learn to recognize that man must depend on someone greater than himself if he is to rise above the animal state. The animal state to the Calvinist is the condition of the unregenerate, the damned, and Golding pictures this condition in the novel as terrifyingly as any early Calvinist did.

Golding's religion in the novel is based on experience and not on "unquestioning acceptance of revelation."¹ Experience here bears out the Calvinistic concepts. If the growth of savagery does demonstrate the power of original sin, as Cox suggests,² then the story is not a story of regression, but of the power of sin waiting for the propitious moment in man's life:

His mind was crowded with memories; memories of the knowledge that had come to them when they closed in on the struggling pig, knowledge that they had outwitted a living thing, imposed their will upon it, taken away its life like a long satisfying drink.³

¹C. B. Cox, "Lord of the Flies," Critical Quarterly, II (Summer, 1960), 113.

²Ibid.

³Lord of the Flies, p. 64.

It is not such killing that alone destroys man, but the effect of killing on the nature of man. The killing is not merely a physical act; it is an act by which man gains knowledge and power that he takes into himself, like a drink, and which becomes part of his nature, pervading his very substance and satisfying his lower appetites and instincts.

Although Jack may be diagnosed as a disturbed boy, it seems more likely that he merely displays the characteristics of undisciplined or natural man, for he wins too many boys to his way of thinking and too soon for him to be unnatural. In other words, the boys seem to be ready and more than willing to follow Jack's leadership and his thinking. Jack, however, does not symbolize total confusion, but he does represent a more primitive order than Ralph.¹ This interpretation can be applied to Hawthorne's little Pearl. Her tormenting of her mother, her outbursts of temper, and her resemblance to a witch child all represent her as belonging to a more primitive order of being than her parents. Jack, however, exceeds Pearl, for he is also a hypocrite. To gain prestige "for doing the decent thing,"² he apologizes to Ralph for letting the fire go out. He does gain prestige by his apology, but mostly he satisfies the appetites of the boys with meat that "hisses" at them from the fire. They have lost their innocence in the kill, and even

¹Oldsey and Weintraub, p. 22.

²Lord of the Flies, p. 66.

Ralph, Simon, and Piggy satisfy their appetites on the meat. The signal fire is out; home is even more remote, and Ralph, the only hope of the boys, stands with his hands filled with meat.¹

Ralph, however, knows that something is wrong, and at the next assembly his speech is filled with don'ts. The boys do not carry out resolutions, and Ralph knows that something is wrong: "'Things are breaking up. I don't understand why. We began well; we were happy. And then--.'"² Unknowingly Ralph has summarized the human predicament--the Adamic heritage. Throughout the assembly and throughout the assurances that there is no beast, the conclusion is, "'But we don't know, do we? Not certainly, I mean--.'"³ It is Simon, however, who knows: "'What I mean is . . . maybe it's only us.'"⁴ Even Simon, unfortunately, is part of the "beast" he is trying to explain. He is victimized by his own fallen nature, becomes "inarticulate in his effort to express mankind's essential illness."⁵

The book is thus not a portrayal of man's regression to animality or to savagery. It is a portrayal of the predominant and subordinate elements in man's nature. The difficulty for

¹Ibid., p. 67.

²Ibid., p. 75.

³Ibid., p. 81.

⁴Ibid., p. 82.

⁵Ibid.

man is to keep the elements of his nature in proper perspective, a difficulty not only for humanity generally, but also for man individually. Golding demonstrates the necessity of law "because the rules are the only thing we've got!"¹ He also reveals that some men need more rules, some less, but all need external controls of some sort. It is part of each man's responsibility to know his own nature and thus know what rules are necessities for him.

There is a real hypocrisy lying in the fact that the adults of the ruined civilization have made these boys feel that they, the adults, "meet and have tea and discuss."² In reality the adults are engaged in a war, a nuclear war, of total destruction. When Ralph asks for a sign from the adult world, he receives all the adult world can offer--the dead body of an adult--a pilot who died because man cannot have "tea and discuss" the "essential illness" of man. Man still seeks the beast somewhere out there in the dark. Cotton Mather knew where the beast hid, and asked of parents: "I pray what is that Heart which these poor children of yours are born withal? Truly, such an one as you know, that you before them were born withal."³

The pilot, ironically, is the beast in them, for he, too, is man. The sign he brings to Ralph is further irony; he

¹Ibid., p. 84.

²Ibid., p. 87.

³Mather, Course of Sermons on Early Piety, p. 11.

has been killed in a war--he bears within him the same kind of heart that the boys bear. The boys are not regressing to become animals; their cruel natures are merely being stripped of restraint and exposed in isolation. Both Hawthorne and James opposed isolation as a proper state of development of man's humanity. Actually, the pilot is closer to the boys than is the pig, which seeks only survival; the pilot seeks to destroy others of his species. Why? That is difficult to answer, for men hesitate to discuss it, knowing, perhaps, that any discussion may be humiliating in the admission it requires.

Ralph alone has the feeling of the vastness of nature and the smallness of man. In facing the sea, he reflects:

one might dream of rescue; but here, faced by the brute obtuseness of the ocean, the miles of division, one was clamped down, one was helpless, one was condemned, one was--¹

When such reflecting depresses Ralph, it is young Simon who says, "'You'll get back to where you came from.'"² Following Simon's statement, the two boys smile at each other.³ To know mankind's nature and to participate in its frailty does not mean man cannot smile. Ironically, it is a recognition of his sad beginning that gives man the courage to smile. At the moment when these two boys smile at each other, however, Jack bends

¹Lord of the Flies, p. 102.

²Ibid., p. 103.

³Ibid.

down over the steaming pig droppings "as though he loved them."¹ Golding, indeed, knows how to draw a "visible saint," fallen though he may be, and he also knows how to draw man as "unregenerate." At one moment Ralph dreams of home, and at the next moment he flings a spear, wounding a boar, and then chants in the circle of boys that harass Robert:

Ralph too was fighting to get near, to get a handful of that brown vulnerable flesh. The desire to squeeze and hurt was over-mastering.²

After Jack refuses "to play" with the group and organizes his band of hunters, he plans revenge against those who oppose him. His attitude toward the "beast," however, is not to hunt it or oppose it, but to propitiate it by offering up to it a share of the kill.³ Additionally, once the boys join Jack as a band, the vocabulary in the text becomes coarser in describing the boys. Those who were once referred to as boys become hunters; hunters become savages who speak only on command, losing identity and individuality. Even Ralph begins to forget words such as "rescue."⁴ The freedom of the island, the forest, and the sea (natural freedom) enslaves man by identifying him with its nature. These boys are fictional representatives of what the early American Puritans defined as natural man.

¹Ibid., p. 103.

²Ibid., p. 106.

³Ibid., p. 123.

⁴Ibid., p. 131.

The Lord of the Flies knows his natural men, his own, and his explanation to Simon shows that Simon is the only one of the boys who is in the world but not of it. Simon faints when confronted by evil; Miles in "The Turn of the Screw" dies when he is forced to see evil; Morgan Moreen in "The Pupil" dies when evil is thrust upon him; and Ibrahim in "The Gentle Boy," of course, cannot face the evil in his friend. Young Simon "faints because he has received knowledge too overwhelming to endure."¹ Admitting to Simon that he makes things so "'it's no go,'"² the devil advises Simon that "'we shall do you. See? Jack and Roger and Maurice and Robert and Bill and Piggy and Ralph.'"³ They will all take part in the death of Simon. The Lord of the Flies sees and identifies with the beast in man, and expresses it to Simon when it says, "'I'm part of you.'"⁴

Ralph, however, is the only one who will call "doing Simon" by its correct name. He thus assumes the guilt that is his--even Piggy euphemistically calls Simon's death an accident. Ralph names the crime he has taken part in, claims his guilt, feels sorrow, and learns who the beast is and where he resides: "'I'm frightened of us. I want to go home. Oh God, I want to go home.'"⁵ Here then is the true proposition--admission of

¹Bernard F. Dick, William Golding (New York [1967]), p. 28.

²Golding, Lord of the Flies, p. 133.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 145.

what he is, what he has done, and a petition to God for what he needs. This personal conviction of Ralph's is the reason behind Simon's prophecy that Ralph will go home, not because Ralph is innocent but because he recognizes what he is. If there is any hope for man in Golding's novel, it stems from this necessary recognition of man's own nature.

Jack, however, presents the lower appetite of man, the aspect that refuses to recognize anything in its nature but what it chooses. It is man free, as he understands natural freedom. Golding, of course, has a perfect phrase for the attitude Jack assumes over the boys: "irresponsible authority."¹ From his very beginning, man has desired to be his own authority. His pride and lust for power drive him on. As soon as man attains this authority, "irresponsibility" develops with it. Whether it be the authority to carry a sharpened stick or the authority to build a bomb, man rationalizes the destructive power--the irresponsible authority--as defensive. Consequently, Jack puts the boys in a fortress and then puts leverage under the large rock on the neck of the land as a "defense" against intruders that do not exist. Roger, of course, uses the lever and the rock to destroy Piggy. The tribe deteriorates to an attitude of total destruction. They kill, they believe in the existence of an external beast, and they stoop to stealing from one

¹Ibid., p. 147.

another, first fire and then Piggy's glasses. They leave their fortress only to plunder and kill. The boys have completely forgotten the higher things; even Ralph has a curtain that flaps shut in his mind, cutting off thought.¹

The supreme wrong is committed the night the hunters steal Piggy's glasses. In the dark and through fear, Ralph and the twins end up fighting each other while the hunters escape. The incident is a perfect demonstration of the concept that man in his own ignorance and blindness destroys himself. In fact, each successive incident is a further revelation of the nature behind the masks. The murder of Piggy is worse than the killing by negligence of the boy caught in the first fire and worse than the murder of Simon, which was accompanied by confusion and frenzy. The murder of Piggy is a deliberate act, but primarily Roger's act. The intended murder of Ralph will be the general will of the tribe. They have found the communion of their race, blood and destruction.

Recognizing that the consensus of the tribe is his murder, Ralph is pervaded by fear; he, like a hunted pig, must try to outrun them. Ralph's real problem is that he does not see the other boys for what they are. They are savages "whose image[s] refused to blend with that ancient picture of a boy in shorts and shirt."² Ralph must still learn to recognize that

¹Ibid., p. 151.

²Ibid., p. 169.

the images represent the whole nature of man. Only after such recognition can he be rescued. The beginnings of such knowledge are there with Ralph, for he somehow knows "there was that indefinable connection between himself and Jack; who therefore would never let him alone; never."¹ If men are not together in love, then they will be together in hate. Hawthorne understood this principle. The principle fed Roger Chillingworth's personality, and he lived on because Dimmesdale lived. Hate can become man's reason for being.

In their destruction of Simon, the boys eliminate their sense of religion; in their destruction of Piggy, they destroy reason and common sense; but they would annihilate man's will to do good if they could carry out their intention to destroy Ralph. This final act of destruction would give them irresponsible freedom.

Immediately preceding the final conflagration on the island, Ralph remembers that Simon once said, "You'll get back." Ralph does get back because he weeps for the "end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart, and the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy."² The weeping of Ralph does not prove the goodness of man; it proves that Ralph has learned "man's inability to control that depravity within a workable

¹Ibid., p. 170.

²Ibid., pp. 186-187.

social order."¹ The important fact then becomes that Ralph not only weeps for himself, but also that he knows why he is weeping and that he weeps for truth and wisdom, which man constantly attempts to destroy.

Ralph thus is eligible to return "home," but for how long? Jack is still in the background with his sharpened stick, and in the foreground is the cruiser with its guns. The pessimism does not lie in the speculation that the boys will be taken into a bigger war. The pessimism lies in the officer's looking away from the embarrassment to his cruiser. He will never know the nature of man that stands before him weeping, and he will never ask why.

What then is Golding attempting in Lord of the Flies?

His goal, very possibly, is restoration:

He would restore concepts of Belief, Free Will, Individual Responsibility, Sin, Forgiveness (or Atonement, anyway), Vision and Divine Grace. He would restore principles in an unprincipled world; he would restore belief to a world of wilful unbelievers.²

In conclusion, then, the tragic flaw in human nature for Golding is the fall of man, and these children are used in literature to show how fundamental or basic the flaw is--nothing imposed by society. Man aggravates the flaw by failing to recognize or to understand the moral dichotomy in his nature. The conduct of

¹Francis E. Kearns and Luke M. Grande, "An Exchange of Views," Commonweal, LXXVII (February 22, 1963), p. 569.

²Oldsey and Weintraub, p. 34.

the children underscores the concept that there is no time in man's life when the dichotomy does not exist. Golding, therefore, is not being sensational in using children to dramatize his thesis. Perhaps, if man looks deeply into his nature and into his childhood, he will know and will understand the flaw. Golding actually requires more of man than did the Puritans. They believed in a redeemer for the elect, but Golding suggests that man's salvation lies only in his being able to control his destructive instincts. Man must struggle to understand his nature, and this understanding alone must give him the control that is so necessary. Perhaps man must make this much effort within his human predicament before he can cry "Oh God, I want to go home."

"Black, Plucked Little Birds"--Tennessee Williams

The second work suggesting that the Puritan concept of innate depravity is still accepted in modern literature is Tennessee Williams' play Suddenly Last Summer.¹ Like Golding, Williams chooses a jungle setting, children turned cannibal, and imagery stressing man's animalistic appetites. Unlike Golding, however, he does not remove his characters from civilization to show man's nature as depraved. He demonstrates that man's primitive qualities have never been expelled from his

¹Tennessee Williams, The Garden District (London, 1959). Suddenly Last Summer and Something Unspoken were published under this title. All subsequent references to the play will be from this edition.

nature by culture. In fact, there exists in all his characters in the play a primitive-culture polarity. James and Golding both suggest that man's salvation lies only in his recognizing the polarities of human nature. Man must know his nature, regardless of the shock this knowledge creates.

Following is a brief summary of Suddenly Last Summer, which demonstrates so well what Williams holds to be true about the nature of man. The play centers on the fate of Sebastian Venable, who, according to his cousin's report, has been slain in Cabeza de Lobo (Wolf's Head) by a group of boys, whom he has perhaps corrupted. After slaying Sebastian, the boys tore away and ate parts of his body. The slaying was witnessed only by Catherine, Sebastian's cousin, who had accompanied him on this final trip. Catherine traveled with Sebastian because his mother Violet was recuperating from a stroke and could not accompany him as she usually did. Catherine, however, had undergone an emotionally traumatic experience, and Sebastian took her with him in his mother's place, suggesting that the trip would be good for Catherine.

Currently, however, Violet is determined to suppress Catherine's report and has her detained in a mental institution. In addition, Violet has promised a young surgeon a large endowment for a hospital if he will perform a prefrontal lobotomy on Catherine, cutting out of her brain what Violet considers to be a slander of Sebastian and of the whole family.

Under a truth drug administered by the surgeon, Catherine again reveals the shocking details of last summer, including her account of Sebastian's death. The surgeon accredits Catherine's fantastic tale as possible and not the ravings of a sick mind. Violet's recognition of the story as true is demonstrated by her hysteria and her own escape into madness.

A vision of cruelty in the universe may be one of the themes of the play.¹ More importantly, however, is the fact that the characters in the play expose the universal nature of man. Sebastian's last action suggests that he did recognize his nature and the nature of the universe, for Catherine testifies that Sebastian accepted things as they were. Only once does she remember that he "ordered a correction in a human condition," and that occurred when he asked the waiter to make the children stop their noise.² This request is made just before he is slain by the children. In addition to Williams' suggesting a type of predeterminism in man's nature, he also accepts a type of morality, for man has the responsibility to know the makeup of his own nature. Ganz explains that the moral of Williams is a "consistent ethic," but Williams does more than reward the good and punish the evil, for "beneath the skin of the Christlike martyr destroyed by the cruel forces of death and sterility lies

¹J. G. Wrightman, "Out and About: Varieties of Decomposition," The Twentieth Century, CLXIV (November, 1958), p. 462.

²Williams, p. 68.

the disease, the sin that has made his creator destroy him."¹ Ganz also notes that as the Puritans believed rejection of God brought a terrible punishment, Williams believes in punishment for the rejection of life itself--whatever its nature."² Sebastian, then, is punished not for his sin of corrupting the children but for his rejection of them. In his rejection he commits a worse sin because he turns away from his own nature, which is the same as theirs--inherently corrupt.³ It is easily granted that Williams' morality is not one the Mathers would use as a basis for a Sunday sermon, or even for a Thursday sermon, but it does show that Williams accepts the bad in the universe, as well as any good. Williams demonstrates that such an accepting of depravity is the only way man can make his own nature acceptable to its creator. Sebastian becomes a rejector, and for this he must be punished.⁴

The setting of the opening scene foreshadows the action in Cabeza de Lobo. The name tags on the carnivorous plants of Sebastian's jungle garden are fading away, suggesting a possible return to the primitive.⁵ There are flowers in the garden that

¹Arthur Ganz, "The Desperate Morality of the Plays of Tennessee Williams," American Scholar, XXXI (Spring, 1962), 284.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 288.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Williams, p. 29.

resemble human organs, "torn out, still glistening with undried blood. There are harsh cries, and sibilant hissings and thrashing sounds in the garden, as if it were inhabited by beasts, serpents and birds, all of savage nature."¹ Indeed Sebastian's garden is Cabeza de Lobo, and Catherine will repeat her terrifying story against this natural background of primitivism and savagery.

This "well-groomed jungle" is not the only setting of savageness. The Encantadas, the Galapagos Islands, as described by Melville, also enchanted Sebastian: They represent "the world after a last conflagration."² Sebastian returned to the Encantadas to see the sea turtles hatch from their eggs and make "their desperate flight to the sea,"³ with the carnivorous birds of the air swooping down, turning them over, and tearing out their soft undersides. In this wild scene Sebastian saw God.⁴ Whether this scene depicts God is, of course, open to interpretation. The doctor suggests that Sebastian did not see God in the scene, but that he saw "'experience or existence."⁵ Mrs. Venable answers almost as if she were describing the Puritanic God of Wrath: "He meant that God shows a savage face to

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 33.

⁵Ibid., p. 34.

people, and shouts some fierce things at them, it's all we see or hear of Him. Isn't it all we ever really see and hear of Him, now?--Nobody seems to know why."¹

Williams does provide the answer in the doctor's response. Man has turned "experience" or "existence" into a carnivorous act. Man, however, does his devouring in many ways. Mrs. Venable wants to destroy Catherine by means of science; Sebastian used people to serve his physical and social needs; Catherine's family would sacrifice her for an inheritance; therefore, the children who devour Sebastian are only more crude in their technique than are the sophisticates of a cultured society.

The actions of the children may terrify Sebastian, but they do not surprise him, because he has seen nature's cruelty and he knows there is a vengeance in nature and no hope for escape: "only one tenth of one per cent" of the turtles make it to the sea. The elect are indeed small in number.

Sebastian knows that his chances for escape are small or nil. Perhaps this is the reason for his going in the wrong direction, or at least what seems to be the wrong direction to Catherine. Sebastian has seen the turtles' "race for the sea" and knows the predetermined conclusion; therefore, he runs toward his destination, a sacrificial victim who accepts his end,

¹Ibid., pp. 34-35.

knowing full well that he has brought that end into the open because he has tried to reject his own nature.

Catherine, too, has seen a metaphysical wrath work itself out against Sebastian. She must not only accept it, but must get the story accepted by others. The doctor's training gives him an objectivity, a basis for an acceptance of Catherine's story.

All Sebastian's culture could not remove from him the call to depravity, and he capitulates to it when he corrupts the children. In so doing, he has unleashed more than he intended. He has taught them to be older, but he has not realized the latent qualities, the depths within the children. Once they are aroused, they will not cease until they have destroyed their victim. Golding realizes this in depicting his boys in Lord of the Flies, but imposes an artificial control that stops them momentarily. There is no control for Williams' characters. If Catherine is not the next victim, then Violet will be. The doctor is trying to be objective. He does respect Catherine's capacity for telling the truth, and he does believe that such a tale may be possible; thus, he refuses to destroy her only because she reveals the truth about man's nature. The doctor does not commit the unpardonable sin of violating the human personality. In this respect Williams joins hands with Hawthorne and James, who felt that no one had the right clinically to probe, or violate, another's humanity. The doctor, however, has

no other role than to enable Catherine's story to be made credible, and when he fulfills his role, he will necessarily destroy Violet.

The boys at Cabeza de Lobo openly manifest the cruelty that is present in Sebastian, Violet, Catherine, and her family. The boys do not regress to a primitive nature; Sebastian and his attention to them have merely provided an occasion, an opportunity, for them to demonstrate overtly the fullness of man's nature. Neither does Violet regress morally, for Catherine's story of Sebastian's death merely provides her nature with the occasion, or, again, with the opportunity to express a "jungle" cruelty that was always present behind the facade of the "garden" in New Orleans. Tischler sees that Williams makes a twofold predication about man: "Man is the artist and the beast," making an "art out of malignancy and maleficence."¹ Cultured man's nature differs from primitive man's nature only in technique or in the refinement he has in demonstrating his depravity. There is only a superficial difference between a Sebastian and the boys from the public beach of Cabeza de Lobo. In the garden district of New Orleans, Sebastian thinks he controls predatory nature, but he becomes a sacrifice to the cruel god he sees.² After Sebastian's death, Catherine almost

¹Nancy M. Tischler, Tennessee Williams: Rebellious Puritan (New York [1961/]), p. 257.

²Ibid., pp. 259-260.

becomes a sacrifice to the story about the truth of man's nature. She, however, escapes only to make Violet, a soft creature under a hard shell, the victim of the truth. "There is no hope for escape, but the continuing sacrifices lead to an emotional salvation."¹ The Puritan attitude of pessimism toward man's ever being able to lift himself from his own depraved condition is present in Williams' play. One Catherine, one tenth of one per cent, escapes to the sea.

The boys demonstrate no emotion, no hatred towards Sebastian. He has denied his identification with them, and for this he must be punished. In reality he has committed the sin of pride against nature. Sebastian, completely in white, has dressed himself for the role of victim. He and Catherine are between the city and the sea (safety), just as the newly hatched turtles were when they were on the beach racing for the sea. Sebastian knows the danger at the beach and has abandoned it because the children have become greedy and noisy,² suggesting the carnivorous birds that ate the young turtles. At the restaurant the children are held off from Sebastian by a barbed-wire fence. The imagistic connection with the devouring of the turtles by the birds again becomes obvious:

There were naked children along the beach, a band of frightfully thin and dark naked children that looked like a flock of plucked birds, and they would come

¹Ibid., p. 258.

²Williams, p. 66.

darting up to the barbed wire fence as if blown there by the wind. The hot white wind from the seas, all crying out, "Pan, pan, pan?"¹

Catherine adds that the children also make gobbling noises, sticking their own fists into their mouths and then grinning frightfully. The devouring theme is stressed. These children know what they will do; they do not act on impulse. Additionally, the deterministic theme becomes evident in the situation when Catherine says that she and Sebastian were sorry they came but it was too late to leave.²

Indeed, it is far too late, The children begin a death dance by beating on primitive percussion instruments, and Sebastian is "terrified" by the "concert" because he recognizes some of the boys "between childhood and--older."³ Here, as throughout the works that have been examined, childhood gives way to the appearance of age when knowledge is gained. Sebastian recognizes that the children are not innocent but are performing according to their natures. Thus he is terrified, hypnotized as he was when he saw the turtles being devoured by the birds. When Sebastian runs, not toward the sea but up the hill, the children overtake him, and he disappears "in the flock of featherless little black sparrows." Catherine then runs down the hill for help. When she returns, Sebastian has been torn

¹Ibid., p. 67.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 69.

apart, and she reports that the boys had:

"Torn or cut parts of him away with their hands or knives or maybe those jagged tin cans they made music with. They had torn bits of him away and stuffed them into those gobbling fierce little empty black mouths of theirs. There wasn't a sound anymore, there was nothing to see but Sebastian, what was left of him, that looked like a big white-paper-wrapped bunch of red roses had been torn, thrown, crushed--against the blazing wall."¹

Catherine adheres to the truth about man--even if it means her own destruction. Violet denies the truth; therefore, she, like Sebastian, denies human nature. Perhaps Violet will become a victim of the lobotomy that she intended for Catherine.

Tischler's statement about the intentions of Williams seems very appropriate and reasonable:

His [Williams'] Puritanism, in this corrupted form, reappears as he insists on the filth of man's physical nature. He wants no bones that have flesh still clinging to them--he wants them clean and sun-bleached before he touches them.²

The devouring of Sebastian by the children, then, in all its depravity and perversion, is a purgation. Sebastian was not true. He said: "'That gang of kids shouted vile things about me to the waiters.'"³ Perhaps the things the boys shouted were vile, but they were true, true to man's nature. If man does not accept his nature, he becomes a victim of it, entangled in his own fraud. Williams is a Puritan insofar as he sees man's

¹Ibid., pp. 71-72.

²Tischler, p. 260.

³Williams, pp. 70-71.

depravity and man's need to accept his depravity if he is going to control it, but nowhere in the play does Williams suggest a full redemption for man. In his conclusion, he, like Golding, seems to provide no redeemer other than man himself, recognizing the truth of his fallen nature, and he suggests that from this admission man may learn how to prevent his own willful destruction.

CONCLUSION

Literature indeed demonstrates that writers have been conscious of the Calvinistic evaluation of man's nature. This evaluation is part of the American heritage, not necessarily religiously but literarily and culturally. American writers have effectively employed the concept of inherited depravity from colonial to modern times. To the writer it is not important whether man is corrupted or how he is corrupted, for the important task of the authors is to have man know the corruption of humanity because such knowledge of his own nature will enable him to guide and control himself. Among the writers examined in this thesis, there seems to be no suggestion that man would be less a man or would even accomplish less should he admit to a depraved nature. In fact, they suggest the opposite to be true, feeling that such an acknowledgment would be man's first step to salvation, temporal if not eternal. Just as the early Calvinist felt man must convict himself of sin, so American writers suggest that man must give unqualified recognition to the fullness of his nature, which includes evil as much as it includes the possibility of good.

Man, however, withdraws from the admission of depravity as something unnatural. Perhaps his withdrawal is caused by

true ignorance of his being, or perhaps it is caused by his pride. He apparently feels that such an admission declares his defeat. Or, even more importantly, man may reason that such an admission would annihilate the personal freedom for which he has striven since his creation. The Puritans did not reason about man's nature or his condition in this way, for they felt that man could be free only if he knew and accepted the truth about the human predicament. They, therefore, everlastingly probed into man's nature and into the motivations for his conduct, finding only corruption, pollution, and depravity. Now, however, the technique of probing man's personality has gained popularity as a medical science, but it is the analyst who probes the personality of his patient, not to find guilt but to explain away guilt or the pain of truth. The Puritan never denied or turned from his sin or guilt; he accepted his failings as part of his nature, did penance for them, and struggled to obtain everlasting grace. Such was his freedom. He did not want the freedom of animality or of nature and the wilderness--freedom without responsibility. He wanted freedom to worship, to work, and even to play within the fullness of his "limitations." To deny his creator or even to proclaim his death would not have changed the nature of man for the Puritan. Such denial would not have made man godlike for the Puritan, for man could only escape from his own depraved nature by an act of God, and only

through God could he know his responsibilities, his duties, and perform them.

The Puritan felt that every man, unregenerate or elect, was required to perform certain duties. One of man's duties was that of a parent. The Puritan truly felt that the child was "father to the man" and must be guided through life and simultaneously guarded from his own nature. This attitude did not mean that the Puritan parent loved his child less; it means that he loved him spiritually more and strove to provide for the child in the next world as well as in the present world. Not to instruct a child spiritually was to leave him a slave of the devil, a witness against the parent at Judgment. Psychologists have similarly concluded that children must be "safe-guarded by education" to overcome "infantile natures." The emphasis on the origin of evil has shifted, of course, but the recognition of the need for education and for personal control is still emphatically present.

Hawthorne's analytical approach to life and his own psychological probing of man led him to recognize that man is not born in innocence but only in ignorance, and that a major part of man's struggle with life is to determine what kind of creature he truly is. Hawthorne's acceptance of human nature as innately depraved did not lessen his respect for mankind. He not only respected man, but refused to probe into man for forbidden knowledge. Calvin, incidentally, did warn against too

much curiosity or presumption about God's mysteries. There was about man a human dignity and integrity that should not be violated. It was each man's individual responsibility to know his own nature and to control it accordingly. No matter how depraved Hawthorne may have felt man to be, he never treated him as less than human. Thus man does not destroy himself by recognizing his nature for the purpose of "knowing thyself."

Although Hawthorne did not deny his Puritan heritage, he facetiously admitted that he was happy to be removed from it by two hundred years. If he had not been so removed, there is the possibility that he might have identified with the earlier Puritan intellectuals, Edwards, or even the earlier Mathers, who felt that the doctrines of election and reprobation were not an arbitrary judgment passed on man, but thought of the doctrines as an expression of man's true position of lowliness. This expression, then, has two possibilities for man, and his earthly existence from birth to death is poised precariously between two opposing absolutes. Hawthorne felt that regeneration started within the individual, not in science or even in social or institutional humanism. Similarly, the early Puritans held that regeneration came only to the individual from God. Even little Pearl needs a true personal identity before she could enter society. She does not gain the identity from society but through a heritage of sin which was corruption but the inheritance is hers and she accepts it fully. This acceptance

is man's starting position for life, and none should deny it to him. Most of all, man should not deny it to himself.

Hawthorne further demonstrates in his novels that the primary victim for the exercise of human depravity is man. Children, too, victimize their peers as well as adults. Man must know and understand at an early age his potential for evil and strive to direct these intense energies into positive construction, or he will work to destroy even himself. For example, Hester's nature never changes throughout The Scarlet Letter, but she redirects her energies into helping others, and probably would not have been tempted so seriously to run away with Arthur Dimmesdale had there been more of a human response to her weakness from the neighbors of Salem Village. Throughout the years following her first indiscretion, however, there is little learning on the part of Hester's Puritan neighbors. She feels the letter on her own breast responds to human nature, but none will admit that they too feel such a response within their own natures. The Puritans continue to look upon Hester's sinful act as singular and her person as estranged.

Ironic as it is, man needs to recognize that he is bound to humanity by his weakness, by his depraved nature, and he must be brought to the knowledge that, in his recognition of his communion in sin, he gains his freedom. The admission of human depravity appealed to the seventeenth-century Puritan because it called for a creator who could raise man from his

predicament and because it supported the doctrine of the sovereignty of God. It would be difficult to say to what extent the doctrine of human depravity appealed to Hawthorne theologically, but he certainly saw that the admission of guilt made man question, judge, and evaluate his intentions and acts, thus creating necessary restraints on human conduct but not limiting human development. The modern writer, in a pragmatic age, realizes man is a thinking creature, and if he is going to be brought around even to thinking about his pragmatism, he must start by analyzing his own nature, for from this proceeds all moral conduct.

James, like Hawthorne, stresses the nature and the dangers of intellectual evil, rather than the open violence stressed by Golding and Williams. The evil in the writings of Hawthorne and James is more diabolical than open violence, because man brings about human destruction through the misuse of his highest faculty, rationality. By intellectual evil man destroys his own nature, and he violates that of other men for reasons of pride or vanity. Physical violence may be perpetrated in response to instinctual appetites or for self-protection, but intellectual evil is evil for its own sake, an utter delinquency of man's rationality. It is worse than animality, for no animal will destroy his own nature willfully. James recognized Hawthorne's stress on the dangers arising from man's nature and advanced the thesis technically. He cast his characters into

very complicated relationships, relationships arising from a more definitive analysis not only of character but also of situation. James applied to Hawthorne's thesis the advancements of art and of psychology and his own sensitivity.

Within the whole framework, James does not deny the depraved nature of the child, nor does he deny the possibility for evil that the child represents. If man commits any evil in his maturity, it is because the child is the potential man. Since James seldom resorts to physical violence dramatically, it is very possible for him to demonstrate evil in children, for he accepts the axiom that evil is as old as the world and therefore needs no time to mature. His child characters, consequently, can provoke evil as readily as his adults. In fact, an evil child is the most effective support for the thesis of inherited human depravity. James, of course, examines his characters intensely, but at no time does he suggest the "bad" should be subjected to clinical analysis only to find their evil motivations. It is for each man to question his own motives, know his capabilities, know his limitations, and from this body of knowledge will he be able to live life to its fullest, not living in fear of what he does or why he does it. Few of James's characters succeed in life, even the children. Those children who do succeed, however, are "sadder and wiser," expecting nothing, surprised at nothing. Maisie and Nanda will not fear life, but as their sadness has been tempered by

knowledge, so will be their joys. They will reject no part of life, but they obviously will judge it well before participating in it fully--judgment is necessary in the precarious human situation. Since these children understand their own natures and their own motivations, they will not judge others narrowly, but neither will they judge innocently or foolishly.

Carrying on the question of the human predicament, William Golding feels that man must go back into his own nature to discover the error, and thus it becomes necessary for man to escape his immediate environment. Society is not the disease from which man suffers. Man suffers from the intentions and acts of individual men. Evil predominates in man's nature when the restraining arms of law and society are removed. Man must recognize the need for restraint; he is not ready for irresponsible freedom. Golding dramatizes this conclusion when he acknowledges that the world is not ready for Piggy and Simon, and Ralph can only weep for a "wise and good friend." It is a question of whether man is evolving towards a recognition of what is wise and good, or is his position always to recognize these qualities too late? The modern Puritan not only stresses man's weakened intellect but also dramatizes man's overt atrocities to shock mankind into recognition of his real cruelty. Indeed, the modern Puritan has included in his novel and stories a "hell-fire" sermon of total destruction, not necessarily at the hands of an angry God, but at the depraved hands of puny man.

The modern Puritan's pessimism introduces a smaller elect and little or no providential help for man.

Tennessee Williams stresses man's overt violence and demonstrates little external help for man. God shows to man a fierce face because this is all that man knows from his own violence. Man obviously will have to look long and hard at the history of existence before he will find an act of love arising from human nature. Such a search, if successful, might however end with a beneficent creator. It is man's old cry: "If I cannot see it, it is not there." Williams never doubts man's ability for cruelty and perversion, and he grants little or no external rewards. The elect for him are indeed small in number. Suddenly Last Summer is ironically cast in a jungle cultivated as a garden. The setting, of course, symbolizes the primitive emotions of man disguised in a social culture. There is change of place and time, but man's devouring nature remains consistent throughout history. Williams, too, chooses children to support the thesis that man is not being destroyed by society but is the destroying element, a product of his inheritance. Williams stresses that man must objectively convict himself of his weakened, primitive nature. His pessimism, however, goes beyond that of Calvinism, for those who see and recognize the truth, like Catherine Holly, are victimized by the world for their knowledge without any recourse to humanity for help. It is the doctor, the man of scientific training, who supports the

truth. It is only his scientific background that enables him to overcome the "human" impulse to destroy Catherine and gain a hospital to save other Catherines.

Man is punished by a wrathful God; one human sacrifice leads to another each time the truth is discovered, because man refuses to recognize the accusation against his nature that is contained in the truth. Because the truth is recognized by too few, too late, or perhaps because he feels that the world is not yet ready for such truth, Williams does not see man progressing toward humanism. Perhaps recognition of man's innate depravity, represented by man's perpetuating cruelty to man, can only be stopped by another "Great Awakening" in which man must first awaken to man before he can awaken to God. Modern Puritans, however, hold little hope that the "flood gates" will be opened once again for man. The innocence of man at any age is a myth, a myth that has long been recognized as such in literature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Amis, Kingsley. New Maps of Hell. Ballantine Books, New York, 1960.
- Anderson, Quentin. The American Henry James. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1957.
- Barrett, Wendell. Cotton Mather: The Puritan Priest. New York, 1891.
- Beach, Joseph Warren. The Method of Henry James. Philadelphia, 1954.
- Beers, Henry A. Four Americans. New Haven, 1919.
- Bell, Millicent. Hawthorne's View of the Artist. New York, 1962.
- Bender, Loretta, M.D. Aggression, Hostility, and Anxiety in Children. Springfield, Illinois, 1953.
- Bewley, Marius. The Complex Fate: Hawthorne, Henry James and Some Other American Writers. London, 1952.
- _____. The Eccentric Design: Form in the Classic American Novel. New York, 1963.
- Boas, Ralph and Louise. Cotton Mather: Keeper of the Puritan Conscience. New York, 1928.
- Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago, 1961.
- Bowden, Edwin T. The Themes of Henry James. New Haven, 1956.
- Burstein, Frances Brownell. "The Picture of New England Puritanism Presented in the Fiction of Henry James." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of English, Boston University, 1964.

- Calhoun, A. W. A Social History of the American Family. Vol. I: Colonial Period. Cleveland, 1917.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of Christian Religion. Trans. Henry Beveridge. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964.
- Cargill, Oscar. Novels of Henry James. New York, 1961.
- Chase, Richard. The American Novel and Its Tradition. New York, 1957.
- Cherry, Conrad. The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal. New York, 1966.
- Clair, John A. "The Turn of the Screw," The Ironic Dimension in the Fiction of Henry James. Pittsburgh, 1965.
- Cleckley, Henry. The Mask of Sanity. St. Louis, Missouri, 1964.
- Cobb, John B., Jr. Living Options in Protestant Theology: A Survey of Methods. Philadelphia, 1962.
- Crews, Frederic. The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne's Psychological Themes. New York, 1966.
- Crowder, Richard. No Featherbed to Heaven: A Biography of Michael Wigglesworth, 1631-1705. East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.
- Cunliffe, Marcus. "The House of Seven Gables," Hawthorne Centenary Essays. Ed. Roy Harvey Pearce. Columbus, Ohio, [1964/].
- Davidson, Edward H. Jonathan Edwards: The Narrative of a Puritan Mind. Boston, 1966.
- Davies, Sir Alfred Thomas. John Calvin and the Influence of Protestantism on National Life and Character. London, 1946.
- Dean, John W. Memoirs of the Reverend Michael Wigglesworth. Albany, New York, 1871.
- Dick, Bernard F. William Golding. New York, [1967].
- Dillenberger, John, and Claude Welch. Protestant Christianity. New York, 1954.

- Donohue, Agnes McNeill. "'The Fruit of That Forbidden Tree': A Reading of 'The Gentle Boy.'" Casebook on the Hawthorne Question. Ed. Agnes McNeill Donohue. New York, [1963], pp. 157-170.
- Dupee, F. W. Question of Henry James. New York, 1945.
- _____. Henry James. New York, 1951.
- Earle, Alice M. Child Life in Colonial Days. 2nd ed. New York, 1927.
- Edel, Leon. Henry James: The Conquest of London. Philadelphia, 1962.
- Edel, Leon, and D. H. Laurence (eds.). A Bibliography of Henry James. Rev. London, 1961.
- Edwards, Jonathan. The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended; Evidences of Its Truth Produced, and Arguements to the Contrary Answered. Boston, 1758.
- _____. Images or Shadows of Things Divine. Ed. Perry Miller. New Haven, 1948.
- _____. "A Narrative of Surprising Conversions." Selected Works of Jonathan Edwards. Vol. I. London, 1965.
- _____. "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England (1740)." Works of President Edwards. Eds. Jonathan Leavitt and John F. Trow, III, Boston, 1843. A reprint of the Worcester Edition.
- Elwood, Douglas J. The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards. New York, 1960.
- Fick, Leonard J. The Light Beyond: A Study of Hawthorne's Theology. Westminster, Maryland, 1955.
- Fiedelson, Charles, Jr. "The Scarlet Letter," Hawthorne Centenary Essays. Ed. Roy Harvey Pearce. Columbus, Ohio, [1964], pp. 31-77.
- Fleming, Sanford. Children and Puritanism. New Haven, 1933.
- Fogle, Richard. Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark. Norman, Oklahoma, 1952.

- Forster, E. M. "Introduction." The Lord of the Flies. New York, 1962, pp. ix-xii.
- Freud, Anna, and Dorothy Burlingham. War and Children. New York, 1943.
- Galdone, Paul. Pandora's Box: The Paradise of Children. New York, 1967.
- Gale, Robert L. The Caught Image: Figurative Language in the Fiction of Henry James. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1964.
- Geismar, Maxwell. Henry James and the Jacobites. Boston, 1963.
- Gemmill, William Nelson. The Salem Witch Trials: A Chapter of New England History. Chicago, 1924.
- Gerstner, John. Steps to Salvation. Philadelphia, 1960.
- Golding, William. The Hot Gates and Other Occasional Pieces. New York, 1961.
- _____. William Golding's Lord of the Flies: Text, Notes and Criticism. Eds. James R. Baker and Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. New York, 1954.
- Grattan, C. Hartley. The Three Jameses. New York, 1962.
- Greene, Graham. The Lost Childhood and Other Essays. New York, 1952.
- Grotjahn, Martin. Beyond Laughter. New York, 1957.
- Hall, Thomas C. The Religious Background of American Culture. Boston, 1930.
- Hawthorne, Julian. Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife. 2 vols. New York, 1884.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. The American Notebooks. Ed. Randall Stewart. New Haven, 1932.
- _____. The Complete Writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne. 22 vols. Old Manse Edition. New York, /1900/.
- _____. The English Notebooks. Ed. Randall Stewart. New York, 1941.

- Hazard, Lucy. The Frontier in American Literature. New York, 1941.
- Heimart, Alan. Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution. Cambridge, Mass., 1966.
- Hoffman, Charles G. The Short Novels of Henry James. New York, [1957].
- Hoffman, Daniel. Form and Fable in American Fiction. New York, 1965.
- Horton, Rod W., and Herbert W. Edwards. Background of American Literary Thought. New York, 1952.
- Jackson, Esther Merle. The Broken World of Tennessee Williams. Madison, Wisconsin, 1966.
- James, Henry. Ghostly Tales of Henry James. Ed. Leon Edel. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1948.
- _____. Hawthorne. New York, [n.d.]
- _____. Notebooks of Henry James. Eds. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock. New York, 1961.
- _____. Notes and Reviews. Ed. Pierre de Chaignon la Rose. Cambridge, Mass., 1921.
- _____. The Complete Tales of Henry James. 8 vols. Ed. Leon Edel. New York, 1962.
- _____. The Novels and Tales of Henry James. New York Edition. 24 vols. New York, 1907-09.
- _____. The Selected Letters of Henry James. Ed. Leon Edel. New York, 1955.
- _____. Watch and Ward. London, 1960.
- Jefferson, D. W. Henry James. New York, 1961.
- Karl, Frederick R. The Contemporary English Novel. New York, 1962.
- Kaul, A. N. The American Vision. New Haven, [1964].
- Kelley, Cornelia Pulsifer. The Early Development of Henry James. Rev. ed. Urbana, Illinois, 1965.

- Kesselring, Marion L. Hawthorne's Reading, 1828-1850. New York, 1949.
- Krauth, C. P. Infant Salvation in the Calvinistic System. Philadelphia, 1874.
- Krook, Dorothea. The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James. Cambridge, England, 1962.
- Lawrence, D. H. Studies in Classic American Literature. New York, 1923.
- Levin, David. What Happened in Salem? 2nd ed. New York, [1960].
- Levin, Harry. The Power of Blackness: Hawthorne, Poe, Melville. New York, 1958.
- Levy, Alfred J. "Hawthorne's Attitude Toward Depravity and Evil." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of English, University of Wisconsin, 1957.
- Levy, Leo B. Versions of Melodrama. Berkeley, 1957.
- Lewis, R. W. B. The American Adam. Chicago, 1955.
- Liddell, Robert. A Treatise on the Novel. London, 1947.
- Male, Roy R. Hawthorne's Tragic Vision. New York, [1964].
- Martin, Terence. "The Method of Hawthorne's Tales," Hawthorne Centenary Essays. Ed. Roy Harvey Pearce. Columbus, Ohio, [1964], pp. 7-30.
- Masback, Frederic J. "The Child Character in Hawthorne and James." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of English, Syracuse University, 1960.
- Mather, Cotton. Diary of Cotton Mather /1709-1724/. Collections of Massachusetts Historical Society. 7th series, Vol. VIII (1912); Boston, 1912.
- _____. The Wonders of the Invisible World. London, 1693.
- _____. Family Well-Ordered, or an Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in One Another. Boston, 1699.
- _____, et al. "What the Pious Parent Wishes For," The Course of Sermons on Early Piety. Boston, 1721.

- _____. "Cotton Mather's Views on Catechizing 1708." Reprinted in the New England Primer. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York, 1897.
- _____. Magnalia Christi Americana: A Ecclesiastical History of New England. 2 vols. Hartford, 1820.
- _____. Corderius Americanus: A Discourse on the Good Education of Children. Boston, 1828.
- _____. "Memorable Providences." Reprinted in Narratives of The Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706. Ed. George Lincoln Burr, New York, 1914.
- _____. Selections from Cotton Mather. Ed. Kenneth B. Murdock. New York, 1926.
- Matthiessen, F. O. Henry James, The Major Phase. New York, 1944.
- _____. American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. New York, 1964/.
- McCarthy, Harold T. Henry James: The Creative Process. New York, 1958/.
- McNeill, John T. History and Character of Calvinism. New York, 1954.
- Melville, Herman. Review of Mosses from an Old Manse, Nathaniel Hawthorne, in Literary World, August 17 and 24, 1850. Quoted in Romantic Triumph, ed. Tremaine McDonald. Rev. Ed. New York, 1949, p. 512.
- Miller, Perry. Errand into the Wilderness. New York, 1956.
- _____. Jonathan Edwards. New York, 1949.
- Miller, Perry, and Thomas H. Johnson. The Puritans. 2 vols. Rev. Ed. New York, 1963.
- Mills, Barriss. "Attitudes of Some Nineteenth Century American Writers Toward Puritanism." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of English, University of Wisconsin, 1942.
- Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family. Rev. Ed. New York, 1966.

- Murdock, Kenneth B. Literature and Theology in Colonial New England. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1949.
- Murray, Iain. "Appendix II--Prefatory Note." George Whitefield's Journals. London, 1965.
- Nelson, Benjamin. Tennessee Williams: His Life and Work. London, 1961.
- Nelson, William. William Golding's Lord of the Flies: A Source Book. New York, /1963/.
- Nevins, Winfred S. Witchcraft in Salem Village in 1692. Boston, 1892.
- Oldsey, Bernard S., and Stanley Weintraub. The Art of William Golding. Bloomington, Indiana /1965/.
- Parkes, Henry. Jonathan Edwards: The Fiery Puritan. New York, 1930.
- Parrington, Vernon Louis. Main Currents in American Thought. Vol. II: 1800-1860: The Romantic Revolution in America. New York, /1927/.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey (ed.). Hawthorne Centenary Essays. Columbus, Ohio, 1964.
- Persons, Stow. American Minds: A History of Ideas. New York, 1958.
- Poirier, Richard. The Comic Sense of Henry James. "Galaxy." New York, /1967/.
- Poole, William F. Cotton Mather and the Salem Witchcraft. Boston, 1869.
- Putt, S. Gorley. Henry James: A Reader's Guide. Ithaca, New York, 1966.
- Reid, Alfred S. The Yellow Ruff and the Scarlet Letter. Gainesville, Florida, 1955.
- Robbins, Rossell Hope. Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology. New York, 1959.
- Rooy, Sidney H., Th.D. The Theology of Missions in the Puritan Tradition. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1965.

- Schneider, Herbert W. The Puritan Mind. New York, 1930.
- Sharp, Corona, O.S.U. The Confidante in Henry James. Notre Dame, Indiana, 1963.
- Sheen, Fulton J. Philosophy of Religion. New York, 1948.
- Shepard, Thomas. The Sincere Convert. Boston, 1664.
- Spangler, D. R. "Simon." William Golding's Lord of the Flies: Text, Notes and Criticism. Eds. James R. Baker and Arthur R. Ziegler, Jr. New York, 1964, pp. 211-215.
- Spender, Stephen. The Destructive Element: A Study of Modern Writers and Beliefs. London, 1935.
- Spiller, Robert E., et al. Literary History of the United States. New York, 1959.
- Stafford, William T. James's Daisy Miller: The Story, The Play, The Critics. New York, 1963.
- Steele, David N., and Curtis C. Thomas. The Five Points of Calvinism Defined, Defended, Documented. Philadelphia, 1965.
- Stein, William Bysshe. Hawthorne's Faust: A Study of the Devil's Archtype. Gainesville, Florida, 1953.
- Stern, Milton R., and Seymour Gross (eds.). American Literature Survey. Vol. I: Colonial and Federal to 1800. New York, 1962.
- Stevenson, E. The Crooked Corridor: A Study of Henry James. New York, 1949.
- Stewart, Randall. American Literature and Christian Doctrine. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, [1958/.
- Tischler, Nancy M. Tennessee Williams: Rebellious Puritan. New York, 1961.
- Trilling, Lionel. The Experience of Literature. Chicago, [1967/.
- Turnbull, Ralph G. Jonathan Edwards, The Preacher. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1958.

- Turner, Arlin. Nathaniel Hawthorne: An Introduction and Interpretation. New York, 1961.
- Tyler, Moses C. A History of American Literature During the Colonial Period, 1607-1765. New York, 1949.
- Vaid, Krishna Baldev. Technique in the Tales of Henry James. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.
- Van Doren, Carl. The American Novel. New York, 1921.
- Van Doren, Mark. Nathaniel Hawthorne. "American Men of Letters Series"; New York, [1949].
- Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the American Novel. New York, [1952].
- _____. Nathaniel Hawthorne: Man and Writer. New York, 1961.
- Waggoner, Hyatt H. "Art and Belief." Hawthorne Centenary Essays. Ed. Roy Harvey Pearce. Columbus, Ohio, [1964], pp. 167-195.
- _____. Hawthorne: A Critical Study. Cambridge, Mass., 1955.
- Ward, J. A. The Imagination of Disaster: Evil in the Fiction of Henry James. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961.
- Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. Calvin and Augustine. Philadelphia, 1956.
- Warren, Austin. Nathaniel Hawthorne. New York, [1934].
- _____. Rage for Order. Chicago, 1948.
- Wesley, John. Selections from the Writings of John Wesley, M.A. Rev. ed. Comp. Herbert Welch. New York, 1918.
- Wiesenfarth, Joseph. Henry James and the Dramatic Analogy. New York, 1963.
- Wigglesworth, Michael. The Day of Doom. Reprinted in Colonial American Writing. Vol. I. Ed. Roy Harvey Pearce. New York, 1950.
- _____. The Diary of Michael Wigglesworth, 1653-1657. Ed. Edmund S. Morgan. New York, 1965.

- Willen, Gerald (ed.). A Casebook on Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*. New York, 1960.
- Williams, Tennessee. The Garden District: Something Unspoken, Suddenly Last Summer. London, 1959.
- Wilson, Edmund. The Shock of Recognition. New York, 1943.
- Winslow, Ola Elizabeth. Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758: A Biography. New York, 1940.
- Winters, Yvor. Maule's Curse. "New Directions." Norfolk, Conn., 1938.
- _____. In Defense of Reason. Denver, Col., 1947.
- Withain, W. Tasker. The Adolescent in the American Novel: 1920-1960. New York, 1964.
- Wright, Walter F. The Madness of Art: A Study of Henry James. Lincoln, Nebraska, [1962/.

Periodicals

- Abel, Darrell. "Hawthorne's Pearl: Symbol and Character," English Literary History, XVIII (March, 1951), 50-56.
- _____. "Hawthorne's Hester," College English, XIII (March, 1952), 303-309.
- Aswell, E. Duncan. "Reflections of a Governess: Image and Distortion in *The Turn of the Screw*," Nineteenth-Century Fiction, XXIII, No. 1 (June, 1968), 49-64.
- Baker, James R. "Why It's No Go," Arizona Quarterly, XIX (Winter, 1963), 293-305.
- Banta, Martha. "Henry James and 'the Others,'" New England Quarterly, XXXVII (June, 1964), 171-184.
- Beebe, Maurice. "The Fall of the House of Pyncheon," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XI (June, 1956), 1-17.
- Blair, Walter. "Color, Light, and Shadow in Hawthorne's Fiction," New England Quarterly, XV (March, 1942), 74-94.

- Bowen, John. "One Man's Meat: The Idea of Individual Responsibility in Golding's Fiction." Times Literary Supplement, August 7, 1959, p. 146.
- Brebner, Adele. "How to Know Maisie." College English, XVII (February, 1956), 283-285.
- Broes, Arthur J. "Journey Into Moral Darkness: 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux' as Allegory." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIX (September, 1964), 171-184.
- Buell, John. "The Evil Imagery of Tennessee Williams." Thought, XXXVIII (Summer, 1963), 162-189.
- Buitenhuis, Peter. "Henry James on Hawthorne." New England Quarterly, XXXII (June, 1959), 207-225.
- Cargill, Oscar. "The Turn of the Screw and Alice James." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVIII (June, 1963), 238-249.
- Caulfield, Ernest. "Pediatric Aspects of the Salem Witchcraft Tragedy: A Lesson in Mental Health." American Journal of Diseases of Children, LXV (1943), 788-802.
- Connors, Thomas E. "My Kinsman Major Molineux: A Reading." Modern Language Notes, LXXIV (April, 1959), 299-302.
- Cooney, Seamus. "Awkward Ages in The Awkward Age." Modern Language Notes, LXXV (March, 1960), 208-211.
- Coskren, Thomas M., O.P. "Is Golding Calvinistic?" America, CIX (July 6, 1963), 18-20.
- Costello, D. P. "Structure of The Turn of the Screw." Modern Language Notes, LXXV (April, 1960), 312-321.
- Cox, C. B. "Lord of the Flies." Critical Quarterly, II (Summer, 1960), 112-117.
- Ebert, Roger. "Movies Mated with a Method." Chicago Sun-Times, August 18, 1967, p. 56.
- Egan, John M. "Golding's View of Man." America, CVIII (January 26, 1963), 140-141.
- Eisinger, Chester E. "Hawthorne as Champion of the Middle Way." New England Quarterly, XXVII (March, 1954), 27-52.

- _____. "Pearl and the Puritan Heritage." College English, XII (March, 1951), 323-329.
- Evans, Oliver. "James's Air of Evil: The Turn of the Screw." Partisan Review, XVI (February, 1949), 175-187.
- Fagin, N. B. "Another Reading of The Turn of the Screw." Modern Language Notes, LVI (March, 1941), 196-202.
- Fairbanks, Henry G. "Sin, Free Will and 'Pessimism' in Hawthorne." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXI (December, 1956), 975-989.
- Firebaugh, Joseph J. "Inadequacy in Eden: Knowledge and 'The Turn of the Screw.'" Modern Fiction Studies, III (Spring, 1957), 57-63.
- Fogle, R. N. "An Ambiguity of Sin and Sorrow: Hawthorne's the 'Minister's Black Veil.'" New England Quarterly, XXI (September, 1948), 342-349.
- Fox, Hugh. "Henry James and the Antinomian James Household: A Study of Selfhood and Selfishness." Arizona Quarterly, XV (Spring, 1959), 49-55.
- Fussell, E. "Hawthorne, James and 'The Common Doom.'" American Quarterly, X (Winter, 1958), 438-453.
- Gale, Robert L. "Religion [sic] Imagery in Henry James's Fiction." Modern Fiction Studies, III (Winter, 1961), 64-72.
- Ganz, Arthur. "The Desperate Morality of the Plays of Tennessee Williams." American Scholar, XXXI (Spring, 1962), 278-294.
- Garlitz, Barbara. "Pearl: 1850-1955." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXII (September, 1957), 689-699.
- Goddard, H. C. "A Pre-Freudian Reading of The Turn of the Screw." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XII (June, 1957), 1-36.
- Goldsmith, Arnold L. "Henry James's Reconciliation of Free Will and Fatalism." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIII (September, 1958), 109-126.

- Gorgano, J. W. "What Maisie Knew: The Evolution of a 'Moral Sense.'" Nineteenth Century Fiction, XVI (June, 1961), 33-46.
- Green, Peter. "The World of William Golding." Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature, XXXII (1963), 37-59.
- Gregor, Ian, and Mark Kinkaid-Weekes. "Strange Case of Mr. Golding and His Critics." The Twentieth Century, CLXVII (February, 1960), 115-125.
- Gross, Seymour L. "Hawthorne's 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux': History as Moral Adventure." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XII (1957), 97-107.
- Hafley, James. "Malice in Wonderland." Arizona Quarterly, XV (Spring, 1959), 5-12.
- Hartsock, Mildred. "The Exposed Mind: A View of The Awkward Age." Critical Quarterly, IX (Spring, 1967), 49-58.
- Haugh, Robert F. "The Second Secret in The Scarlet Letter." College English, XVII (February, 1956), 269-271.
- Heilman, Robert B. "Freudian Reading of 'The Turn of the Screw'" Modern Language Notes, LXII (November, 1947), 433-445.
- _____. "'The Turn of the Screw' as a Poem." University of Kansas City Review, XIV (Summer, 1948), 277-289.
- Hoffman, Charles G. "Innocence and Evil in James' The Turn of the Screw." University of Kansas City Review, XX (Winter, 1953), 97-105.
- Holmes, Thomas J. "Cotton Mather and His Writings on Witchcraft." Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, XVIII (1925), 30-59.
- Hurley, P. J. "'Suddenly Last Summer' as Morality Play." Modern Drama, VIII (February, 1966), 392-402.
- Hurt, James R. "Suddenly Last Summer: Williams and Melville." Modern Drama, III (1961), 396-400.
- Hyde, Reverend Alvan. "Essay on the State of Infants." Yale University Library, College Pamphlets 2170, No. 16. New York, 1830.

- Hynes, Joseph A. "The Middle Way of Miss Farange: A Study of James' Maisie." English Literary History, XXXII (December, 1965), 528-553.
- Hynes, Samuel. "Novels of a Religious Man." Commonweal, LXXI (March 18, 1960), 673-675.
- Irwin, Joseph J. "The Serpent Coiled Within." Motive, XXIII (May, 1963), 1-5.
- Johnson, W. Stacy. "Sin and Salvation in Hawthorne." The Hibbert Journal, L (October, 1951), 39-47.
- Kearns, Francis E., and Luke M. Grande. "An Exchange of Views." Commonweal, LXXVII (February 22, 1963), 569-571.
- Kermode, Frank. "Coral Island." The Spectator, CCI (August 22, 1958), 257.
- Kern, Alex C. "A Note on Hawthorne's Juveniles." Philological Quarterly, XXXIX (1960), 242-246.
- Kirk, Russell. "The Moral Conservatism of Hawthorne." Contemporary Review, CLXXXII (December, 1952), 361-366.
- Kling, Carlos. "Hawthorne's View of Sin." Personalist, XIII (April, 1932), 119-130.
- Lesser, Simon O. "The Image of the Father: A Reading of 'My Kinsman Major Molineux' and 'I Want to Know Why.'" Partisan Review, XXII (Summer, 1955), 370-390.
- Lydenberg, John. "Governess Turns the Screw." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XII (June, 1957), 37-58.
- Maclure, Miller. "Allegories of Innocence." Dalhousie Review, XL (Summer, 1960), 144-156.
- McCloskey, J. C. "What Maisie Knows: A Study of Childhood and Adolescence." American Literature, XXXVI (January, 1965), 485-513.
- McNamara, Anne Marie. "The Character of Flame: The Function of Pearl in The Scarlet Letter." American Literature, XXVII (January, 1956), 537-553.
- Marks, Barry A. "The Origin of Original Sin in Hawthorne's Fiction." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIV (March, 1960), 359-362.

- Martin, Terence. "James's 'The Pupil': The Art of Seeing Through." Modern Fiction Studies, IV (Winter, 1958, 1959), 335-345.
- Matthiessen, F. O. "Michael Wigglesworth, A Puritan Artist." New England Quarterly, I (October, 1948), 491-504.
- . "Portrait of The Artist." Partisan Review, XI (Winter, 1944), 71-87.
- Maxwell, J. C. "Henry James' 'Poor Wantons': An Unnoticed Version." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIX (December, 1964), 301-302.
- Mills, Barriss. "Hawthorne and Puritanism." New England Quarterly, XXI (March, 1948), 78-102.
- Miller, James E. "Hawthorne and Melville: The Unpardonable Sin." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXX (March, 1955), 91-114.
- Monteiro, George. "Hawthorne, James and the Destructive Self." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, XIV (Spring, 1962), 58-71.
- Mueller, William R. "An Old Story Well Told." Christian Century, LXXX (October 2, 1963), 1203-1206.
- Neimeyer, Carl. "The Coral Island Revisited." College English, XXII (January, 1961), 241-245.
- Nordell, Phillip Gregory. "Jonathan Edwards and Hell Fire." Forum, LXXV (June, 1926), 860-869.
- Ohmann, C. "Daisy Miller: A Study of Changing Intentions." American Literature, XXXVI (March, 1964), 1-11.
- Oldsey, Bernard, and Stanley Weintraub. "Lord of the Flies: Beelzebub Revisited." College English, XXV (November, 1963), 90-99.
- Orians, G. Harrison. "New England Witchcraft in Fiction." American Literature, II (March, 1930), 54-71.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. "Hawthorne and the Sense of the Past, or the Immortality of Major Molineux." English Literary History, XXI (December, 1954), 327-349.

- Peter, John. "Fables of William Golding." Kenyon Review, XIX (Autumn, 1957), 577-592.
- Reed, Glenn A. "Another Turn on James's 'Turn of the Screw.'" American Literature, XX (January, 1949), 413-423.
- Reilly, Robert J. "Henry James and the Morality of Fiction." American Literature, XXXIX (March, 1967), 1-30.
- Roellinger, F. X., Jr. "Psychical Research and The Turn of the Screw." American Literature, XX (January, 1949), 401-432.
- Rogers, Robert. "The Beast in Henry James." American Literature, XIII (Winter, 1956), 427-454.
- Rosenfield, Claire. "Men of a Smaller Growth: a Psychological Analysis of William Golding's Lord of the Flies." Literature and Psychology, XI (Autumn, 1961), 93-101.
- Rozenzweig, Saul. "The Ghost of Henry James: A Study in Thematic Apperception." Partisan Review, XI (Fall, 1944), 435-455.
- Schlesinger, Elizabeth Bancroft. "Cotton Mather and His Children." William and Mary Quarterly, X (1953), 181-189.
- Snow, Lotus. "Some Stray Fragrance of an Ideal: Henry James's Imagery for Youth's Discovery of Evil." Harvard Library Bulletin, XIV (Winter, 1960), 107-125.
- Spilka, Mark. "Turning the Freudian Screw: How Not to Do It." Literature and Psychology, XIII (Summer, 1963), 105-111.
- Steinke, Russell. "The Scarlet Letter of Puritanism." University of Kansas City Review, XXXI (June, 1965), 289-291.
- Stern, James. "English Schoolboys in the Jungle." New York Times Book Review, October 23, 1955, 38.
- Stewart, Randall. "Hawthorne and Faulkner." College English, XVII (February, 1956), 258-262.
- Szeliski, John. "Tennessee Williams and the Tragedy of Sensitivity." Western Humanities Review, XX (Summer, 1966), 203, 211.

- Tanner, Tony. "The Literary Children of James and Clemens." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XVI (1961), 205-218.
- Taylor, H. H. "Case Against William Golding's Simon and Piggy." Contemporary Review, CCIX (September, 1966), 155-160.
- Thorslev, Peter L., Jr. "Hawthorne's Determinism: An Analysis." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIX (September, 1964), 141-157.
- Trachtenberg, Stanley. "The Return of the Screw." Modern Fiction Studies, XI (Summer, 1965), 180-183.
- Turner, Arlin. "Nathaniel Hawthorne in America Studies." College English, XXVI (November, 1964), 133-139.
- Van Abele, Rudolph. "Baby and Butterfly." Kenyon Review, XV (1953), 280-292.
- Volpe, Edmund L. "James' Theory of Sex in Fiction." Nineteenth Century Fiction, XIII (June, 1958), 36-47.
- Waggoner, Hyatt. "Hawthorne: A New Evaluation." American Literature, XXVIII (1956), 526-530.
- Wain, John. "Lord of the Agonies." Aspect, No. 3 (April, 1963), 56-67.
- Wasserstrom, William, and Claire Rosenfield. "An Exchange of Opinion Concerning William Golding's Lord of the Flies." Literature and Psychology, XII (Winter, 1962), 2-3, 11-12.
- Wilson, Harris W. "What Did Maisie Know?" College English, XVII (February, 1956), 279-281.
- Wolff, R. L. "The Genesis of 'The Turn of the Screw.'" American Literature, XIII (March, 1941), 1-8.
- Wrightman, J. G. "Out and About: Varieties of Decomposition." The Twentieth Century, CLXIV (November, 1958), 461-463.

APPENDIX

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CALVINISM
IN AMERICA

It has been observed rather frequently and with considerable warrant that God's special providence is clearly evident in the timing of the discovery of America. America was discovered just twenty-five years before Martin Luther inaugurated the Protestant Reformation. That religious upheaval which split the Roman Catholic establishment wide open and gave birth to the Protestant churches was to mean rigorous religious persecution. Exile or death was the dismal alternative for many thousands of Protestants. At this crucial juncture God opened up America as an asylum for the persecuted. Untold numbers saw clearly the hand of destiny and with economic, social, and political factors playing a not insignificant role, the new land was colonized. In these waves of emigration Calvinism was conveyed to America.

The Planting of Calvinism

There were five main emigrating streams that deposited Calvinism on this continent. The first in order of time and importance was the Pilgrim and Puritan which deposited its

¹From The Rise and Development of Calvinism, ed. John H. Bratt. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964. Reproduced here by permission of William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

members in New England. The Pilgrims (Separatists or radical Puritans) under the leadership of John Robinson, a sturdy Calvinist who bested the Dutch Arminian Episcopius in debate during the Puritans' ten year stay in Holland, although appreciative of the refuge given them in the Low Countries, feared the loss of their distinctiveness. And when they experienced some economic difficulties and a renewal of the war between Holland and Spain loomed as a possibility, they decided to emigrate to America. They received a grant of land in Northern Virginia from the Virginia Company but contrary winds landed them on the bleak shores of New England in 1620. To circumvent the threat of anarchy and rebellion, since they possessed neither charter nor legal grant of land, they drew up on shipboard the Mayflower Compact, which was to serve as the basis of their government for many years. Elder William Brewster served as their first spiritual leader and William Bradford was the first governor of note. Growth was slow at first and hardships were many, but by 1643 the Plymouth colony boasted of ten towns and a population of twenty-five hundred. As Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation and the extant sermons of that day indicate, doctrinally they were solidly Calvinistic.¹ As to church polity they were Congregational.

¹There are scholars who demur, it is true, but "if the beliefs of the Puritans (and Pilgrims) have not as a background such a genuinely Calvinistic theology as is commonly assumed without investigation, their theological conceptions are dominated by elements which, in spirit, must be described as

That was inevitable since individual churches had severed themselves from the parent body in England and had resolved to go their own ways. Increase Mather wrote about them in 1677:

"There never was such a generation that did so perfectly shake off the dust of Babylon, both as to civil and ecclesiastical constitution, as the first generation of Christians that came to this land for the gospel's sake."

The Puritans who left England eight years later, to the great relief of Charles I, were given a grant of land in New England, and under the leadership of John Endicott, who became the first governor, they settled in Salem in 1628. That colony, having a greater measure of royal favor and being less rigorous in its views, grew much more rapidly than its sister colony. By 1640 it numbered 20,000 colonists, most of them having come from the Cambridge area in England. They too were Calvinistic as to doctrine, and circumstances led them to the Congregational form of church government.

These Salem colonists had congenial contacts with the people in Plymouth. The help given by Dr. Samuel Fuller of the Plymouth colony to the Salem colony, when the latter was stricken by a severe epidemic, served to remove some of the prejudices that were harbored in Salem against Plymouth. Then when the

typical of Calvinism, even if their genetic connection with the theology of Calvin is weak." G. Hammar, Christian Realism in Contemporary American Theology, p. 81.

need for a pastor and teacher in the Massachusetts Bay colony was urgent, on July 20, 1629, Francis Higginson and Samuel Skelton were questioned by the congregation (which had organized itself by covenant that spring), were approved by popular vote, and were ordained by imposition of hands of three or four elderly members of the church. Thus Congregationalism was born in the Bay Colony.¹ Other settlements followed suit and Congregationalism became accepted practice. When news of this action filtered back into England, there was considerable criticism, whereupon John Cotton of Boston, Richard Mather of Dorchester, John Davenport of New Haven, and Thomas Hooker of Connecticut collaborated in a defense of Congregationalism, published in 1646 and called the Cambridge Platform.² The Synod which

¹Perry Miller insists, however, that it was due not to conspiring circumstances but to deliberate, venerable intention. "There is copious evidence," says he, "that though the leaders were careful not to advertise the fact, they were fully committed to putting into practice, the moment they set foot on shore, the Congregational rather than the Presbyterial order They had learned from a succession of English theologians (the greatest being William Ames) how to read the New Testament in a Congregational manner The New England Way, as it came to be called, was a fully developed blueprint in England which the Great Migration simply translated into an actual church." The American Puritans, p. 21.

²Near the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth, when liberalism began its invasion, Increase and Cotton Mather suggested the expedient of ministerial associations and conventions (somewhat resembling classes or presbyteries) in order to check it by scrupulous examination of candidates for the ministry. This plan was accepted in Connecticut (the Saybrook Platform of 1708), which veered towards Persbyterianism, but rejected in Massachusetts. In 1710 John Wise made another spirited defense of Congregationalism based on a philosophy of democracy.

convened in Cambridge in 1648 made this pronouncement as to doctrine and polity: "We do judge it [the Westminster Confession]⁷ to be very holy, judicious and orthodox in all matters of faith and we do freely and fully consent thereunto for the substance thereof. Only in those things which have respect unto church government and church discipline we refer ourselves to that platform agreed upon by the present assembly."¹

In 1691 the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies were united. Congregationalism grew apace and by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War there were eight hundred Calvinistic Congregational churches in New England. As Gerstner observes, "New England, from the founding of Plymouth in 1620, to the end of the 18th century, was predominantly Calvinistic."²

The second emigrating stream bearing Calvinism to America was the Dutch Reformed (Reformed Church of America), which was responsible for the settlement of New York.

New Netherlands, later called New York, was established as a fur-trading colony in 1623 by the Dutch West Indies Company when thirty families were located in Ft. Nassau (Camden, N.J.) and Ft. Orange (Albany, N.Y.). In 1625 the population numbered two hundred.³ In 1626 Peter Minuit, the first governor, bought

¹William Hill, American Presbyterianism, p. 22.

²In American Calvinism, p. 16.

³This colony never grew to large proportions because commercial interests remained very strong and because the population of Holland had been depleted by the war with Spain.

Manhattan Island from the Indians at an incredible bargain.

In New Netherlands a dual religious arrangement, bound to be somewhat unsatisfactory, obtained whereby the minister, schoolmaster and sick visitors were appointed by Classis Amsterdam and received their salaries from the Dutch West Indies Company. In 1628 Jonas Michaelius, the first minister, arrived, celebrated communion and began to hold religious services. Thus the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, with its Presbyterian form of church government (which is Calvinistic in origin), was instituted. Michaelius was succeeded by E. Bogardus, who found himself in constant conflict with the corrupt and incompetent governors Van Twiller (1633-1638) and Kieft (1638-1647). Under Bogardus's leadership, a church edifice was erected, some of the money being pledged at a wedding reception where the wine flowed freely and the lightheaded pledged heavily.

Another factor impeding the free religious development of this colony was the "patroon system" initiated by the Dutch West Indies Company. Under this system anyone who brought over fifty families of emigrants within four years was given a landed estate and titled a "patroon." The latter was obligated to provide one minister for the estate. Included among these landed-estate ministers was Megapolensis, who also worked among the Mohawks and holds the distinction of being the first Protestant missionary to the American Indians.¹

¹He saved the life of the Jesuit missionary, Father Jogues, who was captured by the Mohawks and about to be

Under Peter Stuyvesant, the last Dutch governor before the transition, trade flourished, population increased, and the "liberty of conscience" which obtained in the homeland (Holland was an asylum for the persecuted) was gradually introduced. That freedom of religion was continued when in 1644 the English forcibly wrested the colony from the Dutch and renamed it New York. A considerable number of persecuted French Huguenots and German Reformed from the Palatinate swelled the ranks, but Governor Dongan reported in 1687 that "the most prevailing opinion is that of the Dutch Calvinists."¹ By 1700 there were some twelve hundred Dutch Calvinist families in New York and by 1750 the number had grown to seventeen hundred. Religiously the colony proved to be quite static until it was enlivened by Frelinghuyzen and the Great Awakening.

The third stream, less considerable numerically but not in influence, was the French Huguenot, which deposited its representatives in the Middle and Southern Colonies.

Despite repressive measures, by the royalty for the most part and by many of the nobility, Protestantism had a fairly strong start in France. By the middle of the sixteenth century there was a large number of churches, served in the main by

tomahawked. Jogues wrote about the colony, "No religion is publicly exercised but the Calvinist and orders are to admit none but Calvinists." W. W. Sweet, The Story of Religions in America, p. 128.

¹Sweet, op. cit., p. 135.

pastors trained in Geneva and consequently imbued with the doctrinal and church political views of Calvin. The first synod, comprising about fifty churches, met in Paris in 1559. It adopted a form of discipline, a confession of faith, and a modified Presbyterian form of church government. About this time the Protestants in France came to be called Huguenots¹ and the movement took on a political as well as a religious character. A series of struggles between Protestants and Roman Catholics followed, and these culminated in the savage massacre of seventy thousand Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's day in 1572. When Henry of Navarre took the throne in 1594 the country was weary of war. Under the influence of the Politiques, a patriotic group, who favored toleration of religion in the interests of peace, Henry issued the Edict of Nantes on April 13, 1598. That edict permitted freedom of religion in some two hundred towns and in the castles of about three thousand nobles, and pledged immunity from interference in the church assemblies. In this period of toleration the Huguenots grew markedly in numbers and developed their educational institutions. After the assassination of Henry in 1610, however, a gradually increasing number of repressive measures was adopted. Church services were interrupted, synodical assemblies were prohibited, and when the irreligious Louis XIV ascended the throne in 1659 the last

¹The derivation of the term is uncertain. The most plausible conjecture is the Swiss Eidgenossen, or confederates.

remaining vestiges of toleration were removed. He attempted the forcible "conversion" of the Huguenots to Roman Catholicism, and on the pretense that no Protestants remained in the land revoked in 1685 the Edict of Nantes. Despite prohibition of emigration and stationing of guards on the frontiers, some five hundred thousand of the best citizens of France emigrated to Prussia, England, Germany, and America.

Some of them settled in New York, when toleration was established there, and at first they were served by Dutch pastors who knew the French language. Others settled in Virginia and the Carolinas. They did not unite in a French Reformed Church but became members of the Dutch and German Reformed churches in the north and the Presbyterian churches in the south.

The fourth emigrating Calvinistic stream was the German Reformed, members of which settled for the most part in the Middle Colonies.

Germany, especially its Palatinate, was to serve as a haven of refuge for the persecuted Protestants of France. When news of the savage butchery of St. Bartholomew's Day reached him, Elector Frederick III sent a military force to assist the harried Huguenots and invite them to his domain. Many thousands accepted his offer. So, too, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Twelve days after that fateful decision the Elector of Brandenburg issued the Edict of Potsdam and extended the exiles

a welcome. Other electors followed suit and streams of refugees entered Germany.

For many of them, however, it proved to be only a temporary home. In the last part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth there was a substantial dislocation of German population. In the period 1690-1777 over two hundred thousand emigrated to America. One impelling reason was the frequent changes of religions in the Palatinate after the Peace of Westphalia. This treaty afforded toleration to the Roman Catholic, Reformed, and Lutheran faiths, and permitted the prince of the territory to determine which one should be compulsory in his province. Under the territorial system dissidents had no alternative but to conform or leave. A second impelling reason for emigration was the invasion of the Palatinate in 1674, 1680, and 1688 by Louis XIV. Louis had spent a huge sum of money in an attempt to bribe the electors to choose him emperor of Germany, and when he failed he laid waste the land. A third reason was a devastating crop failure in 1708-1709 accompanied by such bitter cold that "the birds froze in the air and wild beasts in the forest."¹

Unsuccessful attempts at settlement were made in Mississippi and in North Carolina. An epidemic of yellow fever in the former and an attack by the Indians in the latter

¹Quoted by Dubbs, German Reformed Church, American Church History Series, VIII, p. 238.

liquidated the incipient colonies. Permanent settlements were made in New York, and especially in Pennsylvania when William Penn invited them to make that state their home. The first congregation was organized at Germantown in 1719, and there was urgent need for pastoral aid. In 1725 they asked John Philip Boehm, a capable young schoolteacher, to serve as their minister. In preaching and administering the sacraments he rendered competent and invaluable service. When an ordained minister arrived, George M. Weiss by name, the irregularity was pointedly obvious and advice in the matter was asked of the Dutch ministers in New York. They referred the matter to Classis Amsterdam, who gave the wise advice that Boehm be ordained at once and that all of his past ministerial acts be judged "lawful" in view of the exceptional circumstances. He was ordained in 1729, and the intimate relations between the German Reformed and Classis Amsterdam continued until the German Reformed Church became independent in 1792. Scattered German Reformed churches were organized in Virginia and the Carolinas. In 1746 an excellent administrator, Michael Schlatter, took over the leadership. He established churches and schools, imported ministers, and arranged for the first synod, which met in Philadelphia in 1747. By 1794 the denomination had 178 churches and some 40,000 members. A century later it had increased its strength eightfold.

The fifth significant Calvinistic stream was the Scotch-Irish, whose strength was eventually concentrated in the Middle and Southern colonies.

The Scottish Reformation, which had its political overtones in that the Roman Catholics favored alliance with France while the Protestants desired political affiliation with England, was quite solidly established by 1557 when the Scottish nobles sympathetic to Protestantism formed the "Lords of the Congregation" and when in 1559 John Knox, the fearless and capable reformer, returned to give aggressive leadership. The Reformation spread into northeastern Ireland, notably the four counties of Ulster, when English and Scottish settlements were planted there by English rulers in an effort to extend their control over the island. These transplanted Calvinists proved to be excellent colonists and achieved a considerable measure of prosperity.

Despite their prosperous beginnings, they were not destined to remain there permanently. The English government began to levy economic restrictions in the form of Navigation Acts which curtailed their exports, and when, in addition, they were forced to pay tithes to the Irish Anglican Church, even though it was in the minority, they decided to leave for more congenial lands. By 1750, over one hundred thousand of them had emigrated to America.

The earliest Scotch-Irish immigrants, sensing their affinity to New England Calvinism, entered through the port of Boston and made initial settlements in the New England states. It was soon evident, however, that the differences between them were not inconsiderable and after mounting tensions and after a series of disagreeable episodes the main body of the Scotch-Irish went southward into the Middle and Southern colonies, influencing the other establishments with their uniform and solid Presbyterianism.

The "Father of Presbyterianism" in America was Francis Makemie, consecrated Ulsterman who itinerated in Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas in 1683. Despite active opposition by the Anglicans, who had virtually a state church in those states, he established churches, secured additional ministerial help from London, and by 1706 organized the first presbytery in Philadelphia, with six ministers in attendance. In 1716 the number of presbyteries had increased to four, the number of ministers to seventeen, most of whom came from Scotland, Ireland and New England, and the first synod was held. Although there was urgent need for more pastors, and the pressures were great for hasty ordination, the Presbyterians clung doggedly to their ideal of an educated ministry. In 1726 William Tennent, former priest in the Established Church of Ireland, inaugurated for the training of ministers Log College, the progenitor of Princeton. At the outbreak of the American Revolution the Presbyterian churches numbered five hundred.

As a consequence of this extensive immigration and internal growth it is estimated that of the total population of three million in this country in 1776 two-thirds of them were at least nominally Calvinistic. The judgment is warranted that "originally Calvinism dominated the American theological scene."¹

Disintegration and Decay

Winfield Burggraaf, writing in 1928, asserted, "The first theology in American bore the unmistakable stamp of the person and teaching of John Calvin. The absolute sovereignty of God in all of human affairs was not only maintained theoretically . . . but was in reality the cornerstone upon which colonial statecraft as well as domestic life was based and upon which the stately structure of Puritan life was erected." But "today, three centuries later, the prevailing theology is far from Calvinistic."²

The seeds of decay were present very early. There were nonconformists and dissenters from the beginning. Within the first decade in New England two Anglicans as well as some Quakers, who placed the "inner light" above the Bible, were

¹C. Bouma, Calvinism in Times of Crisis, p. 77. At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the largest denominations were, in order: Congregationalists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Baptists, Lutherans, German Reformed and Dutch Reformed. Roman Catholicism was tenth and Methodism twelfth in size.

²Burggraaf, W., The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America, p. 1.

expelled from the colony. There was Ann Hutchinson, the antinomian, who confused the Biblical covenants, and denied the Calvinistic teachings of sanctification as an evidence of justification. She settled with her followers in Rhode Island. There was Roger Williams, who repudiated the covenant doctrine by his denial of the validity of infant baptism. He also found refuge in Rhode Island. There was William Pynchon, who wrote in 1650 The Meritorious Price of Our Redemption in which he rejected substitutionary atonement. There was the Half-way Covenant or Stoddardism, in which the covenant was violated in that children of non-confessing members were admitted to baptism, and the Lord's Supper was transformed into a converting ordinance. All of those facts were harbingers of defection and dissent that was to come.

It is worthy of note that the first defection reared its head in New England. And it did so for good reason. While the Dutch colony in New Amsterdam, for example, had its authoritative creed, in New England there was suspicion of humanly constructed creeds.¹ Moreover, New England had a greater number of original, creative theologians; it had closer contact with the liberal stream of thought of Europe²; and it had autonomy

¹John Robinson, the first important leader of the Pilgrims, who remained in Holland but whose views were deeply engraven upon the Pilgrim colony, asserted that he wanted no creeds; all he was interested in was the Word of God.

²Ibid., p. 7.

of the local congregation, so that heresy could run an unimpeded course. But defection soon spread to the other colonies or arose within the other communions. The Plan of Union of 1801, for instance, in which Congregationalists and Presbyterians joined forces in supplying the spiritual needs of the frontier served to infect the latter body with the heresies present in the former.

The liberal theology that was eventually to engulf America assumed various forms, but all of them had the same basic root--the humanism of the Renaissance,¹ which was in turn a revival of the anthropocentrism of pagan antiquity. Humanism, as the term implies, is essentially man-centered and is thus the sworn enemy of theocentric Calvinism. On the American scene it takes the form of Arminianism, Universalism, Classic Modernism, and Christian Realism.

Arminianism, which allows a measure of human contribution in the transaction of redemption and denies the five fundamental Calvinistic doctrines, spread to England through

¹Burggraaf contends that the following elements in Erasmus's teachings are perceptible throughout liberal theology: "(a) permits religious tolerance within the same church group; (b) makes religion to consist of ethics: cultural training rather than regeneration, not grace but the bonae literae; (c) Christ is the teacher, the 'heavenly doctor'; (d) the heart of Christianity is to be found in the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer; (e) the God of the Jews is not the God of the Christians; (f) man has free will, for the command to do involves ability to do . . .; (g) intense aversion to dogma." Ibid., pp. 42-43.

such agents as Hugo Grotius, jurist from Holland who lectured there; students and writers (e.g., John Locke) who spent some time in the Netherlands and on the continent; and through the spread of Arminian writings (the Cambridge Platonists, for instance, steeped themselves in the works of Episcopius). It had precipitated a crisis in Holland which led to the Synod of Dort (1618-1619). The Arminians were exiled, and thus their teachings were disseminated. By 1700 Arminianism had gathered many adherents in America and was spreading at an alarming rate. The Reforming Synod held in 1679 in New England when calamities were multitudinous was designed to counteract it, as was the Adopting Act of 1729 by which all ministers and licentiates in the Presbyterian church were forced to subscribe to the Westminster Confession and promise to uphold it. Jonathan Edwards, Sr. (1703-1758) put forth a valiant effort to stem that tide, preaching a series of sermons on justification by faith in 1743 to check Arminianism. That series touched off the Great Awakening, the first great revival in America. By his herculean efforts "the elimination of Calvinism as a determining factor in New England, which seemed to be immanent as he wrote, was postponed for a hundred years."¹

¹J. Hastings, ed., Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. V., p. 226. Estimates vary as to the strict Calvinism of Jonathan Edwards, Sr. Shelton Smith, Borden, P. Y. De Jong, et al., contend that he taught imputation, but Warfield, Gerstner, et al., disagree. Burggraaf says that he subjectified the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, but Gerstner interprets

Calvinism fared ill, however, with the successors of the senior Edwards. The younger Edwards (1745-1801) broke with Calvinism on the atonement when he accepted the governmental view of Grotius, in which the emphasis is shifted from God as sovereign to God as moral governor of the universe and when, in distinction from his father, who taught "moral inability and natural inability," he taught, as did Joseph Bellamy (1719-1790), "moral inability but natural ability." Nathaniel Taylor (1781-1858), taught that God was limited, grace was resistible, and sin consisted only in voluntary acts, and Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803), with others, taught general atonement. The breakdown of New England theology meant the breakdown of Calvinism.

The major revivals after the Great Awakening were designed to reclaim the thousands who had pushed across the frontier in the westward trek and had failed to keep their church membership vital. This negligence, along with the floods of infidelity that reached America after the Revolutionary War, made America a fertile mission field. The denominations most active in frontier evangelism were the Methodists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterian Reactionaries, all of whom were impelled by an Arminian theology, since that appeared to comport best with

him differently. Twenty-seven publications of Edwards are estant, including his trenchant criticism of Arminian anthropology entitled Freedom of the Will. A completely new edition of the works of Jonathan Edwards is in the process of being published by the Yale University Press. The first volume, Freedom of the Will, edited by Paul Ramsey, appeared in 1957.

the rising democratic spirit of the West.¹ In the second Awakening in 1800 there was, for example, a Barton W. Stone, "who at his ordination had stated that he received the Westminster Confession only so far as it was consistent with the Word of God, and others . . . who preached that God loved the whole world, that Jesus died for all men, and that sinners were able to accept the means of Salvation."² Out of that revival sprang the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which revised its Westminster Confession in the direction of universal atonement and repudiation of the doctrine of infant damnation. The Revival of 1857 was marked in the main by extensive prayer meetings, but the other nineteenth century revivals, sparked by Charles E. Finney, who was "inclined to be unsparing in his criticism of the Calvinistic theology,"³ definitely tended to assume a free will in man. The later revivals led by Moody and Billy Sunday went in the same direction, so that Arminianism became firmly entrenched and evangelicalism in America today is predominately Arminian in theology.

¹"Through the spirit of Revivalism the emphasis in theology shifted from Calvinistic objectivism to American subjectivism, from Calvinistic theocentricity to American anthropocentricity, from Calvinistic theocratic collectivism to American democratic individualism." Hammar, op. cit., p. 83.

²F. G. Beardsley, The History of Christianity in America, p. 103.

³Ibid., pp. 139-140.

Liberalism took the form secondly of Universalism, which had its greatest appeal in small towns and rural areas.

The Arminian position that Christ has earned salvation for all men and God has made provision for man so that all can accept, found further development in the revival of the position that all men will eventually be saved, a heresy that appeared at least as early as the time of Origen (c.185-c.254). Jonathan Mayhew, an anti-Trinitarian, criticized the doctrine of reprobation vigorously in 1762. In 1770 there came to America a convert of George Whitefield who was destined to become the minister of the first Universalist Church in America. He was John Murray, a vigorous reactionary against the doctrine of eternal punishment in Calvinism, who settled in Gloucester, Massachusetts, and began the Universalist Church there in 1779. In 1782 Charles Chaucy wrote The Salvation of All Men, Illustrated and Vindicated as a Scripture Doctrine, calling the doctrines of election and reprobation "horrible absurdities" and asserting that there was no "partial design . . . and effect of the mediating interposition of Jesus Christ."¹ The most influential Universalist theologian was Hosea Ballou (1771-1852), son of a Calvinistic Baptist preacher. Ballou was converted to the Universalist position by his study of Romans 5:12. The rationalistic impact of Ethan Allen's Reason the Only Oracle of Man led him to repudiate the doctrines of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, and

¹Quoted by Burggraaf, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

substitutionary atonement. The younger Edwards made able reply to Universalist propositions, and although churches were ultimately established all over the country the movement never gained appreciable strength.

Much greater strength was evident in the third form which theological liberalism took, Unitarianism. This belief had more appeal for the intelligentsia and captured the bulk of churches in New England.

The Great Awakening, in which Jonathan Edwards, Sr., and George Whitefield, both of whom emphasized human depravity and salvation by grace, played the most significant roles, precipitated considerable doctrinal discussion. In this discussion Unitarian ideas began to emerge. Among the first to enunciate them was Jonathan Mayhew, the liberal preacher of Boston,¹ who claimed that "total depravity is both dishonorable to the character of God and a libel on human nature."² Unitarianism was not, as might be supposed, "in the first place a reaction against the doctrine of the Trinity It was a revolt against the prevalent Calvinistic doctrines of total depravity, substitutionary and limited atonement."³ Its two foci, both of which come into sharp perspective in later liberalism, were:

¹See above, p. 125.

²R. G. Wilburn, The Prophetic Voice in American Christianity, p. 50.

³Burggraaf, op. cit., p. 59.

faith in human goodness and confidence in human reason.¹

Organizationally it dates its rise in 1787 when James Freeman was ordained by the church wardens of King's Chapel in Boston. Two years previously, that church had voted to omit from its order of worship all references to the Trinity. The appointment of Henry Ware, an avowed Unitarian, to a professorship of divinity at Harvard in 1805², served to sharpen the rising cleavage within the Congregational churches. The turning point occurred in 1819 when William Ellery Channing delivered his "Baltimore Sermon" at the ordination of Jared Sparks. After that event 120 churches went over to Unitarianism. The American Unitarian Association was formed in 1825. Although Channing retained some vestiges of conservatism, saying that Christ was more than a mere man and that the Bible was in some sense authoritative, to all practical purposes he elevated human reason above the Scriptures. He said of total depravity that "a more irrational doctrine could not be contrived" and "were it really believed . . . men would look up with dread and detestation to the author of their being, and look round with horror on their fellow-creatures."³ Unitarian ideas were

¹Note the radical departure from John Robinson the Separatist, who maintained that "divine authority is to sway with us above all reason; yet reason teacheth, that God is both to be believed and obeyed in the things for which man can see no reason." Quoted by Burggraaf, op. cit., p. 10.

²Andover Seminary was started in 1808 in protest, but it also capitulated to Unitarianism in due time.

³Wilburn, op. cit., p. 51.

publicized and propagated by Ralph Waldo Emerson, one time preacher, Transcendentalist poet and philosopher, who substituted religious intuition for supernatural revelation and maintained that Christianity was diseased with the "mumps and measles" of the doctrines of original sin, depravity and predestination.¹

The extreme radicalism of Theodore Parker, thoroughly imbued as he was with Deism and German Biblical Criticism, meant a split into Conservative and Radical Unitarianism, the former finding continuance and kinship in later liberalism and the latter issuing into bald naturalism. By 1825, 80 percent of the Congregational churches in New England had gone Unitarian.

Liberalism also took the form of "The New Divinity" or Classic Modernism. Walter Marshal Horton has called the period of 1850-1914 "the great age of liberalism in America." Then it was that the older liberalism was colored and "enriched" by new elements, and "The New Divinity" is the result of this attempt "to take up and neutralize the shock brought about by the sudden rise of the natural sciences and the influx from Germany of the rationalistic-critical theology."² The optimistic view of man which had resulted from the denial of the doctrines of total depravity and original sin was further promoted by the Darwinian theory of evolution. At first the theologians were hostile to or suspicious of it, but led by H. W. Beecher, Washington Gladden

¹Ibid.

²Burggraaf, op. cit., p. 160.

and others, many of them gradually capitulated and agreed with Lyman Abbott that "God has but one way of doing this . . . the way of growth, of development, of evolution."¹ The motif of progress was applied to history by the German Albrecht Ritschl, in his reinterpretation of the Biblical concept of the Kingdom of God.² That Kingdom was not to be construed as eschatological, finding its full realization in the next world, nor simply as a commonwealth of born-again Christians, but as "an association of men for reciprocal and common action from the motive of love."³ By improvement of living conditions and relationships between men, by elevating the standard of living, and by ameliorating the ills of society, the Kingdom of God would gradually be realized on earth. That reinterpretation worked "hand-in-glove" with the rise of the Social Gospel, another feature of the New Divinity. Christianity was not to be viewed as primarily individualistic, providing salvation for the sinner who had violated the laws of God and offended His holiness, but social, removing the injustices and inequities among men and excising the evils from society. There was little patience with creeds and propositional truth, for "Christianity is not a doctrine, but

¹Quoted by H. S. Coffin, Religion Yesterday and Today, p. 9.

²From Bushnell on there is the reading of new meanings into the old theological terms by American theologians. Bushnell also taught the Moral Influence theory of the atonement.

³A. Ritschl, The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, p. 210.

a life." Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch sought to provide a theology for this activist Christianity and located it in the universal Fatherhood of God (whose main attribute is love), the universal brotherhood of man, and in a human Jesus who "saves" men by teaching them to be like God.

The immanence of God, to the virtual exclusion of His transcendence, became the reigning principle of the new theology. The emphasis was upon continuity between revelation and natural religion, Christianity and other religions, God and man, and Christ and mankind. Horton has written: "In liberal Protestant thought the old clear-cut distinction between reason and revelation has been abolished, because human discovery and divine disclosures have come to be regarded as two sides of the same process."¹

The writings of Ritschl, noted above, as well as those of Schleiermacher, who reduced religion to a "sense of dependence on God" and emphasized the subjective, and Immanuel Kant, who virtually equated religion with morality, were influential in American theology. So too were direct contacts with German thought. A considerable number of American students pursued study in Germany in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and they took back with them many radical theological ideas, including the Higher Criticism of the Bible. A cardinal feature of the New Divinity, Higher or Historical Criticism

¹W. M. Horton, Revelation, p. 242.

meant the repudiation of a "biased" standpoint. That is the Bible must not be approached as the divinely inspired and infallible Word of God, but it must be analyzed and judged as any other book. Thus, the Bible lost its authoritative character, and it came to be viewed as a record of man's religious experiences arrived at by empiricism, or the "scientific method" rather than God's redemptive disclosure to men.

By 1913 The New Divinity had engulfed the American church world and Washington Gladden could write, "The idea of the immanence of God; the idea that God's method of working is the method of evolution; the idea that nature in all its deepest meanings is supernatural; the idea of the constant presence of God in our lives; the idea of the universal divine Fatherhood and of the universal human Brotherhood . . . those are ideas which are here to stay."¹

He was only partially right. The first World War dealt a severe blow to classic modernism and there resulted Christian Realism, or what might be called chastened Modernism. The optimism of the old modernism with its doctrines of inevitable progress and human perfectibility was rudely shattered by the outbreak of a conflict of global proportions. And when it was followed by a staggering depression, The New Divinity was forced to take inventory. From it there emerged a sobering or chastened liberalism. As Kerschner remarked, "World events served to

¹W. Gladden, Present Day Theology, pp. 6-7.

brush aside trivialities and surface optimisms and to reveal the necessity for grounding one's faith upon a profounder basis."¹ A series of autobiographical articles in the Christian Century in the 30s on the subject "How My Mind Has Changed in the Last Decade" reflects that reassessment. Various remedies were proposed: a shift from ethics to religion, a return to the writings of St. Paul, and elimination of "romantic illusions." "Back to the facts then, back to all the facts, back to the grim facts of the actual world, and back to sound thinking on those facts, the liberal theology must go."²

Specifically, a chastened modernism sounds the call, firstly, for a more realistic anthropology. The vast majority of its proponents concede that man has been regarded altogether too optimistically. Walter Marshal Horton says he has restored "original sin" to his theology, Harry Emerson Fosdick warns against reading the reality out of sin, and W. L. Sperry calls for a "realistic and credible doctrine of man."³ Accompanying this more realistic anthropology is a measure of skepticism with respect to modern social programs and panaceas. Certain it is that the trend of contemporary events "has served to

¹F. D. Kerschnér, "Realities and Vision," Christian Century, LVI (1939), p. 149.

²F. H. Foster, The Modern Movement in Theology, p. 214.

³W. L. Sperry, "How My Mind Has Changed," Christian Century, LVI (1939), p. 187.

reinforce in American Protestantism the notion that evil cannot be disregarded or even treated as lightly as the followers of Albrecht Ritschl and their descendants were accustomed to do."¹

Secondly, there is recognition of the need of reconstruction of the idea of God. Fosdick holds that the old liberalism relegated God to an advisory role and "watered down and thinned out the central message and distinctive truth of religion, the reality of God."² Foster calls for a return to the neglected truths of the sternness and justice of God, and men like Wieman and Bennett decry the extreme emphasis on the immanence of God and call for a new appreciation of His transcendence and "otherness." There is recognition of the fact that religion has been virtually reduced to humanism. "Man today is not satisfied with self-culture and with the echo of his own voice, sent back as the only answer from the infinite mystery."³

Thirdly, chastened liberalism acknowledges that although Christ has been honored in a measure, He has not received His full due. We need to pay more attention to His cross and resurrection, says Georgia Harkness, and see much more in Him than a great martyr dying for His convictions."⁴

¹P. Woolley, "American Calvinism in the 20th Century" in American Calvinism, p. 52.

²H. E. Fosdick, "Beyond Modernism," Christian Century, LVI (1939), p. 1551.

³Sperry, op. cit., p. 187.

⁴G. Harkness, "A Spiritual Pilgrimage," Christian Century, LVI (1939), p. 348.

Such is the judgment of at least a segment of modern religious liberalism as it sits in judgment upon itself. It is by no means ready to return to the position of historic orthodoxy and it has serious strictures with respect to Barthianism, but by adopting a more realistic attitude it hopes by its own genius and method to resolve the spiritual and religious problems of mankind.

Preservation and Perpetuation of Calvinism

As we have already observed, the New England stream of Calvinism was early muddied by Arminianism and other forms of liberalism. Some attempt to stem the tide or purify the stream was made by the Ministerial Associations proposed by the Mathers,¹ and by the valiant efforts of Jonathan Edwards, Sr. But Congregationalism gradually succumbed, leaving individual Calvinists and struggling evangelical groups in New England. The German Reformed Church, which was progressively infiltrated with contrary winds of doctrine, also declined.

The Reformed Church of America (Dutch Reformed Church) held the Calvinistic line until the opening of the nineteenth century. Then the rise of Hopkinsianism and Arminianism within its ranks occasioned in 1822 a secession led by the Rev. Solomon Froeligh which brought about the True Reformed Dutch Church. This church aimed to continue the Calvinistic tradition. There

¹See above, p. 115.

were divisive tendencies in the seceding group, and a segment of this church united with the Christian Reformed Church in 1877. The French Huguenots were absorbed into other communions.

The Scotch-Irish stream deposited Presbyterianism on American soil. It, too, was threatened by divergent doctrines, and in the Adopting Act of 1729 it demanded of all ministers and licentiates subscription to the Westminster Confession in order that the threat of Arminianism be warded off. The spread of liberalism through the Plan of Union merger of Congregationalists and Presbyterians in their missionary program led to a cleavage in 1836 between the Old School (conservative) and New School (liberal) Presbyterians. Reunion between those two groups was effected in 1869. Princeton Seminary, which was founded in 1812, carried on the Old School tradition and promoted conservatism under the Hodges and under B. B. Warfield. Warfield dominated the scene in his tenure of thirty-four years (1887 to 1921). But the pressure for a liberalized, inclusivistic theology grew apace. Heresy trials involving Briggs, Smith, and McGiffert marked the closing decade of the nineteenth century. The Westminster Confession was subjected to a liberalizing revision in 1903; in 1906 reunion with the Arminianistic Cumberland Presbyterian Church was affected; and in 1924 some 1274 ministers of the Presbyterian Church signed the Auburn Affirmation. This document advocated tolerance and flexibility of interpretation of five basic, historic Christian doctrines. The rift between

conservatives and liberals steadily widened. In 1929 Westminster Seminary was established as a protest institution and it was followed shortly thereafter by the formation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Calvinism in America today is a "struggling remnant." There are, to be sure, individual Calvinists and groups of Calvinists in the evangelical denominations, but organizationally there are only five or six small denominations that are still quite thoroughly imbued with Calvinism. They include the Christian Reformed Church, which is rooted in a double secession from the State Church of the Netherlands, dates its American origin at 1857, subscribes to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dordt, and has 473 ministers, 585 congregations, and 254,704 members in the United States and Canada; the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which seceded from the Presbyterian Church USA in 1928, has approximately 100 churches and 12,000 members, and subscribes to the Westminster Confession and the Westminster Shorter and Larger Catechisms; the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, with its Covenanters who organized in 1742 on the basis of strong opposition to British rule over the colonies and who now number some 4,635 members, and the General Synod, made up of descendants of the persecuted Presbyterians in Scotland who refused to accede to the Erastian "Settlement of Religion" at the Revolution of 1688, which group now numbers 2,356 members (both groups subscribe to the

Westminster Confession and the two Catechisms); the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, originating in opposition to lay patronage in Scotland and emigrating to America in the eighteenth century, located mainly in the South, operating Erskine College, having 147 ministers, 151 churches, and 27,600 members, and subscribing to the symbols of the other Presbyterian bodies; the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, formed in 1956 as an offshoot of the Bible Presbyterian Church, operating Covenant College and Seminary in Chattanooga, Tenn., having 72 churches, 160 ministers, 6,800 members (heaviest concentration in the Philadelphia, Pa. and Wilmington, N. J. areas) and likewise holding the Westminster Confession and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; the Reformed Church in the U.S. (more commonly known as the Eureka Classis), remaining intact when the parent body joined with the Evangelical and Reformed in 1940, numbering some 20 churches (14 of them in the Dakotas), 16 ministers and 2,457 members, and subscribing to the Heidelberg Catechism; and the Protestant Reformed Church, an offshoot of the Christian Reformed Church in 1924, numbering some 15 ministers, 20 churches, and 2,000 members and holding the same doctrinal standards as the Christian Reformed Church.

This is not to say that Calvinism is in its dying throes. On the contrary, with the new interest in the Bible and with the renaissance of Calvin studies, there are signs of a better day. William Ellery Channing, the "father of

Unitarianism," wrote over 125 years ago: "Calvinism, we are persuaded, is giving place to better views. It has passed its meridian, and is sinking to rise no more. It has to contend with foes more powerful than theologians; with foes from whom it cannot shield itself in mystery and metaphysical subtleties--we mean the progress of the human mind, and the progress of the spirit of the gospel. Society is going forward in intelligence and charity, and of course is leaving the theology of the 16th century behind it." He proved to be a false prophet.

Calvinism still lives. And the truths of the Word of God which constitute the inner fibre of Calvinism will always have their enthusiastic and dedicated adherents. As long as this world runs its course, men will exalt His marvellous grace and commit themselves to promoting the glory of God and extending His hegemony over all of life.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Norma G. Rooney has been read and approved by three members of the Department of English.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signature of Adviser

Date

VITA

Norma G. Rooney was born in Harvey, Illinois, October 7, 1926. She was graduated from Thornton Township High School, Harvey, Illinois, June, 1944, and attended Gregg Business College, Chicago, Illinois, receiving a medical secretary's certification in June, 1945. From 1945 until 1955 the writer was employed as a medico-legal secretary in Chicago, Illinois.

In September, 1955, the writer entered De Paul University, Chicago, Illinois, and received a Bachelor of Arts in 1959 and a Master of Arts from the Graduate School of DePaul in 1961. In February, 1962, she began her doctoral studies in English at Loyola University. Additionally, the writer has studied at Northwestern University and the University of Chicago.

In September, 1961, she began teaching English at Bremen Township High School, Midlothian, Illinois, and in 1963 she accepted an appointment as chairman of the Department of English, Tinley Park High School, Tinley Park, Illinois. Her present appointment is at Purdue University, Calumet Campus, Hammond, Indiana, where she has taught in the Department of English since 1966.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Norma G. Rooney has been read and approved by three members of the Department of English.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Agnes McMillan Dore

Signature of Adviser

10 / 30 / 69

Date