



Watermark

Volume 13, 2019

Department of English
California State University, Long Beach

Watermark

Watermark accepts submissions annually between October and February. We are dedicated to publishing original critical and theoretical essays concerned with literature of all genres and periods, as well as works representing current issues in the fields of rhetoric and composition.

All submissions must be accompanied by a short abstract of the essay—approximately 250 words—that also includes the author’s name, phone number, email address, and the title of the essay or book review as well as a short biography. All essay submissions should approximate 8-20 pages—while 12-15 is ideal—and must be typed in MLA format with a standard 12 point font. Book reviews ought to be 750-1,000 words in length. As this journal is intended to provide a forum for emerging voices, only student work will be considered for publication. Submissions will not be returned. Please direct all questions to csulbwatermark@gmail.com and address all submissions to:

Department of English: Watermark
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90840

Visit us at www.watermarkjournal.com for more information.

Watermark © Copyright 2019.
All rights revert to contributors upon publication.

Watermark

Executive Editor

Christopher Maye

Managing Editors

Nina Calabretta

Margaux Corsini

Carolina Hernandez

Vanessa Moore

Maitlyn Reynolds

Editors

Joaquin Acosta

Alexa Findlay

Ryan Hunter

Maxwell Kent

Lizzy Oliver

Volume 13, 2019

Readers

Melissa Berland

Emily Lauder

Nick Rader

Lucila Rojo

Kathleen Thile

Cover Artist

Tarik Mask

Layout Designer

John Feijoó

Staff Advisor

Norbert Schürer

Table of Contents

- ix A Note from *Watermark's* Editor
- 1 The Double-Consciousness of Claude McKay
Stacia Arnold
- 9 Washed Away: Rain and the Creation of Intimate Space in
Rhoda Broughton's *Cometh Up as a Flower*
Jessica Banner
- 14 Some of both: The Ways in Which Puerto Rican and
American Cultures Are Accepted and Rejected in
Esmerelda Santiago's *When I Was Puerto Rican*
Elsbeth Beardsley
- 21 Repression, Fantasy, and Desire in Jackson's
The Haunting of Hill House
Melissa Berland
- 32 Reckoning with the "Self-Made" Man of Post-Revolutionary
America: Hawthorne and Irving on Fragile Nationality
Miranda Gámez
- 41 An Equal Partnership: The Collaboration of Julia Morgan
and William Randolph Hearst
Adriana Giacoletti-Crandall

- 53 Getting Out: Intersections of Queer Desire, Spirituality,
and Black Escapism in Randall Kenan's *A Visitation of
Spirits*
Salisa Grant
- 63 "A Weapon for Liberation": Utilizing Forum Theatre in the
Promotion of Liberatory and Contact Zone Pedagogies
Within the Composition Classroom
Gage Greenspan
- 71 Confronting the White Gaze: Examining the Pliability of
Photographs and Constructing a Self-Defined Collective
Consciousness in Richard Wright's *12 Million Black Voices*
Carolina Hernandez Muñoz
- 79 The Re-organizing Principle of Memory in *Mrs. Dallozway*
Rachel Narozniak
- 95 The Reclamation of Identity Rests in the Power of Naming
Zara Raheem
- 101 Ishmael's "(Un)Equal Eye" and the Overlapping Images in
Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick*
Allison Reames
- 111 Inherited Memory, Absent History, Fragmented Identity:
The Palestinian Experience in Mahmoud Darwish's
Memory for Forgetfulness
Nina Youkhanna
- 118 Contributors

Watermark

A Note from *Watermark's* Editor

While *Watermark* is a journal published annually, it signifies more than its individual manifestation. Rather, it is necessary to view the journal as a collection that builds on its previous editions, and with that in mind, I feel truly fortunate to be writing the Editor's Note for this edition of *Watermark*. Through some sort of fatalistic happenstance, I was gifted with the opportunity to herald this edition and build on *Watermark's* previous successes; however, I could never have done this alone. I would like to thank our readership, the submitters, and contributors who continue to support *Watermark* as well the entire *Watermark* team because without them this journal would never have seen the light of day.

This issue of *Watermark* follows the theme of **memory**, and while the essays within this edition discuss varied literary works through a series of critical, analytical, theoretical, and pedagogical perspectives, they coalesce in observing the various nuances of what "memory" represents. Because of this, it is crucial to mention that this journal is much more than a collection of essays, but it serves as a medium for the oppressed and subjugated individuals and communities whose experiences and narratives have been overlooked and lost. The cover, which builds on this notion, is similar to a class photo that includes a series of familiar and unfamiliar faces in a single setting to broadly suggest that each memory has significance. With this in mind, I am grateful that we dedicated this edition to openly discuss such a serious subject.

Watermark

The Double-Consciousness of Claude McKay

The early 20th century in America was a turning point for African American identity. The Harlem Renaissance gave agency to a new Black voice that, for the first time in American history, allowed Black Americans to create a new identity that was completely for themselves and created by themselves. According to Alain Locke, editor of the anthology *The New Negro*, the “New Negro” was to leave behind the ways of the past as he moved forward into this new, self-created space. While this theory was fully embraced by many poets and authors, such as Langston Hughes, who relied on the form of a Black-created art, the blues, in order to develop the form of his own poetry, some poets still relied on more traditional methods in order to create a new form of identity and protest. One of these such writers was Claude McKay, a Jamaican poet who immigrated to the United States in 1912. McKay’s early education was formed by Western writers such as Shakespeare and other “great English masters and a few translations from the ancients” (McKay, “Claude McKay”), and he did not leave their influence as far behind him as perhaps Locke would have liked and called for. In fact, “McKay’s earliest American poetry submissions signaled his English colonial education” (Van Nyhuis 33), and McKay relied on the form of these white writers to create the form and structure of his own poetry. However, rather than using this structure for the purpose of celebrating or conforming to white authors, McKay used it as a tool to sharpen the message he had for American audiences. McKay, horrified at the treatment of Black folks in America, used his poetry to pointedly criticize race relations in America, relying on familiar poetic methods to accentuate his message. The sonnet, one of the most recognizable forms in Western poetry, was typically used by poets to portray love and desire. However, “McKay chose the sonnet as the form best suited to express powerful

Watermark

emotions controlled and measured by structure” (Denizé and Newlin 101). Using the sonnet to express and discuss Black issues transformed the sonnet into a form of protest and focused McKay’s critiques of white America. Thus, McKay used the sonnet form as a way to harshly critique racism in society and reflect his double-consciousness as a Black man and an immigrant in America.

While Claude McKay was influenced by the structural form of white poets like Shakespeare, he was also influenced philosophically by Black thinkers and writers, specifically W. E. B. Du Bois. Du Bois was an African American author who was incredibly influential for many Black authors and artists of the Harlem Renaissance movement. Du Bois was instrumental in McKay’s formation as an artist, and McKay felt particularly connected to Du Bois’ theory of double-consciousness. Double-consciousness, according to Du Bois, is a state for African Americans in America of “feel[ing]...two-ness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder” (2). For McKay, double-consciousness pertained not only to his identity as a Black man living in the United States, but as an immigrant who was aware of the distinct cruelty of American racism, having grown up in a predominantly Black community where “[t]he whites at home constitute about 14% of the population only and they generally conform to the standard of English respectability. The few poor ones accept their fate resignedly and live at peace with the natives. The government is tolerant, somewhat benevolent, based on the principal of equal justice to all” (Denizé and Newlin 101). McKay was horrified by the treatment of Blacks in America and “found the American racial violence extremely traumatic; it compelled him into a writing that was hybrid in point of view—a *double-consciousness*” (Denizé and Newlin 102). McKay’s use of double-consciousness in his writing was represented not only in the content of his poetry, but in the very form and structure of it as well.

McKay’s poem “The Lynching” uses the sonnet form to highlight the objectivist view of Black bodies to white audiences and elevate this issue to one of primary concern. Additionally, the duality in the poem critiques the cultural event of lynching itself. The act of lynching African Americans and all the practices that came along with it—such as distributing lynching photographs or the severed parts of the individual who was lynched to the cruelly eager crowd observing the grotesque event (Davis)—is a stain on American history that is distinctly Southern. To a foreigner coming to and residing in America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly someone who was Black, the regularity of this atrocious act must have been a horrific realization of the realities for Black Americans and would have led to a greater perception of the racial divide in America at this time. It certainly seemed to do so for McKay, as “[s]eventy-six blacks, the highest number in 15 years, were lynched in 1919, and ‘The Lynching’ was published in 1920, only one year later” (Denizé and Newlin

103). In this poem, McKay's own double-consciousness as an immigrant viewing this distinctly American ritual and realizing his place in American society is clear, and yet, he further extends this duality by placing into contrast the black body that has been cruelly murdered and the white audience observing him. The poem begins by focusing on the unnamed individual who has been lynched: "His spirit is smoke ascended to high heaven" (McKay, "The Lynching" 826). Of the fourteen lines of the sonnet, half of them focus on the murdered individual as a person. He is given male pronouns, and there is a tone of sympathy for this lynched man. He was killed "by the cruelest way of pain" for an "awful sin," and even the "bright and solitary star" which, though it "hung pitifully" over him, may have been that which "gave him up at last to Fate's wild whim." It seems that, at first, the audience is given the perspective of one side of Du Bois' double-consciousness—here, the African American man "sees himself as human" (Denizé and Newlin 102). However, in the very next line, the lynched victim transforms from a person who has been cruelly murdered to an object of entertainment for the white audience. Instead of using male pronouns, the murdered subject is now an object; he is "swinging char," a "ghastly body," and, finally, a "dreadful thing." The dehumanization that has occurred is reflected in the audience that observes him. While other poets at the time "populate their lynch mobs with males, it is noteworthy that McKay's 'mixed crowds' include women and children" (Davis 50). Women, so often viewed as the "softer sex," are here reduced to the same potential for cruelty as their male counterparts. Instead of taking in the scene with compassion or empathy, "The women thronged to look, but never a one / Showed sorrow in her eyes of steely blue." The women "are not described for their attractiveness or innocence or motherly warmth. On the contrary, it is just these qualities which they must lack by being at the scene at all" (Williams 106). The use of the verb "throng" further separates the women from their stereotypical traits as it indicates that the women were not passive participants in this event. Instead, the word evokes a rush to the scene and an eagerness to view the body as a spectacle. Additionally, the assonance of "[s] howed sorrow" in the beginning of the line connects the two words as if sorrow at the sight of the body is something that is to be expected, but the abrupt shift of sounds the second half of the line—"eyes of steely"—seems to indicate a break in these women from the expected norms of humanity. These women, both by their presence in the crowd and their reactions to the Black man that has been lynched, initiate the creation of the view of his body as an object and begin to hint at the other side of Du Bois' double-consciousness.

Although the women in the poem are horrifying in their reaction to and cold perception of the lynched man, it is perhaps the children in the poem who are the most haunting. The children, the "little lads, lynchers that were to be," occupy only two lines of the poem, but their placement as the couplet at the end of the poem enhances their power and significance. These children are not

Watermark

innocents. Rather, they are the next generation that will continue the cycle of inhumanity and torture. According to Melvin Williams, “To be a ‘little lad’ is not only to be at an innocent age; the language itself is romantically poetic...But then for these lads to become ‘lynchers’ is abruptly to change romance back to brutal reality” (106). The children, placed at the end of the poem, are a reminder to the reader of the other side of Du Bois’ double consciousness—they are part of the “prejudiced whites [that] see [Black women and men] as subhuman” (Denizé and Newlin 102). These children are “the next generation of white males [and signal] continued slaughter of the African American race” (Davis 51). Their final presence in the poem serves as both a prediction and a warning to America. Through them, McKay foretells the future of race relations in America that is to continue should this double consciousness continue to occur for Black men and women. In order for African Americans to no longer be viewed as objects, to maintain the view of humanity present in the beginning of the poem, the white audiences reading the poem need to work towards collapsing the double-consciousness for African Americans so that the agency and humanity of Black folks is recognized.

The duality in the poem “The Lynching” is further emphasized by the poem’s sonnet structure, and this form leads to an even harsher critique of white society. This poem is one of McKay’s many poems that rely on the form of the Shakespearean sonnet. However, whereas “Shakespeare’s sonnets deal essentially with private experience and are not...connected to specific events...McKay’s, on the other hand, were inspired by happenings that are a matter of historical record, though his experience of them was deeply felt and personal” (Denizé and Newlin 100). By using a form most associated with one of the most renowned and revered authors of the Western world, McKay gives equal credence not only to his own poetry, but to the very subjects which they addressed. In “The Lynching,” McKay’s portrayal of a lynched Black man using the sonnet form forces his subject into a white space that he has been repeatedly denied access to. Not only that, but his lynched man has only been allowed a welcome entrance into this space at the cost of his own brutal death. McKay’s use of the sonnet forms elevates his subject and gives him equal standing to the objects of love and desire present in Shakespeare’s own sonnets. McKay accentuates the importance he places on this murdered man by elevating him to a Christ-like standing. In the beginning of the poem, McKay says,

His spirit is smoke ascended to high heaven.
His father, by the cruelest way of pain,
Had bidden him to his bosom once again;
The awful sin remained still unforgiven.

Here, “McKay is drawing on the traditional Christian imagery in Renaissance sonnets” (Denizé and Newlin 103). It is unclear if the father of the lynched man is his biological father or God himself, but like God, it appears as

though this father has sent his son to pay for a sin that is not his own. However, unlike Christ, the sin of the lynched man “remain[s] still unforgiven”—his sacrifice has not been enough. Use of the sonnet form and Christian imagery in this poem allows McKay to establish yet another duality—Black art and white art. By using the poetic form most commonly associated with one of the most renowned white poets of all time, McKay has elevated his own poetry and its subjects in a way that had been ignored by Western society, and “the dialectical nature of the sonnet—the setting up of a thought or situation brought to a solution, answer or comment—allowed him to dramatize the double-consciousness” (Denizé and Newlin 102).

McKay once again uses the sonnet form in “The Harlem Dancer” to criticize the objectivist view of Black bodies in America, but the duality in this poem turns inward as McKay comments on his insider/outsider feeling as an immigrant. In “The Harlem Dancer,” McKay focuses on a dancer who performs or a crowd of “wine-flushed, bold-eyed boys” (McKay, “The Harlem Dancer” 826) and “young prostitutes.” Although the dancer “[sings] and dance[s] on gracefully and calm,” her countenance belies the detachment she felt with the audience, as seen through “her falsely-smiling face.” The dancer’s disconnect with the audience is a mirror for McKay’s experience as a Black immigrant in America. The dancer, like McKay, appears to be an active and engaged participant with the scene around her. She sings, and “[h]er voice [is] like the sound of blended flutes” as she seductively captures the attention of her audience: “...her perfect, half-clothed body sway[s]” as “[t]he light gauze [hangs] loose about her form.” However, though she draws in her audience with her physicality, the narrator of the poem recognizes there is more to her than what initially appears. He says, “To me she seemed a proudly-swaying palm / Grown lovelier for passing through a storm.” The imagery of the “proudly-swaying palm” brings to mind the tropical environment of McKay’s homeland, immediately linking the experiences of this woman and McKay himself. Unlike the audience, the narrator does not “[devour] her shape with eager, passionate gaze,” but instead believes that she “grows lovelier” because of the hardships she has endured. The narrator recognizes that this woman has grown despite the challenges she has faced, but it seems that only he is able to recognize her for what she has conquered and what she has become. Like the dancer, McKay recognizes a distinct difference between how he views himself and how American society views him—a double-consciousness of the immigrant experience. The double-consciousness felt by McKay is actually felt twice over because of his status as both a Black man and an immigrant. McKay, in a letter to the publisher of *Pearson’s Magazine*, said, “...my first year’s residence in America...was the first time I had ever come face to face with such manifest, implacable hate of my race, and my feelings were indescribable” (Denizé and Newlin 101). Donna Denizé and Louisa Newlin also note that “[I] like all immigrants, McKay experienced an awareness of how he viewed himself

Watermark

and a keen awareness of how American whites in particular viewed him and other blacks, and the ethnic contrast was stark..." (101). Like the dancer in "The Harlem Dancer," American society (particularly, white American society) recognized McKay for only his physicality. The dancer uses her voice to sway her audience—"Her voice was like the sound of blended flutes / Blown by black players upon a picnic day." But though she uses her voice with them and clearly has something to say, the audience watching and devouring her is only interested in "tossing coins in praise" when it is her physical form that entertains them. So, too, is this the experience for Claude McKay, and by extension, other Black folks living in America. McKay has a clear voice and a message that he wants and needs to spread through his poetry to this country that he has adopted as his own. McKay wanted to "explore and question the traditional democratic ideals of *American identity*—political and economic freedoms and the social rights of all" (Denizé and Newlin 102). However, McKay, like the dancer, was unable to shed society's view of his physicality as the perception of his worth. In "The Harlem Dancer," we are reminded that a Black body was only as worthy as its ability to entertain, and because of this, the voice of the dancer and the voice of the poet is always overshadowed by the physical form to whom the voice belongs. McKay's narrator in "The Harlem Dancer" is able to see past her superficial form, something that the voyeuristic audience is unable to do. The narrator sees beyond what the audience is willing to see and "looking at her falsely-smiling face, / I knew her self was not in that strange place." Like the dancer, McKay must keep wearing the mask that, according to Paul Laurence Dunbar, "...grins and lies / It hides our cheeks and shades our eyes." While it is unclear if McKay is waiting for the same recognition that the narrator gives the Harlem dancer or if he is simply trying to make audiences aware of the feeling of otherness experienced by immigrants in America, what is clear is that he brings to light an alternative Black point of view through an alternative Black perspective in America—that of the club dancer.

Similar to his technique in "The Lynching," McKay uses the Shakespearean sonnet form in "The Harlem Dancer" to address issues relating to Black folks in the United States. However, in "The Harlem Dancer," McKay extends his critique even further by focusing on an often-ignored perspective to enhance the message he is trying to convey as an immigrant—another often-ignored perspective. The subject of "The Harlem Dancer" is a woman who uses her sex appeal to earn money and is at the mercy of her devouring audience. While initially this woman may have some parallel traits to the dark lady, the subject of many Shakespearean sonnets, the focus on one of the "low-down folks," such as the dancer, once again establishes the Black voice as worthy of a classic poetic tradition. "The Harlem Dancer," like other poems emerging out of the Harlem Renaissance, "suggest[s] the immense human potential behind the toil of the washer-woman, the strutting and wiggling of the prostitute, the swagger

of the dandy, and so forth—human potential that has been destroyed by the social system” (Collier 81). However, McKay does not merely objectify her as the audience has done and use her simply to make a point about the legitimacy of the Black voice, but he allows her sense of self to be reflected in the poem. He ends the poem with the couplet, “But looking at her falsely-smiling face, / I knew her self was not in that strange place.” Once again, McKay utilizes the final couplet of his sonnet to convey the strongest message—the Harlem dancer here is not as she appears to be to her audience, but instead is a woman of agency whose sense of self is defined beyond the restrictions of the night club she works in and beyond the perceptions that the audience has of her. Furthermore, by organizing her experience by the sonnet’s iambic pentameter, he organizes the chaos that surrounds her. However, once again, there is a duality in his use of the sonnet. The experience and the treatment he gives to the Harlem dancer in the sonnet is one that he wishes to transfer back to himself. By using the sonnet to reflect the dancer’s experience and, thus, his own, he is recognizing that the “sonnet is demanding and restrictive” (Collier 83) just as “social and economic forces that have shaped the [lives]” (Collier 83) of both him and the Harlem dancer are equally restrictive.

The double-consciousness that Claude McKay both addressed and attempted to rectify in his poetry are still, unfortunately, present in our society almost one hundred years later. Black folks living in America have to struggle against the perceptions and assumptions that a white-dominated society has placed on them while immigrants in America struggle to separate themselves from the cruel and deceitful identifiers that our very own president forces upon them. However, though the issues Claude McKay addressed in his poetry have not been fully eradicated, people of color and other oppressed individuals can take the lessons put forth by McKay and apply them to a new, modern art. Perhaps by taking dominant forms of art, literature, and poetry and transforming them to create a new and more inclusive American identity and experience, we can move closer to the end of our various double-consciousnesses and to our mutual recognition of one another’s agency and humanity.

Watermark

Works Cited

- Collier, Eugenia W. "I Do Not Marvel, Countee Cullen." *CLA Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, Sept. 1967, pp.73-87, www-jstor-org.csulb.idm.oclc.org/stable/44328232. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- Davis, Maggie E. Morris. "Sound and Silence: The Politics of Reading Early Twentieth-Century Lynching Poetry." *Canadian Review of American Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2018, pp. 40-60, doi:10.3138/cras.2017.015. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- Denizé, Donna E. M., and Louisa Newlin. "The Sonnet Tradition and Claude McKay." *The English Journal*, vol. 99, no. 1, Sept. 2009, pp. 99-105, www-jstor-org.csulb.idm.oclc.org/stable/40503338. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Dover Publications, 1994.
- Dunbar, Paul Laurence. "We Wear the Mask." *Poetry Foundation*, 2018, www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/44203/we-wear-the-mask. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- McKay, Claude. "Claude McKay Describes His Own Life." *Harlem Shadows: An Electronic Edition*, edited by Chris Forster and Roopika Risam, 13 Aug. 2018, www.harlemshadows.org/supp_mckay_claude-mackay-describes.html. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- . "The Harlem Dancer." *American Poetry: The Twentieth Century*, compiled by Robert Hass et al., Vol. 1, Library of America, 2000, p. 826.
- . "The Lynching." *American Poetry: The Twentieth Century*, compiled by Robert Hass et al., Vol. 1, Library of America, 2000, p. 826.
- Van Nyhuis, Alison. "American Dreams and Nightmares: Migration and Myth in Claude McKay's Twentieth-Century American Poetry." *Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses*, no. 62, 2011, pp.31-42, csulb-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=TN_dialnetART0000582050&context=PC&vid=01CALSL_ULB&search_scope=EVERYTHING&tab=everything&lang=en_US. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.
- Williams, Melvin G. "Black Literature vs. Black Studies: Three Lynchings." *Black American Literature Forum*, vol. 11, no. 3, Autumn 1977, pp. 104-08, www-jstor-org.csulb.idm.oclc.org/stable/3041637. Accessed 16 Dec. 2018.

Washed Away: Rain and the Creation of Intimate Space in Rhoda Broughton's *Cometh Up as a Flower*

Victorian England, at least in many of its textual representations, was a damp place. Rhoda Broughton's novel, *Cometh Up as a Flower* (1867), is no exception. In the world of Nell Lestrangle, the wetness of the nineteenth-century English countryside is an omnipresent force. From deluges of rain to misty fields, dripping tombstones, trees and people, Broughton's text overflows with water. Jules David Law in *The Social Life of Fluids: Blood, Milk, and Water in the Victorian Novel* suggests that the prevalence of liquids in nineteenth-century texts relates to increasing anxieties around bodily vulnerability to changing social and ecological surroundings (4). Law suggests, "Victorian novelists found in the social circulation of fluids a means for imagining this contingent relationship between the individual and his or her environment" (4). Through these depictions of fluids, Victorian authors created a platform wherein the relationship between internal motion, both physiological and emotional, and external forces of circulation, could be explored (3).

Using the prevalence of liquids and their potential for such affective exploration as a starting point, this paper will explore the ways in which rain shapes Nell and Dick's relationship. I will argue that rain acts as a "thingy" intermediary, creating an intimate space between the two characters, a space that is made possible by a shift in the subject/object relationship. This paper will engage with Bill Brown's "thing theory" in conjunction with Lisa Blackman's notion of affective circulation to explore the underlying novelistic tension between internal/external and domestic/natural spaces.

Before delving into the way in which rain creates an intimate space for Nell and Dick, I want to first outline how thing theory will be used in this paper. In his seminal text "Thing Theory", Bill Brown proposes that "we begin to confront

Watermark

the thingness of objects when they stop working for us...when their flow within the circuits of production and distribution, consumption and exhibition, has been arrested" (4). For Brown, things obtain their "thingy-ness" as a response to a "failure, or partial failure, to name or to classify" (qtd. in Plotz 110). Instead of remaining confined within the subject/object dichotomy, things have the potential to facilitate explorations of the spaces between subjects and objects by making the invisible visible through the change from object to thing. In this case, it is not that the rain "stops working" for Nell, but rather that her family's decline and the inherent stress that accompanies their mounting debt, the failing health of her father, and the pressure from Dolly and Sir Hugh cause the social or interior/domestic world of *The Grange* to fail Nell. As a result of this failure, Nell takes refuge in outdoor spaces, which in response to the decline of the Lestrangle family begin to assert themselves into the narrative.

Outside the internal/domestic world of *The Grange*, the thingy-ness of the rain allows for the formation of an intimate space where the internal motion, generated by emotions, can be externally expressed. Unlike the internal/domestic space – where Nell is constantly attempting to suppress her feelings for Dick as an expression of familial support – this intimate space allows for Nell and Dick to openly express their feelings for each other. In Chapter Ten, Nell is not hindered by the rain as she heads out to meet Dick by "an ornamental wooden gate in the lilac hedge; a gate separating our Eden from the profane outer world" (Broughton 103). At this gate, which acts as a boundary marker between the outside world and her family's clearly demarcated "Eden," the rain engulfs her body and obscures her vision, creating an intimate space for the two lovers to meet. What is particularly interesting here is that, unlike the internal-domestic space of the house, where social realm is governed by material concerns, primarily of the monetary variety, the "rain space" is not a physically defined space and as such it exists both within the "real" world and in excess of it.

Standing in the deluge of water, Nell gazes out across the sodden landscape, where from her first-person narrative perspective she describes the ways in which the water shapes her vision, as she must look "through the rain" (103). From this obscured position within the rain, Nell continues, "I spied an object looming dimly through the misty air... it resolved itself into a large laughing young man, in damp velveteen" (103). Not only does the rain obscure the Nell's vision, but the tumultuous downpour muffles any sound, leaving the two characters in a world of their own. Dick emerges and, moving through the rainy haze, covered in damp velveteen, the boundaries between his body (as subject) and the rain (as object) become blurred.

Coming to greet him, Nell moves through the garden gate, the boundary marker of her family's domestic sphere. As their tumultuous and passionately charged conversation progresses, Nell moves in and out of the "rain space" coming back into the garden and out again via the garden gate. With every

oscillation, her actions become more and more affectively charged. Lisa Blackman, in her work *Affect: Embodiment and Mediation*, suggests that affect is “integral to a body’s perceptual *becoming*” where internal emotion is “pulled beyond its seeming surface-boundedness by way of its relation to, indeed its composition through, the forces of encounter. With affect, a body is as much outside itself as inside itself – webbed in its relations – until ultimately such firm distinctions cease to matter” (1). Blackman posits that “bodies are not considered stable...entities, but rather are processes which extend into and are immersed in worlds” (1). Each time Nell returns to the intimate rain space she becomes increasingly expressive, externally conveying her internal sentiments, and temporarily free to come into herself and follow her own desire as a subject.

In this intimate space dripping with affect, their clothes and bodies become saturated with rain water, to the point where it becomes unclear where the rain stops and their bodies begin. Nell continues: “I cover my face with my left hand...while the shawl takes the opportunity of slipping off my head, down into an improvised pool” (105). By situating this moment of overflowing emotion within the literal downpour of rain, Broughton draws our attention to the affective power of internal feeling, making visible the internal motion of *emotion* through the fluidity of rain water. In this sense, rain as a “thing” lubricates Nell’s clothing animating the inanimate and pulling it down into a pool from whence Dick, “bent over [her] to re-arrange my shawl, but when he had disposed its shabby old folds to his mind, he kept his arms about [her]” (107), which practically speaking gives Dick the premise he needs to touch Nell. Thoroughly drenched and held in his embrace, Dick teases Nell asking, “Poor little pussycat, is she very anxious to get away?” (107) to which Nell responds by laying her head “on his breast, which the inclement weather has rendered rather a moist resting-place.” Reflecting on this, she states, “He kisses me softly, and I forget to be scandalized” (107). In this moment, within the intimate, obscured world of the rain space, they can freely express their desire for each other less encumbered by the confining domestic sphere.

I would like to suggest that rain in this moment creates what Vivian Sobchack calls “morphological imagination” (qtd. in Blackman 10), a term that speaks to the “affective dimension” that characterizes subject/object interactions as they relate to the body (10). In short, “morphological imagination” describes the merging of body and object that allow for “new bodily configurations to be brought into being” (9), which replace rigid subject/object relationships with a “more kinaesthetic, non-visual sense of incorporation” (10). The rain falls on their bodies, “dripp[ing] from [Dick’s] hat...his curly yellow hair” (Broughton 107) and from Nell’s “limp old gown” (104), highlighting the powerful affect and the sensational outpouring of feeling that fills this moment. Saturating their bodies, the rain space acts as morphological imaginary that allows for them to

Watermark

temporarily act outside the confines of social convention and against familial intentions.

Despite the evident imaginary power of the rain space, it is important to note that it is temporally limited; generated by the perpetual downward movement of the rain – as thousands of drops fall from the clouds to the ground – this space can only exist as fashioned by the downward motion of the rain, and therefore offers only a temporary refuge. The rain space acts as a threshold between several important oppositions in Broughton's narrative (subject/object, mobile/static, internal/external and domestic/natural), and at the threshold of this opportunistic door Nell falters.

This moment in Chapter Ten between Nell and Dick is not the only time she takes refuge in the garden, woods, and fields of The Grange; with frustrating repetition, she hides from all those who impose upon her agency. However, regardless of where she conceals herself, each time Nell is dragged back inside. As powerful as this intimate space is, each of Nell's places of refuge is no match for the socio-economic, material world championed by Dolly. Not only is Nell physically brought back inside the internal domestic space each time, but as the text progresses, Nell's first-person narration becomes increasingly filled with cutting and self-deprecating remarks about her own behavior – she cannot live in the romantic natural world she craves and also thrive in the internal domestic one, which is her reality.

Cometh Up as a Flower presents us with a subtle, but cutting, critique of Victorian conceptions of “acceptable femininity.” Despite the intimate spaces and the morphological imaginary that fills this text, Nell is not able to escape material-social constraints. Broughton's depiction of the natural world does not function simply as a Romanticized space in the novel, or as a counterpoint to the interior domestic space. Instead, these natural sites of refuge that generate imaginary spaces, intimate worlds and alternative realities are still subject to the domination of the material world and those who have power, money and status. Toward the end of the novel, Nell despairingly asks: “am I not [Sir Hugh's] property?” (269), and ultimately, she is. Nell's melodramatic fits of tears, her childish passions, and her love for Dick are all contained within the extension of the domestic (inside) space into the natural (outside) world where she becomes nothing more than a consumed commodity.

Works Cited

- Blackman, Lisa. *Immaterial Bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. London, SAGE, London, 2012, pp. 1-12.
- Broughton, Rhoda. *Cometh Up as a Flower*. Edited by Pamela K. Gilbert, Broadview, 2010.
- Brown, Bill. "Thing Theory." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1-22.
- Law, Jules David. *The Social Life of Fluids: Blood, Milk, and Water in the Victorian Novel*. Cornell UP, 2010.
- Plotz, John. "Materiality in Theory: What to Make of Victorian Things" in *The Oxford Handbook of Victorian Literary Culture*, edited by Juliet John, Oxford Handbooks Online, 2012, pp. 1-20. — "Can the Sofa Speak? A Look at Thing Theory." *Criticism*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2005, pp. 109-118.

Some of both: The Ways in Which Puerto Rican and American Cultures Are Accepted and Rejected in Esmeralda Santiago's *When I Was Puerto Rican*

Nobody likes everything about their culture; there are always elements that agree with or are pleasing to some members of a specific community but are disliked by others. It follows then that when confronted with or thrust in the middle of two cultures, one might choose the best elements from each one, abandoning those aspects they, or the more dominant culture, deem undesirable. This mixture of cultures has been talked and written about widely by U.S. Latin American authors and is often called biculturation or the borderlands mentality. The first book in a three-part memoir by Esmeralda Santiago, *When I Was Puerto Rican* is a coming of age story about Esmeralda, or Negi as she goes by in the book, engaging in this sort of biculturation as she undergoes the transformation from a fully Puerto Rican child to a Nuyorican adolescent. It is the story of a young girl who, even before she is removed from Puerto Rico and placed in the borderlands space of Brooklyn, New York, challenges aspects of Puerto Rican culture. However, it cannot be said that she engages in a process of acculturation, where one culture is completely lost, and another adopted given that she also rejects various aspects of the American or New York culture. This is not only a story of what Negi leaves behind from both worlds, but also what she chooses to keep and celebrate. As the title points out, Negi is some of both; she is not a full member of either community but has instead incorporated elements of both into her own, unique culture where she belongs and is fully accepted. Her story of the reconciliation and beautiful combination of two oftentimes conflicting worlds comes alongside other Latino(as) that share this experience, helping to ease the pressure that comes with the impossible choice between two cultures by demonstrating that it not necessary to make such a choice at all. The combination of both cultures is just as valid and worthy of celebration as each culture is on its own.

One of the aspects of Puerto Rican culture that Negi rejects is its reliance on ontological knowledge—she seems to always be asking questions, wanting to know why things are the way that they are instead of simply accepting them. According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, epistemology is “the study of knowledge and justified belief” (Steup). In contrast, Ontology is “... the study of what there is” (Hofweber). In other words, while epistemology is focused on researching and finding, ontology is more about living and being and experiencing. Negi often wants to find out more about various topics she comes in contact with. For instance, when she realizes that her name is really Esmeralda and that Negi is only a nickname, she insists on knowing the meaning behind her nickname. She asks: “So *Negi* means I’m black?” to which her mother simply responds: “It’s a sweet name because we love you, *Negrita*,” refusing to provide her with the solid answer that she so desires. Her quest for logical explanations of elements within her culture demonstrates that she is, even before much contact with other cultures, questioning her own. Specifically, she is searching for epistemological explanations while her family can only provide the ontological answers. She often turns to her father for answers, especially for answers to spiritual-related concerns such as “What does the soul do?” (Santiago 43). Although her father does his best to answer her questions, she is still left confused and mixed up. Questions such as these do not have epistemological answers. The soul is something that can only be experienced, it cannot be researched or proven to exist. The other members of her community seem to accept ontological truths such as these, whereas Negi always questions them. Even when learning the Lord’s prayer with her abuela she insists on knowing the meaning behind the phrases “Hallowed be thy name” and “And forgive us our trespasses” (100). However, understanding the meaning behind the prayer does not help her gain a spiritual connection; she does not just believe in that which cannot be explained logically to her. Instead of focusing on the experience of prayer, she is always wondering why it is necessary to cross yourself with the right instead of the left hand or counting how many times the people in mass stand up and sit down (98, 100). This inquisitive quality of hers is something that separates her from the rest of her community and often gets her in trouble, particularly with her mother. The distance she creates between herself and the ontological only increases when she encounters the western world where the epistemological is considered to be of far greater value.

Besides her rebellion against the ontological knowledge her culture has traditionally relied on, Negi also rebels through her rejection of gender roles. Remaining single and being content without a husband or a man is not an idea that Puerto Rican culture supports. In fact, when Negi and her father encounter a lady in the *mercado* who is rude to them, Negi’s father explains that, “That’s what happens to women when they stay *jamonas*” (89). The patriarchal idea that women need men in order to be complete, sane human beings is promoted by the

Watermark

members of Negi's community. There are no positive, single women in Negi's life. However, in reality, all the women that Negi encounters who do have men in their lives seem to suffer a great amount of pain because of it. Throughout the book, Negi's parents have a chaotic relationship. Her father drifts in and out of their lives until eventually Negi's mother leaves for the United States, taking her children with her, but leaving their father behind. Ellen C. Mayock describes Negi's response to the toxic relationship of her parents, stating that this is "about the unpalatable nature of male/female roles as she has observed them in Puerto Rico [...] her father holds the power of freedom to sulk and stray over her mother, who, in turn, holds the threat of physical abuse over the children in an attempt to have some control over her large, unsolicited, single-parented brood" (225-226). This tumultuous relationship between her mother and father has not only caused great emotional harm to Negi's mother, but also damages the mother-daughter relationship due to the physical abuse that Monín uses as a response to the sense of helplessness she feels in her own life. Negi does not only have to watch her mother suffer, but also endures suffering as a result of the mistreatment her mother receives and then extends to her children.

It is no surprise that after witnessing this toxic relationship Negi does not agree with the cultural stigma against women remaining single. In fact, she remarks, "It seemed to me then that remaining *jamona* could not possibly hurt this much. That a woman alone, even if ugly, could not suffer as much as my beautiful mother did.... I would just as soon remain *jamona* than shed that many tears over a man" (104). Although there is a short-lived romance between Negi and a young boy from her school, Johannes Vélez who develops a crush on her and offers to carry her books, Negi remains committed to this promise for the remainder of the novel.

Another way in which she challenges the gender roles is through the expression of her sexuality; the first sexual experience she has is when she is sitting at her window and a stranger sitting in his truck gets her attention and begins to masturbate while she watches. While at first, she is confused, she quickly realizes what is happening and thinks to herself, "Men only wanted one thing I'd been told. A female's gaze was enough to send them groping for their *huevos*" (240). However, instead of walking away from the window and hiding from this man's gaze, Negi continues watching. This is an act of defiance against her cultural norms because women in Puerto Rico are not the ones that are supposed to be sexual, that role is reserved for the men. In 1999, Marysol W. Asencio conducted a study in Puerto Rico titled "Machos and Sluts: Gender, Sexuality, and Violence among a cohort of Puerto Rican adolescents" that focused on the gender-based violence experienced by a group of young Puerto Ricans living in New York City. Asencio writes, "The adolescents in this study reasoned that because females got pregnant and gave birth, they were more inclined to be nurturing, monogamous, less sexually motivated [...] Males were

seen as biologically unable to control their passions” (112). This double standard observed in Santiago’s novel has remained ingrained in other members of the Puerto Rican community as well and can even be observed in middle schoolers, such as Negi and those examined in the study. This study makes it clear that in Puerto Rican culture when women express their sexuality, they are seen as sluts, whereas when men engage in sexual activity, they are celebrated for doing so (Asencio 112). As Negi leans into her sexual curiosity instead of running and hiding from it, she is taking another step away from the female standards of Puerto Rican culture.

While Negi sheds some of her Puerto Rican cultural baggage, she does not simply pick up and accept that of the U.S. culture she is exposed to. In fact, she rejects the first aspect of U.S. culture that she is exposed to: the food. She first encounters American food when the Free Associated State begins to provide free breakfast at the community center in Mancún, where Negi lives. After eating her first community center breakfast, Negi concludes, “It tasted like the cardboard of our primers, salty, dry, fibrous, but not as satisfyingly chewy. If these were once eggs, it had been a long time since they had been inside a hen” (76). The artificiality of the American food is what causes Negi to dislike it; she is used to fresh ingredients, that which comes directly from nature and can taste the lack of that which is natural in this American cuisine. While this is only an emotional rejection, later on when she attends another free breakfast and is offered peanut butter mixed into powdered milk, she rejects it physically as well, vomiting up all that she consumes and announcing, “It’s... *repugnante!*” (82). The other Puerto Rican children who attend the breakfasts accept them with enthusiasm and enjoy what they consume. Negi, however, refuses to like any aspect of the American food because she is afraid that by liking American food, she will become American. Joanna Barszewska Marshall explains, “This emphasis on food as a focus of resistance may be ironic, since the food that Negi and her family must prefer in order to claim their identity as Puerto Ricans does not clearly distinguish Puerto Ricans from other islanders and may have resulted from an earlier attempt at colonial control by the Spanish” (52). Although Negi makes it clear that she completely prefers Puerto Rican food over American food, most of the foods she describes in the novel, such as the guava, beans and rice, pernil, etc. are not unique to Puerto Rico, but are foods that many island countries share (Marshall 54). For that reason, her commitment to these foods is not intrinsically a commitment to Puerto Rican culture. Despite this fact, she *feels* more Puerto Rican by her unswerving loyalty to what she considers Puerto Rican cuisine.

However, not all the dialogues about food that appear in the novel display a rejection of American culture. For instance, the prologue to the novel is entitled “How to Eat a Guava” and is a clear example of how, once Negi becomes an adult, Puerto Rico lives only in her memory and the island life of her childhood

Watermark

is one she cannot return to in the same way again. She looks back fondly on the fruit, remembering, “I had my last guava the day we left Puerto Rico. It was large and juicy, almost red in the center, and so fragrant that I didn’t want to eat it because I would lose the smell” (4). However, the guavas she finds in the supermarket are not those that she remembers. They are not ripe yet and, instead of being picked right off the tree, they rest, “... under the harsh fluorescent lights of the exotic fruit display” (4). Puerto Rican foods are not only labeled as “exotic” in the supermarket; they are really an exotic fruit to Negi now as well. They belong back on the island, not in the plastic, unnatural environment of New York. For this reason, Negi leaves the island fruit, turning instead to, “the apples and pears of my adulthood” (4). She embraces that which is natural in her new home and rejects this aspect of Puerto Rican culture that tries to fit in but really does not belong.

Puerto Rican food is not the only thing that does not belong in Negi’s new world; language is another area in which Negi has to choose between adapting and accepting her new life or latching on to her Puerto Rican past. When she first arrives in Brooklyn and meets with the principal of her new, English-speaking school, she does not hesitate in making her choice. Instead of allowing herself to be held back one year due to her minimal command of English, she fights back, saying, “Meester Grant, I go eight gray six mons. Eef I no lern inglish, I go seven gray. Okay?” (226). Surprisingly, her principal takes this deal; although he does place her in a class for disabled students, it is an *eighth-grade* disabled student class. Negi works hard to learn English and quickly begins to do well in her classes; she does so well, in fact, that at an assembly at her school her name is called three times for being one of the students with the highest marks in each class (237). While her eagerness to learn English helps her to do well in school and eventually get into Harvard university, it is also another way in which she lets go of her Puerto Rican past. Benjamin Baez, a professor at Georgia State University and a Nuyorican himself, writes about his experience learning English upon migrating to New York as a second grader in his article “Learning to Forget: Reflections on Identity and Language.” He explains that in learning English, he also learned to forget Spanish, stating, “I lost my private language and picked up my public one... I became a different person, a successful one, through language” (Baez 125). Negi’s experience is similar to that of Baez. Her success begins with English; for instance, being able to recite a monologue in English for an audition is what leads to her acceptance into a Performing Arts high school that eventually leads to her acceptance to Harvard University. This novel was written originally almost entirely in English and was later translated into Spanish by Santiago herself; the Spanish words and phrases that appear in the book are almost always translated, including the epigraphs that appear at the beginning of each chapter. Gustavo Pérez Firmat argues that the novel is not intended for a Latino readership, stating, “Puerto Ricans don’t need to be taught

how to eat a guava, but Santiago was not writing for them, as the glossary of Spanish words at the end of the book also suggests. As one reads the memoir one comes upon conversations whose real interlocuter is not the young Esmeralda but the adult non-Hispanic reader” (6). Until recently, books written in English were more prone to be commercially successful. This is one of the reasons why Santiago did not originally write her book for a Spanish-speaking audience until later when, as Juliana de Zavalía explains, the demand for books written in Spanish began to grow and Santiago translated her book into Spanish (198). However, the dominance of English with the retention of some Spanish words and phrases in this memoir also demonstrate that Santiago has embraced the language of her new life, but that the language of her childhood still lives on within her and bears a great deal of importance to her. She herself explains at the beginning of the Spanish translation of her novel,

When I write in English, I have to translate from Spanish, the keeper of my memories; when I speak in Spanish, I have to translate from the English that defines my present.

And when I write in Spanish, I find myself in the midst of three languages, the Spanish of my childhood, the English of my adulthood, and the Spanglish that constantly crosses over from one world to the other, just as crossed from our neighborhood in Puerto Rico to the ‘barriadas’ in Brooklyn (Zavalida 199).

It is, perhaps, through the language of the novel that Santiago’s biculturation is the most obvious. She does not fully abandon Spanish, nor does she fully accept English; instead, she writes mostly in English in order to be read by a greater audience but insists on the retention of Spanish in small ways throughout the novel. This bilingualism reflects that Santiago is not fully Puerto Rico nor fully American; she is some of both.

In conclusion, Negi has both left behind and held onto pieces of her Puerto Rican identity. She does not rely on the ontological and looks for epistemological explanations for that which she does not understand, even if these explanations do not exist. In addition, she does not comply with the gender norms her culture has abided by, opting to remain single and make her own way in the world without being dependent on a man and expresses her sexuality although this is commonly frowned upon by her community. While Negi embraces the opportunities and lifestyle of the U.S. and understands that some pieces of Puerto Rico must remain on the island of her childhood, she still acknowledges the significance of her Puerto Rican identity and incorporates it into her adult life where appropriate, such as in the Spanish language she uses in the novel. *When I Was Puerto Rican* sends the important message to Latinos and to all migrant groups who experience biculturation that it is okay to be some of both. Neither culture has to be abandoned; in fact, it is possible for the combination of two or many cultures to create one that is equally as beautiful and unique as those that help to build it.

Works Cited

- Asencio, Marysol W. "Machos and Sluts: Gender, Sexuality, and Violence among a Cohort of Puerto Rican Adolescents." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly: International Journal for the Analysis of Health*, vol. 13, no. 1, March 1999, pp. 107-126.
- Baez, Benjamin. "Learning to Forget: Reflections on Identity and Language." *Journal of Latinos and Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2002, pp. 123-132.
- Firmat, Gustavo Pérez. "Sel u no sel." *Review: Literature and Arts of the Americas*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2009, pp. 5-10.
- Hofweber, Thomas. "Logic and Ontology." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2018, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Oct. 4, 2004.
- Mayock, Ellen C. "The Bicultural Construction of Self in Cisneros, Álvarez, and Santiago." *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, vol. 23, no. 3, 1998, pp. 223-229.
- Santiago, Esmeralda. *When I Was Puerto Rican*. Da Capo Press, 2006.
- Steup, Matthias. "Epistemology." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2018, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Dec. 14, 2005.
- Zavalía, Juliana de. "The Impact of Spanish-American Literature in Translation on U.S. Latino Literature." *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, edited by Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre, University of Ottawa Press, 2000, pp. 188-206.

Repression, Fantasy, and Desire in Jackson's *The Haunting of Hill House*

The haunted house is one of the most popular tropes used in novels to frighten readers. Stephen King's *The Shining*, Richard Matheson's *Hell House*, and Susan Hill's *The Woman in Black* all use the trope of the haunted house, but horror is rarely the only function of these houses. Critics have noted that the trope of the haunted house provides an adequate workspace for examining the processes of the mind, such as the house in Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*. Novels such as these reflect interest in "psychic grotesquerie" that highlights the "landscapes of the mind," which are deranged by the "psychological obsessions" of the characters (Punter 2). Shirley Jackson's *The Haunting of Hill House* displays this type of psychological approach to horror. Hill House undergoes investigation by Dr. Montague and his guests in order to explain the psychic phenomena in the House. Among these guests is Eleanor Vance, whose connection to the house soon becomes psychologically detrimental. While the rest of the group find themselves unable to explain the supernatural happenings in the House, causing them to regard the events as either natural or paranormal, Eleanor shows a unique susceptibility to the House. This vulnerability, fueled by her past and ongoing fantasies, leads her to accept the House as a place where she might obtain all of her desires, such as a place in which she feels she belongs. However, the House as an embodiment of "absolute reality" (Jackson 3) – which I will argue is an unrealizable reality or truth – forces Eleanor to face elements of her past that she wishes to forget. Jackson's novel uses the tropes of the haunted house and the repressive qualities of child-like fantasy to reveal that Eleanor's journey towards consummating her desires is impossible due to her inability to recognize and progress from the underlying truths of her character.

It is Eleanor's past that has made her susceptible to Hill House. She had spent eleven years caring for her mother, and in that time she became lonely

Watermark

and unsocial. Throughout the novel, Eleanor reveals many desires that develop in defiance of her past experiences. One of these is her longing to find and be her true self, a desire for independence, which is understood from her comment, “insist on your cup of stars; once they have trapped you into being like everyone else you will never see your cup of stars again” (Jackson 22). This derives from evident effect her mother has had on her:

Her years with her mother were built around small guilts and small reproaches, constant weariness, and unending despair. Without ever wanting to become reserved and shy, she had spent so long alone, with no one to love, that it was difficult for her to talk, even casually, to another person without feeling self-consciousness and an awkward inability to find words. (6-7)

Eleanor had lost most of her own will and personality while caring for her mother. Most influential is Eleanor’s desire for belonging and for a home and family, one that is not as damaging as the one she has come from. This desire explains her insistence on considering herself and the rest of the group at Hill House as a family (97). She wants to become “[a]n Eleanor ... who belongs” (61). Unfortunately, her later statement, “I am home” (232), indicates that believes that she has found this belonging with the House, instead of with the individuals around her. Having such a damaged past makes her an eligible candidate for the House to prey on. She is the weakest member of the group, the one most in need of change and willing to accept what is to come; after all, as Eleanor expresses, she has “been waiting for something like Hill House” all her life (7).

Jackson begins her novel by challenging the construction of reality, suggesting that “absolute reality” may not be experienced for long without losing one’s sanity (3). According to Patricia Waugh, it is necessary to identify reality as something “subjectively constructed” (26), and, through fiction, we might “discover how we each ‘play’ our own realities” (35). The reader is led to wonder what sort of reality is absolute and what might constitute it as a threat to one’s sanity. Here, Vijay Mishra’s observations of “The Gothic Sublime” prove helpful. Traditionally, the sublime is “a fundamentally religious category” that considered the subject’s attachment to God as an attachment to an “absolute Other, a wholly Other, who exists beyond concept.” This relationship, however, has the capacity to become a “negative sublime – uncanny, unfamiliar, awe-inspiring, beyond representation (Mishra 290). That which is indescribable but induces feelings of awe and desire is defined as *ineffable*. It is impossible to give a name to or put into language that which is ineffable because “to do so is more than mortals can bear” (Wilson 114). Jackson’s absolute reality is, then, supernatural and beyond human comprehension. It may, at first, mask itself as something pleasant and desirable, only to be revealed as something dangerous and negative. Eleanor falls into this trap. She comes into contact with House’s “absolute reality” and, just as Jackson has predicted, is not able to “exist sanely” for long under its conditions (Jackson 3).

In light of these examinations, another interpretation of “absolute reality” is that it represents absolute truth. The original religious framework of the sublime offers an explanation for this. If the absolute truth behind human existence is of likeness to an “absolute Other,” then it is also beyond human comprehension and, crucially, detrimental to be witness to. While an individual might desire the truth, it is not possible for them to know what this truth is. Furthermore, in a more literal manner, the truth might reveal information that an individual may have wished to have left forgotten, or it might reveal truths counter to the ones the individual has already constructed for themselves. In this regard, the truth will have revealed something about individual’s own existence that they had not wished to face; this is so for Eleanor. The House forces her to face elements of her own existence that she wishes not to be true. In this way, Waugh’s idea that individuals construct their own realities becomes crucial. An individual will construct their own reality – which Eleanor accomplishes through fantasy – in order to protect him or herself from the unwelcome truth.

Dreaming, or creating fantasies, becomes the barrier that shields any human being from the truth or the ineffable. If one considers Jackson’s concept of absolute reality as one that is unrealizable and detrimental, then our own constructions of reality are necessary to protect us from that danger. For the purposes of this essay, dreaming will be understood as fantasy, so as to suggest the deliberate creation of fantasy in order to fabricate one’s own understanding of reality. This concept is highlighted throughout the novel via Eleanor, who is an elaborate builder of fantasy wherever she goes. During her journey to Hill House, she creates a number of scenarios in her head. When passing a large house she begins to imagine that “she might live there” (Jackson 18), but her imagination becomes excessive:

Every morning I swept the porch and dusted the lions, and every evening I patted their heads good night, and once a week I washed their faces and manes and paws with warm water and soda and cleaned between the teeth with a swab ... When I slept it was under a canopy of white organdy, and a nightlight guarded me from the hall. People bowed to me on the streets of the town because everyone was very proud of my lions. (18)

Eleanor’s constructions have an excessive quality to them that include elaborate details such as the stone lions at this home’s front gate and unusual scenarios of people bowing to her in the street. Her inclination for fantasy is an example of how an individual might shape, or *play out*, their own realities as Waugh has suggested. This instance of fantasy, though, allows Eleanor to ignore the fact that she has stolen her sister’s car and is, essentially, running away from her troubles at home. Her journey to Hill House, and the fantasies that accompany it, allow her to overlook the unpleasant reality of her actions.

Hill House uses Eleanor’s weakness for fantasy to lure her into its trap of “absolute reality.” It is her fantastical imagination that keeps her from seeing

Watermark

the immediate danger threatening both her sanity and her life, up until the moment of her death. When the other individuals realize how dangerous Hill House has become for Eleanor, they decide to send her away, but by this time Eleanor has decided she cannot leave or, rather, that “Hill House means [her] to stay.” Regardless, the others are able to convince her to leave. As she drives away from the House, though, her imagination steps in for one last time: “But by now they must be beginning to realize; I wonder who notices first? ... I can hear them calling now, she thought, and the little footsteps running through Hill House and the soft sound of the hills pressing closer” (245). Her fantasy is overwhelmingly driven by her desire to finally do something “all by [herself].” This dreamy state is broken, however, by the “crashing second before the car hurled into the tree,” during which she rightly questions, “*Why* am I doing this?” (246). Up until this moment, she had not realized that what she was doing was suicidal; to her, it appeared to be an act that was finally all her own, a consummation of her desires. Her fantasy – both her belief that the House meant her to stay and her internal rambling as she sped her car towards the tree – veil the reality she is soon to face, her death.

There are defining moments in which Eleanor appears to have truly lost her sanity to the House, and one of these is during the picnic that she and Theodora encounter. In this scene, the two are walking through the grounds of Hill House at night, but the imagery describes them as walking into an unsettling black-and-white image: “the trees, silent, relinquished the dark color they had held, paled, grew transparent ... [t]he grass was colorless, the path wide and black” (175). They eventually come to a point where the path ends, and the colorless grass is transformed into a rich green; the sun shines, and an array of colors become visible to Eleanor. She describes a picnic scene with a family, hearing children laughing, a mother and father, and a puppy (Jackson 176). The curious difference that Wilson notes in this scene is that the reader only knows what Eleanor sees, not Theodora. Theodora screams and yells in fear to Eleanor, “Don’t look back – don’t look – run!” (177). After the event, Theodora is unable to describe anything that happened. However, she expresses a sense of horror and guilt from having looked back: crying and laughing thinly, she says, “I went on and looked behind us . . .” Her inability to communicate what she sees shows that it was “indescribable ... something that she either *cannot* or cannot *bear* to describe” (Wilson 119). In comparison to this is Eleanor’s ability to describe what she sees with ease. During this event, she had, at first, thought to herself that she was afraid, but when she begins to see her colorful vision, her fears become practical: “she was afraid she might stumble over the puppy” (Jackson 177). However, Theodora’s screaming and telling Eleanor to run suggests something entirely more horrifying than a picnic and puppies. The vision, therefore, does not appear as a horrifying hallucination to Eleanor, but as what she wishes it to be. The elements of the picnic coincide with Eleanor’s own desires: a happy

family enjoying a picnic. Her vulnerability to fantasy (an innocent image of a picnic and puppies) shields her from the terrifying experience that Theodora witnessed.

What is often ignored in regards to Hill House is the fact that it is a living entity that is able to act upon its victims. Even Jackson, in a note on an old home she once lived in, believed in a house capable of living and acting upon those who lived within it. She states that her old home “had grave reservations about [her family] and would allow [them] to feel only provisionally at home” (“Good Old House” 223). This figure of a house as able to feel and have various effects on people clearly reflects her creation of Hill House, for the House, from the beginning of the novel, is described as “not sane,” “vile...diseased,” and “disturbed, perhaps. Leprous. Sick. Any of the popular euphemisms for insanity; a deranged house” (Jackson 3, 33, 70). Anything that is sick or insane must certainly be alive. Its liveliness is further confirmed in that its central room is described as the “heart of the house” (119). In other words, it contains a central organ that maintains it. The House’s liveliness allows it to be discernable as a monster, as is necessary in any horror novel. Noël Carroll states that a “monster may be threatening psychologically, morally, or socially,” but a monster may even be “physically dangerous” (43). While one of Dr. Montague’s guests, Luke, states that he does not feel “in any *physical* danger” from the House, Eleanor challenges this thought by saying that she feels the House is, rather, trying to “consume us, take us into itself” (139). This imagery of consumption suggests a physical danger but it not does neglect the other dangers Carroll references. To make victims a part of itself is to threaten the victims’ individuality and being, which reflects the idea that monsters might “destroy one’s identity” (Carroll 43). Hill House’s desire to consume individuals confirms its being “diseased” and “leprous.” It is something infectious that passes on its disease, infecting the victim well. There are no ghosts in Hill House; the terror of it is the House itself, and its representation of something ineffable. This ineffability as well as its characterization as a living organism, turns it into a monster that is wholly capable of choosing its victims and luring them “into itself,” as it does Eleanor, proving dangerous to both the mind and body.

The ways in which the House lures Eleanor into its trap are specific and all connected to her repressed past with her mother. Because of this, Sigmund Freud’s concept of the uncanny applies to the hauntings of Hill House. Freud describes the uncanny as “that class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar” (825). The uncanny has a sense of familiarity but also of the unknown (826). Hill House uses elements of Eleanor’s past in frightening ways. A clear example of this is seen in the first supernatural event in the House. Eleanor wakes to the sound of banging on the walls and hears a voice calling her name. She instantly exclaims, “Coming, mother, coming” (127). She starts and realizes that she is in Hill House but still insists on

Watermark

thinking, “My mother is knocking on the walls.” The House mimics the past experiences Eleanor has had with her mother, creating both a familiar and frightening experience for her. The association of the sound with her mother is later proven significant. Eleanor reveals that the night her mother died, “she knocked on the wall and called me and called me and I never woke up” (212). She later confesses, “It was my fault my mother died.” The event, then, not only mimics Eleanor’s experience with her mother but also serves as a reminder of her guilt. It confirms the notion that “everything is [unfamiliar] that ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light” (Freud 828). Thus, the House embodies a familiar entity that Eleanor is not able to ignore, while also bringing to light secrets she has been withholding. More than once, the group stumbles upon writing on the walls that says, “HELP ELEANOR COME HOME” (146, 155). The only individual who would be likely to cry to Eleanor for help to come home would be her mother. The House, having written this message itself, establishes an even more personal connection with Eleanor by knowing her name. One might also consider Freud’s examinations of the word *heimlich*. Deriving from “‘homelike’, belonging to the house,” Freud establishes that it inevitably “coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*” (828). It will be familiar, but terrifyingly so. Thus, the House’s façade of being welcoming cannot be trusted.

The House also lures Eleanor through its understanding of her desires. Eleanor’s journey into becoming a part of Hill House is confirmed by the House’s playful performance with Mrs. Montague, who claims to be able to communicate with the ghosts of Hill House. During a séance that Mrs. Montague leads with the help of her assistant, Arthur, she asks the ghosts, “Who are you?” The House then responds, “Eleanor Nellie Nell Nell” (Jackson 192). The House thus takes possession of Eleanor’s name and continues by naming Eleanor’s own desires:

“What do you want?” Arthur read.

“Mother,” Mrs. Montague read back.

“Why?”

“Child.”

“Where is your mother?”

“Home.”

“Where is your home?”

“Lost. Lost. Lost.” (193)

The responses indicate a desire for the bond between mother and child, for childhood itself, and for a home that has been lost. They clearly mimic Eleanor’s erratic attachment to her deceased mother, linked both to the mother and to the idea of home. Eleanor’s feelings toward her mother are ambiguous. It is difficult to conclude whether she truly misses her mother, or if she is haunted by the guilt of her death. This scene also invites one to associate this state of being lost with Eleanor’s state of being without a real home. Is the desire for home a desire for the home she has lost, or desire for a new home? The answer is unclear. It reflects

the same sort of conflicts embodied in Freud's concept of the uncanny. The House uses that which is lost but familiar – Eleanor's home and her mother – to attract her to it.

Early on, Eleanor recognizes the House as potentially living and acting upon them, which the others in the group are reluctant to do. During a discussion about their purpose at Hill House, Eleanor suggests, "I don't think we could leave now if we wanted to" (75), but the others reject the idea that the House is in control. She begins to notice a pattern in their conversations; when the topic of fear comes about, or when they attempt to explain the happenings in the house, "the conversation [is] being skillfully guided away from the thought of fear." She further thinks that "she was to be allowed to speak occasionally for all of them" (98). This is because she believes herself to be a product of fear, one who has experienced "every kind of fear." Her sense of fear is dulled and this allows her to accept the horrifying notion that the House is in control. The only thing the group does come to an agreement on is that something *does* happen in Hill House; Dr. Montague suggests that "the menace of the supernatural is that it attacks where modern minds are weakest, where we have abandoned our protective armor of superstition and have no substitute defense." Thus, the individuals most strongly targeted by supernatural powers are those who would be the most unsettled by tangible evidence of what they know (or what they think they know) to be false. Time spent in Hill House, then, is a threat to reality itself, a place where one questions what is real and what is not. Eleanor's suggestion is that "none of this is real," a statement rebuked by the Doctor but noted by Eleanor as a truth that they cannot recognize (140). On the subject of reality, Wilson notes that it "constitutes the ultimate threat to human existence and sanity" (120). Wilson's study progresses from this to suggest that the House's representation of reality reveals that reality is, in fact, nothing, a meaningless void. This appears to be what Eleanor is suggesting – that reality is nothing. It is understandable, then, for the Doctor to rebuke Eleanor for "venturing far too close to the state of mind which would welcome the perils of Hill House" (Jackson 140). To accept reality as nothing is madness and terrifying in itself.

Counter to Eleanor's perception of the House as alive and in control is Dr. and Mrs. Montague's reliance on scientific and paranormal explanations. The Doctor, especially, clings to scientific and logical explanations. Fear, he states, "is the relinquishment of logic" (159). He references various theories that attempt to explain the happenings at Hill House as "psychic" disturbances, the "result of subterranean waters, or electric currents, or hallucinations caused by polluted air" (71). Mrs. Montague believes that the House is full of spirits "*suffering* because they are aware that you [the group] are afraid of them" (183). The husband-and-wife duo continually battle over their respective explanations, each believing the other to be impossible. The bickering goes to show that "[i]gnorance, rationalization, and blindness are the only alternatives to madness in

Watermark

the world of Hill House” (Wilson 120), and the frustration of this inability to see things as how they really are is reflected through Eleanor. The Doctor and his wife’s desperation to find either paranormal or scientific explanations mirrors the Doctor’s complaint that people are “always so anxious to get things out into the open where they put a name to them, even a meaningless name” (71). However, their desire to *know* and give a name to what is happening in Hill House is undermined by the constant insinuation that the House is more than just haunted by spirits or influenced by scientific phenomena. The imbalance between supernatural and natural explanations shows that the novel harbors qualities of “the fantastic,” as defined by Tzvetan Todorov. Noël Carroll defines Todorov’s genre as “an oscillation between naturalistic and supernatural explanations,” and he considers Jackson’s novel to be a prime example of this type of genre (145–46). He notes various contradictions that are present in the novel, notably, the debate between Eleanor’s “possession [or] madness” (147). The inclusion of supernatural and scientific explanations in the novel become altogether confusing when in conflict with one another. The inclination is to discard them because of their ridiculousness, just as Eleanor discards one of the events as “too silly” (156). She says this when the House writes her name on the wall for a second time. Only, this time, Eleanor cannot understand why the House would do such a thing. By this point, the possibility of a ghost trying to frighten her is a ridiculous idea.

Hill House would not have the effect it does on Eleanor if repression did not play the role that it does in the novel, which is communicated through childlike behavior and fantasy. These are displayed through the use of language in the relationship between Eleanor and Theodora. Theodora often calls Eleanor names such as “[p]oor baby” (45), and Eleanor even refers to herself as “a very silly baby” (94). Notably, though, the early stages of their relationship plays out like that of “two little girls” (57). This language serves to “create a barrier of nostalgia and regret” (Coveney 240), connected both to Eleanor’s past and present. Considering that her relationship with her sister has been damaged from an early stage, it is likely that Eleanor’s willingness to have this relationship with Theodora, such that Theodora takes on the likeness of a bossy, big sister, is a reflection of her desire for a relationship she never had. For Theodora, it is a means of temporary distraction. Before her arrival at Hill House, it is said that she argues with her female roommate so much that “only time could eradicate” the issue (9). She has accepted Dr. Montague’s invitation to Hill House to get away. And so the relationship she develops with Eleanor becomes a temporary replacement for the one she has lost.

A further example of childlike behavior is the presence of games within the novel. Luke, Eleanor, and Theodora are seen taking part in or referencing to various children’s games such as hide-and-seek and tic-tac-toe and racing each other across the House. But most notable is their imaginative play, their ability to play off one another to create wild stories about themselves as children do:

“I live a mad, abandoned life, draped in a shawl and going from garret to garret.”

“Are you heartless and wanton?” Luke asked. “Or are you one of the fragile creatures who will fall in love with a lord’s son and pine away?”

“Losing all your beauty and coughing a good deal?” Theodora added.

“I rather think I have a heart of gold,” Eleanor said reflectively. (62)

This is a small example of how the three introduce themselves to one another. The conversation begins as one normally would, with general information such as names, but it soon becomes a game of make-believe in which each character creates a wild description of him or herself. In this way, their behavior acts as a “means of detachment and retreat from the adult world” (Coveney 241), or as an escape from having to mean anything (Waugh 38), either allowing freedom from the responsibilities of their own lives or a nostalgic desire for that which is lost.

What Eleanor’s relationship with the House goes to show is that the supposed freedom found through childlike behavior – her play with fantasy – is actually unobtainable. Coveney further notes that the “freedom” of childlike behavior is an illusion. It is merely a “regressive escape into the emotional prison of self-limiting nostalgia” (241). As she spends more time in the House, it becomes clear that Eleanor’s desires are unobtainable. Her desire for a sisterly relationship with Theodora is denied when she announces to Theodora that she is going back home with her (208). Theodora, naturally, denies this request and questions, “Do you *always* go where you’re not wanted?” So Eleanor must admit that she has “never been wanted *anywhere*” (209). Whatever romantic attachment she might have had with Dr. Montague or Luke is destroyed as well, as Dr. Montague’s wife arrives at the House, and Luke becomes “selfish” and “simply not very interesting” to her (167). Additionally, Eleanor has continuously insisted on creating fantasies about her dream home and has relied on the lie that she lives alone in this made-up home. Despite this fantasy, though, she must come to admit that she has no home at all. During her stay at Hill House, the fantasies that might connect her to the real world are destroyed one by one. It becomes more simple, “more sensible” (239), for her to stay within the “comforts of Hill House” (244). This is because, as Eleanor has realized upon her arrival at the House, “there was nowhere else to go” (40). The beginning of the novel suggests that Hill House is a place for those who “walked alone” (3), and so it is only fitting that Eleanor should belong to the House. But even the comforts she thinks she has found in the House reveal themselves to be false.

It has been noted that the House desires to bring its victims into itself, and Eleanor has surely reached this point of immersion with it. There are telling moments in which Eleanor and the House appear to be one. Eleanor thinks, “All this noise is coming from inside my head ... I am disappearing inch by inch into this house” (201). During this time, the group is huddled together while

Watermark

the House performs another banging-on-the-walls episode, but Eleanor begins to question whether it is she, not the House, that is doing it. Her thinking “I can hear everything, all over the house” (206) suggests that she has acquired an otherworldly psychic ability, giving her the impression that she is everywhere at once. At this stage, Waugh’s concept of the “illynx” character is helpful, which is “an entropic, self-annihilating form” of character that “loses him or herself in a fantasy world” (40-41). She has become so deeply involved with the House that she does not appear to be a part of the real world anymore, similar to her experience of stepping into the absolute reality of the picnic scene. During her final night at Hill House, she approaches Theodora’s room and takes on a familiar behavior: she “pounded and slapped the door, laughing, and shook the doorknob and then ran swiftly down the hall to Luke’s door and pounded” (229). The act mimics that of the first haunting she had experienced; she has become the House itself, which is evident in her establishing the relationship by saying “we trick them so easily” (230). By this time she has determined that “[t]ime is ended now ... all *that* gone and left behind” (232), indicating that she believes her life in the real world is now behind her. This statement indicates that she is in a place beyond that of the reality we might know and understand. This, again, references Jackson’s definition of “absolute reality” as being an indescribable space, where time and meaning escape significance. However, this also suggests that her both her sense of individuality and her sense of reality have been lost. Eleanor is detached from her true self, finding home in the fantastical reality she has created of Hill House. This “spell” (232) is, however, broken in the seconds before her death, when the veil of her fantasies is finally lifted and she sees all things as they truly are.

The others are able to leave Hill House unscathed not only because they are less susceptible to the House than Eleanor, but also because of the various realities that they have attached to the House in order to explain the events taking place. Dr. Montague leaves with enough conclusions to write an article on “the psychic phenomena of Hill House” (246), but whether this article includes the sad case of Eleanor is unknown. Mrs. Montague’s experience with the House gives her no other avenue but to insist on paranormal manifestations, and it is briefly mentioned that Luke disappears to Paris, insinuating that he is able to easily slip back into his life of luxury. The only possible exception is Theodora who, in the picnic scene, had a glimpse of the true horror of Hill House. But, instead of accepting it as Eleanor did, she “completely blocks [the event] out” and retreats into a “world where events make sense” (Wilson 119). These characters’ perceptions of the House reflect humanity’s inability to name the ineffable. In the face of bizarre events, they are repeatedly unable to explain the reality of Hill House and what is happening. Hill House’s absolute reality, for them, goes unrealized, and they slip back into their own realities, content with their own perceptions.

Jackson's novel explores the issues of guilt and desire through the sensitive personality of Eleanor. Eleanor's fantasy world has protected her from the truth of absolute reality for most of her stay in the House and, because of this, the House has been able to lure her into a false sense of security constructed by the promise of independence, love, and belonging. Her slow detachment from the other characters, paired with her deepening connection to the House, reveals the various ways in which her fantasies are unobtainable, in such that her fantasies cannot be consummated in the real world. This shows that the House reveals to its victims their own absolute realities. In Eleanor's moment of death, her realization of things as they truly are means her realizing the horrible truth of her own existence. She killed her mother, was loved by no one, and has not had a home in the world. Essentially, she was nothing. This brings forth, once again, Wilson's notion that "the end" represents something worse than death. Confronting absolute reality might lead not only to a loss of the self but to a horrifying realization that our lives are meaningless, or that we, individually, mean nothing. Hill House becomes a reflection of what we fear most, that is: "seeing ourselves clearly and without disguise" (Jackson 159).

Works Cited

- Carroll, Noël. *The Philosophy of Horror: or Paradoxes of the Heart*. Routledge, 1990.
- Coveney, Peter. *The Image of Childhood*. Penguin Book, 1957.
- Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Leitch, Vincent B., W.W. Norton & Company, 2010, pp. 824-41.
- Jackson, Shirley. *The Haunting of Hill House*. Penguin Books, 1959.
- . "Good Old House." *Let Me Tell You*, ed. by Laurence Jackson Hyman and Sarah Hyman Dewitt, Random House, 2015, pp. 223-32.
- Mishra, Vijay. "The Gothic Sublime." *A New Companion to the Gothic*, ed. by David Punter, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2012, pp. 288-306, *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/csulb/detail.action?docID=843409>
- Punter, David. *The Literature of Terror: The Gothic Tradition*. Longman Group Limited, 1996.
- Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. Routledge, 1984.
- Wilson, Michael T. "'Absolute Reality' and the Role of the Ineffable in Shirley Jackson's *The Haunting of Hill House*." *Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2015, pp. 114-23, *CSULBLibrary*, doi: 10.1111/jpcu.12237

Reckoning with the “Self-Made” Man of Post-Revolutionary America: Hawthorne and Irving on Fragile Nationality

For some prominent early American Renaissance authors, writing vignettes of America in the time after the Revolution proved to be a challenge, in that the domineering patriotism of the masses unilaterally opposed any critique of the new nation’s fight for independence. Nathaniel Hawthorne and Washington Irving directly tackled the tension developed by these conflicting ideologies, subversively expounding unpopular, though complex, perspectives on the infantile nature of American nationality. When read as illustrative representations of a post-revolutionary America, Hawthorne’s “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” and Irving’s “Rip Van Winkle,” reveal how collisions of temporal and spatial rhythms create new formal spaces for the male protagonists that are posed at the interstices of these collisions. Whereas the operating spatial rhythms of colonial versus independent America are present in “Rip,” Hawthorne similarly utilizes Irving’s dualistic representation, but complicates “Major” further with yet another spatial dichotomy: that of the urban versus the country. By analyzing the effects of these instances of spatial duality in concurrence with the temporal rhythms represented by the protagonists’ ages, we can better understand the intricacies of identity politics within this period. While both authors might seem to prime readers to view the stories as patriotic confirmations of a static American identity, both stories actually reveal the ways in which these assumptions displace the far more complex compositions of “American” identity.

These assumptions of a standardized patriotic narrative arise from seemingly sensible ideological formulations of identity, some of which developed before the Revolutionary War had even ended. Dispatches from revolutionary writers reveal a thread of boundless optimism, such as J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur in *Letters*

from an American Farmer, who observes how American “[m]en are like plants,” in which “the goodness and flavour of the fruit proceeds from the peculiar soil and exposition in which they grow” (56). This may well be the start of his answer to the overall question, “What then is the American, this new man?”; his final stance with regard to this question changes to express a more nuanced understanding of American identity (54). Yet, in this initial visceral response, Crevecoeur urges readers to consider how the “American man” reflects his environment, and to see the ways he sprouts from the soil as if almost nourished by the idea that it belongs to him. In this sense, the strictures of their past, the religious mores, and the societal striations are abandoned, or at the very least ignored, particularly when Crevecoeur insists, “*He* is an American, who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced” (54, emphasis added). While I agree with Crevecoeur’s insinuation that the “American man” develops partially as a product of his environment, I challenge the assumption that the “American man” sheds the “prejudices and manners” in favor of the new ones he creates or finds in his environment.

While Crevecoeur’s mythos of the “American man” has its basis in a simple formulation of male identity, the protagonists of “Rip Van Winkle” and “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” complicate this narrow conception of the “self-made” man in America; in their containment of qualities, deemed correlative to either the colonies or the new nation of America, both Rip and Robin challenge the belief that those qualities are inherent to their respective nationalities. It is in this way that I hope to re-work the historical consideration of this issue to move away from a diametrical opposition of British patterns and American progressions, to one that considers the transitory nature of the multiple temporal rhythms that operated during post-revolutionary America.

For the protagonists of these stories, establishing the self amidst a temporal moment desperate for a unified national identity results in a bout of confusion; becoming an American, as exhibited in “Rip” and “Major,” does not seem as natural as Crevecoeur’s notion of male environment-based identity. Upon his awakening, Rip Van Winkle struggles to place himself within an ambiguous temporality, where, as a literal remnant of the past, he is interpolated into a new era. Similarly, in Hawthorne’s story, Robin experiences the same struggles to discern where he must stand in an environment that viciously discards his sense of loyalty to “past” norms. What these stories pose, if read superficially, is the sense that the cultural customs of the America before the revolution are heretofore null and void in the newly self-established America, or at the very least are vehemently rejected. While this resembles Crevecoeur’s understanding of America, this glancing analysis almost simplifies our understanding of these stories by not taking into consideration the ways in which demographic details, such as age and social standing, may change in accordance to or against

Watermark

this perceived paradigm shift. Both protagonists of “Rip” and “Major” tackle the propositions that their relative ages impose on their bodies as the ground beneath them begins to change in meaning.

Considering Victorian America’s prescriptive norms of age alongside the newly developing ideal of the self-made man, Rip evidently satisfies the standard in part, because of his relationship to the community, but fails to fulfill the role in its entirety. In order to better define what the “self-made man” entails, this paper will incorporate Thomas R. Cole’s *The Journey of Life: A Cultural History of Aging in America*. While Cole more broadly details the gradual move away from veneration of the elderly, he also provides a developed definition of the “self-made man” of Victorian America. Cole’s research provides evidence that highlights the Evangelical influence in the late 18th and early 19th century, much of which provided some of the framework for the conception of the “self-made” man in America. In Cole’s formulation of this term, there seemed to be a call for a reigning in of the self, particularly when he states, “Disciplining his desire for material wealth and calming the persistent anxieties of his lonely struggle for advancement, the ideal self-made man followed a strict regimen of industry, self-denial, and restraint” (Cole 78-79). Viewing Rip Van Winkle in this way, it is clear that this sense of self-discipline was absent within him, whether he lived in the colonies or in America. This “lonely struggle for advancement” mentioned by Cole is key to understanding that Rip, in his youth and with his penchant for idleness, could prevail as such in the more communal environment of the colonies, even as it is not readily accepted as responsible. Though, Rip makes a clear distinction in his lifestyle, and “in a word, Rip was ready to attend to any body’s business but his own; but as to doing family duty, and keeping his farm in order, it was impossible” (Irving 31). Rip definitely exhibits the “self-made man” characteristics of “self-denial” and “restraint” when he assists those in his community, yet simultaneously denies himself the “strict regimen of industry.” However, the definitions proposed for either the colonies or America demands a full commitment to those ideals, of which Rip only partially qualifies.

It should be taken into consideration that the “struggle for advancement” is less communal in the new America, and Rip should be held to the standards of the “self-made” man’s “strict regimen,” but his old age appears to make his idleness an acceptable mode of life. Yet again, Cole’s analysis of age relations in New England proves to be directly relevant to this discussion of Rip’s quality of life after the revolution; he found that those few elderly individuals without family nearby would be given assistance from the community (51). Especially revealing, we find that before the revolution, even though these elderly citizens needed help from others, “[n]evertheless, old people receiving public assistance were expected to be of service in whatever ways were possible” or they would be found “guilty of idleness” (Cole 51). Irving reflects this sentiment within the story in the crafting of Rip’s seemingly overcritical wife, who actually abides by

the socio-cultural norms more than her husband. If idleness, even in the elderly, was considered a crime before the revolution in America, then what are we to make of the treatment of idleness after the revolution? Does it not seem that Rip Van Winkle suddenly, seamlessly sidles into a more socially acceptable self-positioning?

Elderly Rip definitely maintains his penchant for idleness, and the community of Rip's village does not seem to mind nor feel compelled to make him work. Yet, it is not that the newly independent America directly indicates a specialized role for a person such as Rip to be accepted; it is the product of the temporal rhythms overlapping: that of his physical aging body, the newly developing temporal rituals of the industrious "self-made" man, and the spatial arrangements organized by those rhythms render the aged Rip what we might consider a domestic patriarch. I use the term based on the critical approaches of Caroline Levine's *Form: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network*; some of the questions she poses on this subject almost seem to speak specifically to "Rip Van Winkle," such as, "Did the domestic sphere appreciate in value when the old man came to inhabit it, or did his relegation to the feminine sphere of the home render him comparatively worthless? Was he masculine or feminine, contemptible or admirable, emptied of authority or filled with care?" (97). Though the term initially appears to be contradictory, elderly Rip is a patriarch only inasmuch as he is a man and domestic only because he lives in a home, albeit, one that does not even belong to him. As ineffectual as it is to validate the correlation, when the two words are put together, it may be a direct effort to render power to the word "domestic" by its association to patriarchy, or perhaps the term "domestic" castrates the effect of the patriarch. The double-meaning of the term "domestic patriarch," or perhaps even Levine's "maternal masculinity," exposes a more nuanced multiplicity in the story's protagonist, thus demonstrating the significance of age when factored into our understanding of the text (96).

Rip's identity straddles this intersection of rhythms, where his physical body is rendered weak, perhaps effeminate, and unable to participate in the rituals of the "self-made" man. Yet, as a man, Rip is also expected to uphold some sense of patriarchal normalcy, a position of which relegates him to an arbitrary role in the domestic sphere. The America that standardizes the "self-made" man does not take this elderly patriarch in the domestic sphere seriously, especially since, as Cole states, "revivalists in particular looked ahead to a millennial future cut loose from the imperfections of the past" (Cole 79). While this sense of generational hostility seems to be a direct movement towards validating obsolescence of the elderly, I do not argue that Rip Van Winkle is rendered obsolete by the new America. Even though the community does not attempt to find a role for him in the workforce, he doesn't become completely invisible, as he shares his story with those in the community. I contend that the overlapping or colliding rhythms of

Watermark

the colonies and of America provide Rip with an ambiguity to truly become a “self-made” individual, one that operates outside of this sense of “restraint” and “strict regimen of industry” that seem to prevail in definitions of the term.

Some critics have characterized this ambiguity as a matter of moral transgression, one that is upheld by clear-cut generational divisions. Robert Ferguson examines such transgressions in Rip’s character, noting that as “[a] symbol of American infancy and misplaced innocence, [Rip] is the adolescent who refuses to grow up and gets away with it” (530). While Ferguson suggests that Rip has an opportunity to reinvent himself, he garners more evidence to support the fact that Rip can contend with his new environment because the younger generations, though reluctant, provide for him. Rip is an adolescent in so much as he does not ascribe to either the colonial or American standard of duty, and can contentedly “chronicle...the old times ‘before the war’” though “[s]ome always pretended to doubt the reality of it” (Irving 40). Yet, the sense of America, and thus Rip, to be at an infancy of their respective circumstances is to re-state Crèvecoeur’s notion of men being akin to plants. This frames it in a way that presumes old customs to be a figment of the past, that everything “before the war” is left in that temporal container. The new America might have been better described as a mutation of sorts, owing to the many ways in which it enhanced or altered old customs to fit more into the average American man’s idealized way of life. But post-revolutionary America’s fragile claim to nationality demanded a stripping of old customs, though it would prove impractical to realize.

The consideration of America as being in a state of infancy in this time, as we know, has much to do with the relationship between Britain and America being that of a kinship, of Britain maintaining the parental role. As I’ve established, in reference to the predominant scholarship on the matter, post-revolutionary America had a complicated relationship with that of its elderly population, but that is not to say that its impositions on the youth of the nation were any less complex. Hawthorne’s “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” brings forth the same temporal collisions that occur in “Rip Van Winkle,” except in Hawthorne’s story, the protagonist is a young man actively searching for self-identity amidst a newly developing America. Whereas Rip searched for a way to fit his distinct identity in a new world, Robin must struggle to develop an identity whilst the changes in America occur.

Robin enters Hawthorne’s story as the antithesis of Cole’s definition of the self-made man. He relies on the potential for social mobility associated with the name Molineux and the inheritance promised by the man himself. Considering himself “well grown,” Robin “thought it high time to begin the world” and believed the beginning of his particular circumstances involved a reliance upon the Major Molineux (Hawthorne 342). Upon his realization that Molineux will not be of any aid to him, Robin remarks that the town life could not be for him, perhaps an expression of an inclination to revert to an older temporal rhythm.

When the gentleman that accompanies him states that Robin “may rise in the world, without the help of [his] kinsman, Major Molineux,” he seems to insist that Robin can have his own distinct sense of self entirely, without a memory of the past (Hawthorne 345). Yet, this insistence comes with a stipulation: that it is because Robin is a “shrewd youth,” he can better grapple with this stripping of old customs (345). Yet, this is not, as the gentleman seems to pose the issue, a simple matter, and Robin’s youth does not necessarily facilitate an ease into this “rise in the world.”

It is here again that we see the collision of temporal rhythms, where the rhythms of Robin’s age, his loyalty to past customs, and that of the idealized “self-made” man are not posed in direct opposition, but overlapped in such a way as to provide Robin with an alternative identity. Unlike “Rip Van Winkle,” Hawthorne’s story does not provide readers with a definitive outcome for the protagonist of his story, and there is no way to see how Robin acclimates to his new nationality. Readers have only to contend with Robin’s grappling with the uncanny quality of his experiences in the town. On this wave of emotions, Joseph Alkana adds: “The narrative obscurity that effectively amplifies Robin’s own anxious desire to find his kinsman may also be understood in terms of a less immediately apparent situation: the fear of mob rule and social disorder” (2). While Alkana seems to characterize Robin’s internal strife as a matter of “anxious desire” relative to his surroundings, it would be more precise to say that the environment’s “anxious desire” to inculcate a sense of the “American” way effectively quashes Robin’s expectations. Hawthorne articulates this notion in the story; as Robin observes the tar-and-feathering, he

seemed to hear the voices of the barbers; of the guests of the inn; and of all who had made sport of him that night. The contagion was spreading among the multitude, when, all at once, it seized upon Robin, and he sent forth a shout of laughter that echoed through the street; every man shook his sides, every man emptied his lungs, but Robin’s shout was the loudest there. (344)

In this moment, the narrative’s mention that Robin “seemed to hear the voices” makes it evident that the jarring quality of the moment dredges up all of the emotions felt throughout the night (my emphasis). The listing of “all who had made sport of him that night,” as a list of all who abide by the new democratic regime, effectually establishes within Robin an ideological standard by which he must compare himself. Thus, the narrative enacts the paradox of the “self-made man,” where individuals must act of their own volition and succeed by their own means, but the individual must also submit to the “contagion,” lest they be mistaken for a redcoat. Frederick Newberry’s *Hawthorne’s Divided Loyalties* touches on this briefly when he states, “It is not likely that the mob, composed of rummies and a prostitute, will feel the slightest regret over the displacement of this regal figure; but the story emotionally and morally urges that someone ought

Watermark

to feel a burden of guilt” (64). Robin falls somewhere in between the dichotomy created by these opposing forces, because though his “shout was the loudest there,” he fails to comprehend the reasoning behind his own “shout of laughter.” Robin’s liminality becomes further complicated when the reader considers how his age factors into his sense of agency.

In order to appropriately construct an analysis of age’s significance in these post-revolutionary stories, we must first acknowledge another critical element of “Major.” Apart from Hawthorne’s apparent dichotomy of the British colonies and the American nation, he also touches on the division of the urban versus the country. However, Hawthorne’s presentation of this particular division reveals a misleading presumption of spatial differences and geographical isolation. The idea that people in the country have absolutely no inclination to learn about their nation’s progressivisms parallels the archetype of the country bumpkin. While Hawthorne avoids caricature, Robin’s characterization misrepresents the urban/country dichotomy to the benefit of the story’s dramatic arc. Newberry indicates Hawthorne’s use of the “romantic dichotomy of cosmopolitan and rural life” as a device “upon which the tale depends;” but he insists that “it does seem inconceivable that a country youth... could be unacquainted with the political, anti-aristocratic animus pervading Boston unless it has not yet spread to the distant countryside from where he comes” (63). Newberry’s challenge to Hawthorne’s presumptions about this geographical division gives readers a better idea as to the contextual background of the post-revolutionary period.

Though Newberry makes a fairly bold claim about Hawthorne’s main literary device within the story, he does not directly cite any historical context that might uphold his argument. Thankfully, Alkana’s take on the same subject does provide historical support, noting that “[a]lthough antebellum New England industrialization was still in its early phases...the rural system of family farms had been breaking down for decades. As early as the 1790s, population growth could no longer be supported by New England farms” (6). In his analysis, Alkana continues to support the claim that the migration of country-grown men into a more urban populace had already been occurring for so long, that at the time of the story’s release, it would have seemed an unrealistic representation of the dichotomy. Taking Newberry’s criticism of Hawthorne and Alkana’s historical analysis of that criticism into consideration, it becomes evident that while the rural/cosmopolitan dichotomy sits at the forefront of the narrative, Hawthorne calls attention to another operative socio-economic trend that begins to develop at this time: that of the “shrewd” youth.

Yet, the ending plays out in such a way as to give the reader the impression that the only way in which the youth may make a name for himself in the new world is through his own self-determination. Readers are led to believe that parental relations with their children are so stringent, that when a child comes of age, he is let to his own means to configure his future. Judith Saunders’

scholarship on the advent of nepotism, and genetic relations gives us an idea of the ways in which Robin's assumption of an inheritance was not completely outlandish, as being the second son in his family leaves him with no prospects (27). Saunders finds that "At the bottom, however, it is exactly what its title promises—a story about claiming kinship. It scrutinizes nepotistic strategies, ruthlessly exposing the inclusive-fitness logic that drives them, along with the cost-benefit calculations that regulate them" (36). Though Saunders appreciates and understands the value of the historical contexts used in analyses of "Major," she finds significance in the part of the story that reveals the "complex variables" Molineux struggled with in determining who would benefit from his inheritance (36). Saunders elucidations on the value of kinship are integral to the analysis of Robin's identity; Robin comes from a temporal understanding that to have prospects is to ensure a stable future, and it would have been foolish of him to consider building a wealth of his own without anyone to help him. Formerly an intended inheritor, Rip suddenly finds himself disinherited; yet, it is not that he is disinherited by his family, but rather he loses his inheritance because of his country's revolt. Much like Rip, Robin seems lost in constructing his identity in a world that so violently rejects old customs. While Rip benefits from the double-meaning found in his position as a "domestic patriarch," Robin struggles with the superimposition of the "shrewd youth" on his identity, when he is actually a disinherited entrepreneur.

As the so-called self-made men of America struggle to shake off old norms, these protagonists straddle both worlds, and that straddling process makes it difficult for them to understand that temporal rhythms of their aging bodies. My particular reading of these two stories is not just a way of describing and reiterating our political or social considerations of an obvious paradigm shift, but it also intends to bring to light the ways in which that process of shifting is made difficult or confusing. In these stories, what we believe to see are rhythms of colonialism as colliding with rhythms of the new America, but as I've shown, defining the rhythms as strictly contained within either colonial or American modes becomes impossible. So, we must formulate in our interpretations a way to gravitate from temporal oppositions to that of temporal overlapping, and understand how America has not completed a maturation from "infancy," but has instead become a palimpsest of its past and present iterations. Ultimately, the protagonists of both stories struggle to develop personal identities at a time when the fragile nationality of America attempts to superimpose its demands on the bodies of its men; the bodies of either stories are complicated further by their representation of age, young and old. Where Rip Van Winkle's return sees the development of a domestic patriarch, Robin's experience reveals the position of a disinherited entrepreneur.

Works Cited

- Alkana, Joseph. "Disorderly History in "My Kinsman, Major Molineux"." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance*, vol. 1 no. 1, 2007, pp. iv-30. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/esq.2007.0000.
- Cole, Thomas. *The Journey of Life: A Cultural History of Aging in America*. Cambridge U P, 1992. Crevecouer, J. Hector St. John. *Letters from an American Farmer*. New York, Fox, Duffield, 1904. <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~hyper/crev/letter03.html>. Accessed 29 Oct 2018.
- Ferguson, Robert A. "Rip Van Winkle and the Generational Divide in American Culture." *Early American Literature*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2005, pp. 529–544. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25057421.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "My Kinsman, Major Molineux." *Norton Anthology of American Literature*, edited by Robert S. Levine, Norton, 2017, 332-345.
- Irving, Washington. "Rip Van Winkle." *Norton Anthology of American Literature*, edited by Robert S. Levine, Norton, 2017, 29-41.
- Levine, Caroline. *Forms: Whole: Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network*. Princeton U P, 2015.
- Newberry, Frederick. "Puritan Typology and Democratic Ideology: The Validity of Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Tales." *Hawthorne's Divided Loyalties*. Associated U P, 1987.
- Saunders, Judith P. "Nepotism in Hawthorne's 'My Kinsman, Major Molineux.'" *American Classics: Evolutionary Perspectives*, Academic Studies Press, Boston, 2018, pp. 23–36. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv4v3226.7.

An Equal Partnership: The Collaboration of Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst

Had William Randolph Hearst and Julia Morgan prescribed to the gender norms of their time, history may have never recorded their names next to one another. Though this could seem like an overstatement, the relationship between William Randolph Hearst and Julia Morgan truly was unconventional, and ahead of its time. Perhaps best known for her design of Hearst Castle in San Simeon, California, Julia Morgan was by definition an outlier. A woman in a field dominated by men, Julia Morgan went on to not only establish a prolific career, but also gain the patronage of one of America's most powerful men, William Randolph Hearst. I have found the dichotomy between these two key figures to be fascinating: one, on the margins of society, actively working against the restraints of her gender, the other, a picture of privilege and society's definition of success. From the beginning, the story I was most interested in telling through the Julia Morgan Papers archive was of her relationship with William Randolph Hearst. I was struck with questions pertaining to how their famous collaboration came about. What were the intricacies of their professional and personal relationship? In this paper, I argue for the interpretation of Julia Morgan as a proto-feminist figure, and William Randolph Hearst as an ally for equality. The archive has enabled me to compare these two figures side by side, bringing their individual stories together to create a new egalitarian narrative.

The research for this project was conducted in the Julia Morgan Papers collection at Robert E. Kennedy Library's Special Collections and Archives located at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. Comprised of architectural drawings and plans, office records, photographs, correspondence, project files, student work, family correspondence, and personal papers, the Julia Morgan Papers archive encapsulates and commemorates the architect's life and

Watermark

body of work, giving scholars an invaluable look at a trailblazing woman of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Working in the Julia Morgan Papers archive, I have been able to view primary source materials, interpret them for myself, and create a compelling narrative one document at a time. I have been able to handle materials created by a woman who was very much an outlier during her time—and an outlier who has unfortunately gone largely unnoticed until recent years, at that—demonstrating how archives enable scholars to move stories of the marginalized to the forefront of history. The archive allowed me to give Julia Morgan's life—and more specifically, her relationship with William Randolph Hearst—the platform to speak for itself. After all, how better to tell an unheard story than to listen to the voices and experiences of the players themselves? The archive has been especially invaluable to me as I have sought to research, discuss, and argue for Julia Morgan as a proto-feminist and William Randolph Hearst as an early ally for equality, and serves as an example of the creation of larger feminist identities and feminist discourses during the first wave of feminism in the United States. Providing people with the opportunity to tell their stories—whether they are from a time past and “speak” through the documents they have left behind, or are still alive in the present—is especially pertinent to a discussion of feminism and allyship. The archive has provided me with evidence I would not have been able to incorporate into my research otherwise, and has made personal the experiences of two very different people, brought together by a common goal and interest. This is their story.

In order to argue for the feminism and allyship of Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst, it is imperative to first understand, establish, and contextualize the history of the feminist movement in the United States, and their place within it. By the time Morgan and Hearst's collaboration began in 1919, it is true that the women's suffrage movement had already been well established for over 70 years—the beginnings of which are skillfully recounted by American historian, Ellen Carol DuBois, in her book, *Feminism and Suffrage*—but women were still a year away from gaining the vote (21). Raised in the mid to late nineteenth century, both Morgan (born in 1872) and Hearst (born in 1863) grew up in a world that was still largely dictated and controlled by—or at least remained under the influence of—the Victorian idea of separate spheres. In this cultural dichotomy, men were free to conduct themselves outside of the home, and engage in public concerns, while women were consigned to the home, and only permitted to engage in domestic concerns. Tracing the development of this idea and connecting it to the creation of the women's suffrage movement, and first wave of feminism, DuBois writes:

With the growth of industrial capitalism, production began to move outside the home. Yet woman's place, her “sphere,” remained within the family. Outside it there arose a public life that was considered man's sphere. Although public life was based on the growing

organization of production outside the home, its essence was understood not as economic experience, but as political activity... The woman suffrage movement was women's response to these developments. Driven by their relegation to a separate, domestic sphere, which had always been marked by inequality, especially their own, women were also drawn, like the men of their time, by the promise that political activity held for the creation of a truly democratic society. (16)

Contextualizing the upbringings of Morgan and Hearst within this historical backdrop reveals the progressive nature of their collaboration and partnership. Raised in a world that was very much in transition from a Victorian set of ideals to a more egalitarian ideology, both Morgan and Hearst found themselves located in a time that uniquely positioned them to become groundbreakers for feminism and allyship. In other words, while progress toward equality had been, and was being made leading up to the point of their collaboration, Morgan and Hearst's views relating to—and certainly their enacting of—gender still would have been considered progressive within the confines of their time. This is not to say, of course, that their ideologies were necessarily exclusive, or unique to the two of them alone; but rather, that while they could count themselves among a growing movement, the positions held by this movement were by no means fully embraced by the masses.

Before delving into the relationship between Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst, it is important to establish Morgan as a trailblazer in her own right. Writing in honor of her 2014 posthumous win of the American Institute of Architects' Gold Medal, architecture critic Christopher Hawthorne outlines Julia Morgan's impressive career resume:

Morgan, the first female architect to be licensed by the state of California, oversaw more than 700 built projects during her career, or an average of 15 per year between the time she founded her San Francisco office in 1904 and her decision to close it in 1951, when she was 79. (By contrast, Maybeck, her friend and mentor, completed an average of roughly two buildings per year.) (Hawthorne)

While Hawthorne rightly demonstrates the prolific nature of her work—as an architect in general, let alone as the first female architect to achieve all that she did—and offers a helpful overview of her career accomplishments, it is safe to say that in order to get an accurate picture of all that contributed to Julia Morgan's success and trailblazer status, one must look to her past to gain fuller understanding. In her article, "Julia Morgan: Gender, Architecture, and Professional Style," Karen McNeill describes the ways in which Morgan's upbringing established her view of gender and gender roles, arguing that the later accomplishments of her life's work and ideology of female potential were shaped by feminist maternal influences at home. Raised in what appeared to be a typical

Watermark

upper-middle-class household during the nineteenth to early twentieth century, Morgan's mother—Eliza Parmalee Morgan—was actually the primary source of the family's income, as she inherited a great fortune following the passing of her father. This dynamic, as well as her maternal grandmother coming to live with the Morgan family following her husband's death, created a foundation for Julia Morgan's unconventional perceptions of gender. Both her mother and grandmother were sources of income, as well as emotional support to Morgan and her siblings. As McNeill notes, "Throughout her childhood...Julia Morgan learned that men could not necessarily be relied upon for financial, social, or emotional stability, and that women could embody great strength and power" (232). From very early on in her life, Julia Morgan had a different perception of gender and the constraints placed upon women by society; her feminist mother and grandmother offered examples of strong, capable women who were not complacent or accepting of gender norms, but actively worked against them.

When it came to matters of education, Julia Morgan's upbringing also played a unique role in the development of her feminism, and can be attributed to both her academic, and professional success. The Morgan girls—Julia, and her younger sister, Emma—were encouraged to chase after scholarly pursuits just as much as their three brothers. Author and Julia Morgan biographer, Sara Holmes Boutelle, attributes the Morgan household's emphasis on education to their socio-economic position in society. In the first chapter of *Julia Morgan, Architect*, Boutelle recounts Julia Morgan's childhood and early years, writing, "The family maintained an upper-middle-class standard of living, with servants, formal calls, summers by the seashore, participation in civic affairs, and a firm belief in the importance of education for daughters as well as for sons" (Boutelle 20). Had it not been for the family's socioeconomic standing—which we have established was provided by the maternal influences in the family—and the ideologies that came along with it, Julia Morgan might not have had the same opportunities to pursue her interests through education. In fact, Boutelle further emphasizes this fact when discussing the Morgan family's willingness to promote Julia's selected career path: "The Morgans, like Julia's teachers, had recognized her talent and her determination, and they provided financial and emotional support for her unconventional plans" (Boutelle 25). While this awareness of female potential and power grew out of experiences at home, Karen McNeill writes that attending the University of California, Berkeley during a significant shift in rights for women students impacted Morgan all the more:

College introduced her to a life beyond the domestic sphere...
Between 1889 and 1891 they (women) founded clubs and gained
access to new spaces and extracurricular activities...Chartered in
1890, Kappa Alpha Theta, Berkeley's first sorority, was the most
important institution to shape Morgan's undergraduate years. At
the time, the sorority valued academic performance over social

affairs; thus, while Julia Morgan was often the sole woman in the mathematics and science courses required to fulfill her major in civil engineering, she found regular community in a group of women who encouraged and fostered intellectual achievement. More importantly, she lived at the chapter house instead of her parents' home, literally loosening her ties to the domestic sphere and allowing her to engage in academic life without distraction. (232-233)

While life at home led by two powerful female figures defined Morgan's childhood and early perceptions of gender, and the privilege of her family's wealth aided her educational ambitions, moving away from the domestic sphere and finding her place in an intellectual community of women who offered support and encouragement solidified Morgan's feminist trajectory.

Looking to the archive, Julia Morgan's experience as a "woman before her time" is reinforced further. An article published by the *Examiner, San Francisco* on December 6, 1898 discusses Morgan's acceptance to the École des Beaux-Arts. What is most interesting about this article is the rhetorical choices the author makes, clearly signifying how unusual it was for a woman to pursue the path that Morgan chose to walk. Describing Julia Morgan's history-making acceptance, the author places a heavy emphasis on gender: "There are many women students in the fine arts, but up to date there have been no women taking the course in architecture, the mathematics upon which the course is based being very technical and extremely difficult" (Figure 1: "California Girl Wins High Honor"). Though it is worth noting Morgan's gender in this instance—considering she was the first woman to be accepted to the program—the author's phrasing seems to imply that in general women are naturally less suited for technical professions involving difficult mathematics, making Julia Morgan's accomplishment all the more noteworthy. The author

affirms the socially constructed, gendered division between art and science, deeming art feminine—"There are many *women* students in the *fine arts*"—and science masculine—"...but up to date there have been *no women* taking the course in architecture, the *mathematics* upon which the course is based being *very technical and extremely difficult*" (Figure 1: "California Girl Wins High Honor," emphasis added). In a single sentence, the author of the article both lauds, though patronizingly, and makes sexist generalizations about Julia Morgan's accomplishment. The author continues to make similar rhetorical



Figure 1: Photo of *Examiner* Article Announcing Julia Morgan's Acceptance to the École des Beaux-Arts

"California Girl Wins High Honor." *San Francisco Examiner*, 6 December 1898. Box 5, Folder 4. MS 010 Julia Morgan Papers. Special Collections, Robert E. Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA. 11 November 2017. 2017.

Watermark

choices throughout the article, later describing the school's entrance exams in the same manner: "The examination in mathematics is oral, given before a committee, and is of such a nature as to try the nerves of even strong men" (Figure 1: "California Girl Wins High Honor"). Once again, the emphasis on gender not only demonstrates how peculiar it was for women to pursue such a profession, but also reinforces the conventions and stereotypes Morgan was forced to engage with throughout her education. While her educational choice to pursue architecture was without a doubt history-shaping, Julia Morgan was also effectively dismantling larger societal notions regarding the obtaining of knowledge as it pertains to gender, demonstrating that math, though technical, was no more masculine than the emotive fine arts were feminine.

Apart from the language used in the article, the layout of the artifact itself is worth noting when performing a study of gendered stereotypes and sexist assumptions. While the column written about Julia Morgan's history-making acceptance—"California Girl Wins High Honor"—is narrow and positioned on the right side of the newspaper, an article titled, "A Romance of Stanford University" takes the headlining position on the newspaper's page (Figure 1: "California Girl Wins High Honor"). If a picture is worth a thousand words, then the Stanford romance piece must have been very important to the *Examiner's* editors: it contains two photographs next to the story, while Julia Morgan's article stands alone (Figure 1: "California Girl Wins High Honor"). Like the patronizing language used to describe her acceptance to the *École des Beaux-Arts*, the way in which Julia Morgan's article is positioned on the page—especially when compared to the story that accompanies it—further demonstrates the deeply rooted sexist biases she was forced to face throughout her life and career. This fact is further confirmed through the oral history account of Flora North—the wife of Julia Morgan's nephew, Morgan North—recorded for the Bancroft Library's *Julia Morgan Architectural History Project* at the University of California, Berkeley. Speaking about all that Julia Morgan faced when applying to the *École des Beaux-Arts*, Flora states:

It 'had never been done before.' That was their [the *École des Beaux-Arts*] brilliant excuse [for not accepting women into their program]. They also said when she entered the course that she couldn't be graduated, and she accepted it on that basis, thinking that of course she would be if she proved her mettle. That took a certain amount of faith because she could have wasted a lot of years there. As a matter of fact, she traveled a lot in between times, and she worked in various architectural offices there, which was invaluable to her undoubtedly when she came into her own here. (North 175)

Through the archive, as well as information provided by first hand accounts of those who knew her, it is clear that Julia Morgan was forced to fight against belittling stereotypes, and assumed, reductionist rhetoric—"it has never been

done before!”—in order to forge the career path that she did. But, as Flora further remarks in her oral history account, Morgan never let these limitations stand in the way of her ambition: “I’ve heard so many people say, who knew her well, that it wouldn’t have mattered what profession she chose. She had fantastic will power, you know; anything would have been possible for her...” (North 197). While her early life and education was shaped by feminist figures in the home and university—influencing her perceptions of gender and enabling her to successfully face the sexist road blocks in her path—Julia Morgan’s career was also markedly influenced by the support of an ally, one of the most prominent men of the era.

Like Julia Morgan, William Randolph Hearst’s life was marked by a progressive, capable female presence. The only child of millionaires George Hearst and Phoebe Apperson Hearst, William Randolph Hearst was born into a family of strong maternal influences. In her book, *The Hearsts: An American Dynasty*, author Judith Robinson traces Hearst’s experience of strong women back to his paternal grandmother, Elizabeth Collins Hearst and her influence on her son (William’s father), George Hearst. Quoting from George Hearst’s autobiography, Robinson includes the following passage:

My mother lived until I was forty years old...She was quite a good woman, and very conservative under all circumstances. I never saw her mad in all my life. She was very hard to excite on any subject, always cool and always gave good advice. I think I get most of my success from my mother, although my father was a very industrious man; yes, I believe I owe most of my success to her rather than to him. (35)

Though simple and uncomplicated in diction, George Hearst’s reflection on his own maternal influences is telling when studying his son as an early ally for equality. George Hearst was raised by a capable woman, and went on to marry a woman who would become one of the most influential figures in her time, not only shaping the perceptions of her son, but society as a whole.

Phoebe Apperson was just nineteen years old when she wed George Hearst, a man twenty-two years her senior (Robinson 15). In her introduction, Robinson describes Phoebe Apperson Hearst in the following terms: “She was a powerful woman who was ahead of her time. In future years she might have been a senator or member of congress, chair of the board, or president of a company. She understood how to use power and came to know her own power...She made the most of the possibilities within the perimeters given her” (Robinson 19). Though she was living in an era when women’s opportunities were largely confined and dictated by society’s expectations about femininity—something that has improved over the years, but is still an issue—Phoebe Apperson Hearst was guided by her own set of values that priorities. Author Alexandra Nickliss refers to this value system as Hearst’s “gospel of wealth”—the actions and duties that

Watermark

she felt called to perform as a person of means and influence. In her aptly named article, “Phoebe Apperson Hearst’s ‘Gospel of Wealth,’ 1883-1901,” Nickliss describes the tenants of Hearst’s belief:

Her “gospel” declared that wealthy women have a sacred duty to give away their fortunes to causes, especially progressive education and reform, to benefit their communities. They should also help those excluded or marginalized from America’s mainstream, especially women, to obtain personal, social, cultural, economic, and political power to achieve independence, upward mobility, and political equality (576).

During her lifetime, Phoebe Apperson Hearst would go on to develop and design the University of California, oversee important archaeological explorations, advocate for kindergarten teacher training, found the Parent-Teacher Association, and construct the National Cathedral School for girls in Washington, D.C., just to name a few of her pet projects (Robinson 19). She was a champion of women’s higher education, supporter of women’s suffrage, and “By the time she was in her forties, she strongly believed that women needed to train themselves for careers that could alleviate their reliance on men for self-fulfillment and economic survival” (Nickliss 589, 590, 580).

As a woman of affluence *and* influence, Phoebe Apperson Hearst often found herself in situations involving powerful men, something Robinson says did not dissuade her from expressing her wants, needs, and desires, but rather deepened the respect that others gave her, despite her gender:

The men with whom she dealt—a friend wrote that she had a “masculine grasp of financial affairs”—may have been frustrated at times by her strong will, admitting before making decisions, as the Board of Regents at the University of California often did, that they had to “consult Mrs. Hearst first.” But knowing she was smart and had good ideas, they listened to her and did not simply indulge her as a rich old woman. They paid her the ultimate respect of following her leads or advice. (19)

Nickliss also affirms this quality of Mrs. Hearst’s asserting that she was not one to sit on the sidelines: “Rather than act from the margins of male institutions, Hearst placed herself front and center in the developing Progressive movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By 1901 her work had legitimized her, and leisured women like her, as wealthy reformers and political leaders in California and the nation” (577). Raised by a father who gave credit to his mother for his success, and a mother who used her position and influence to change society for the better, William Randolph Hearst’s family lineage gives a fascinating insight into his relationship with Julia Morgan, demonstrating his proclivity to be an advocate and early ally for equality. Growing up with a mother who was a trailblazer in her own right, it is not surprising that Hearst

would trust the skills, expertise, and vision of a woman when selecting an architect for his ambitious project in San Simeon, California: what would later become known as Hearst Castle.

Having established that both Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst's feminist ideologies were influenced by powerful maternal forces throughout their lives, the archive offers compelling evidence in regards to how these beliefs were made manifest in their professional relationship and collaboration. At a foundational level, Hearst acted as an ally of equality in that he did not discriminate against, or let Julia Morgan's gender dissuade him from selecting her to design Hearst Castle. That he would choose a female architect for this project in particular is especially significant, as Hearst, who had a passion for architecture in general, held his project in San Simeon particularly close to his heart. In his book, *The Chief: the Life of William Randolph Hearst*, author David Nasaw affirms Hearst's passion writing, "While Hearst was *intimately* involved with Marion's and Millicent's estates, and with St. Donat's, his castle in Wales, his *first passion* remained San Simeon" (366, emphasis added).

The archive reinforces not only Hearst's love for his project in San Simeon, but also demonstrates his willingness to trust the expertise of Julia Morgan as they collaborated on Hearst Castle. William Randolph Hearst was not interested in societal norms, he simply wanted the best architect for the job. In a letter dated July 29, 1925, Hearst writes, "Dear Miss Morgan: *I agree with you* it is best to have the drawing of the refectory with the mantel in, but it does seem that the mantel is so perfectly suited to it that we are likely to use it" (Hearst, William Randolph. Letter to Julia Morgan, emphasis added). Though this excerpt of writing may seem unextraordinary, it is precisely the *normality* with which Hearst addresses Morgan that is important to note. Unlike the patronizing language used in the article written about Julia Morgan's acceptance to the École des Beaux-Arts, this correspondence between Hearst and Morgan demonstrates the equity and mutual respect that exists between them. Hearst responds to Morgan's opinion concerning a mantel and then offers up a suggestion of his own. The archive contains many examples of correspondence like this, where Hearst and Morgan write back and forth to one another concerning even the most minute details of the project. Rather than judge her or make assumptions about her ability because of her gender, Hearst values Morgan for her skills and expertise, often deferring to her judgement; the archive demonstrates that theirs is an equal partnership. David Nasaw also highlights Hearst's appreciation for Julia Morgan's skill, referencing a letter he sent to her on a separate occasion:

In June of 1926, after a weekend filled with guests, most of them from Hollywood, Hearst sent Julia Morgan a handwritten note, apologizing because 'all those wild movie people prevented me from talking to you as much as I wanted to...Nevertheless the movie folk were immensely appreciative. They said it was the most wonderful

Watermark

place in the world and that the most extravagant dream of a moving-picture set fell far short of this reality. (373)

Here, Hearst praises Julia Morgan's work, passing along the compliments of his guests at San Simeon; he acknowledges her talent, treating her as an equal human being, not as a woman. Though they lived in a day and age when such a close collaboration would have been unusual, Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst exemplify what it looks like for a woman to be treated as an equal, acknowledged for her skill, and supported by a man who clearly sees the benefit of female empowerment and its effects on society.

While his acknowledgement of Julia Morgan's expertise and decision to collaborate with her is noteworthy, William Randolph Hearst's ally status also extends to issues of economic equality. The product of a home where women were both the source and authority in terms of finances, Julia Morgan was not intimidated to handle such affairs. In a letter dated September 13, 1919, Morgan writes to Hearst, "If satisfactory to you, may I suggest that payment for my work be made on this plan...I have been using this method and have found it satisfactory both to my clients and myself" (Morgan, Julia. Letter to William Randolph Hearst). This artifact not only illustrates that Morgan knows her own worth as a professional—"I *have been using* this method"—but also speaks to the type of working relationship she had with her most prominent patron (Morgan, Julia. Letter to William Randolph Hearst). The tone in which she writes is respectful, professional, and direct, implying that she knows Hearst will be receptive to such a request, once again demonstrating their status as equals in the partnership.

Though his mother was not the primary source of income for the family, William Randolph Hearst, like Julia Morgan, grew up in a home where women had autonomy over their own financial situations. Robinson writes that following his father's death, Hearst was dependent on his mother if he wished to access any of his family's vast fortune, as the inheritance had passed directly to her:

Willie was glib and sharp and undeterred. He knew where his bread was buttered, but it piqued him that his mother controlled the family fortune. Old George, who confided in his diminutive wife his numerous, often risky business ventures, knew that his millions would be safe in Phoebe's careful hands, not in those of his impetuous, extravagant son. And so she, after George's death in 1891, inherited all of his \$20 million fortune and doled it out when Willie asked for it. (20)

Though Robinson does imply that Hearst wished to have control over his own money—a reasonable desire, to be sure—the evidence suggests that he was accustomed to women taking control of their own economic interests. It is logical to assume, then—based on his respect for Julia Morgan's prowess and his experiences with women controlling their finances—that William Randolph

Hearst was not only amenable to Morgan's requests, but gave her the freedom to make them in the first place. Because Morgan was secure in her area of expertise, having fought against gendered stereotypes throughout her education and career, and because Hearst acknowledged her for her strengths, it is no surprise that Morgan was able to speak candidly with Hearst about matters of money. In issues of economic inequality, the archive demonstrates that Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst are a commendable example of women and men working together to create a more equitable world, both financially and otherwise.

A woman in a field dominated by men, and one of America's most powerful figures, Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst create an interesting dichotomy: one, on the margins of society, actively working against the restraints of her gender, the other, a picture of privilege and society's definition of success. The relationship between William Randolph Hearst and Julia Morgan was not only unconventional for its time, but a great example of men and women joining together for the sake of a more equitable world. In viewing Julia Morgan as a proto-feminist figure, and William Randolph Hearst as an ally for equality, the story of Morgan and Hearst's professional relationship and collaboration is made more robust and interesting. Working with materials from the archive has enabled me to compare these two figures side by side, bringing their individual stories together to create a new, egalitarian, and rather timely narrative. In a day and age when issues of equality are still being discussed, it is important to reflect on how far we have come as a society, looking to examples in the past for inspiration, and motivation as we continue to move forward. There may be a long way to go, but stories like that of Julia Morgan and William Randolph Hearst demonstrate the importance of allyship in the fight for equality, and give an example of what a successful, more equitable future might look like.

Works Cited

- Boutelle, Sara Holmes. *Julia Morgan, Architect*. Abbeville, 1988. "California Girl Wins High Honor." *San Francisco Examiner*, 6 December 1898. Box 5, Folder 4. MS 010 Julia Morgan Papers. Special Collections, Robert E. Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA. 11 November 2017.
- DuBois, Ellen Carol. *Feminism and Suffrage: the Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*. Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Hawthorne, Christopher. "Gold Medal: Julia Morgan." *Architectmagazine.com*, 23 June 2014, www.architectmagazine.com/awards/aia-honor-awards/gold-medal-julia-morgan_o.
- Hearst, William Randolph. Letter to Julia Morgan. 29 July 1925. W.R. Hearst/Julia Morgan Correspondence 1919-1945, June-December 1925. Reference Copy. MS 010 Julia Morgan Papers. Special Collections, Robert E. Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA. 11 November 2017.
- McNeill, Karen. "Julia Morgan: Gender, Architecture, and Professional Style." *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 76, no. 2, May 2007, pp. 229-267. EBSCOhost, doi:phr.2007.76.2.229.
- Morgan, Julia. Letter to William Randolph Hearst. 13 September 1919. W.R. Hearst/Julia Morgan Correspondence 1919-1945, August 1919-December 1919. Reference Copy. MS 010 Julia Morgan Papers. Special Collections, Robert E. Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA. 11 November 2017.
- Nasaw, David. *The Chief: the Life of William Randolph Hearst*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Nickliss, Alexandra M. "Phoebe Apperson Hearst's "Gospel of Wealth," 1883-1901." *Pacific Historical Review* 71.4 (2002): 575-605. Web.
- North, Morgan and Flora North. *Three Conversations with Morgan and Flora North About Julia Morgan*. By Suzanne B. Riess. 1974-1976. *Internet Archive*. Web. 6 March 2019. <https://archive.org/details/histprojinterviews02julirich>.
- Robinson, Judith. *The Hearsts: An American Dynasty*. Associated University Press, 1991.

Getting Out: Intersections of Queer Desire, Spirituality, and Black Escapism in Randall Kenan's *A Visitation of Spirits*

"Identity would seem to be the garment with which one covers the nakedness of the self: in which case, it is best that the garment be loose, a little like the robes of the desert, through which one's nakedness can always be felt, and, sometimes, discerned. This trust in one's nakedness is all that gives one the power to change one's robes."—James Baldwin, *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction 1948-1985*

In his 1926 speech "Criteria for Negro Art," W.E.B. DuBois discusses the valuable capacity that black art holds for supporting the fight for full personhood, recognition, and progress for black Americans. He identifies the role that the artist plays in capturing the complexities of the black experience and notes the particular limitations experienced by black creatives as he states, "We are bound by all sorts of customs that have come down as second-hand soul clothes of White patrons. We are ashamed of sex and we lower our eyes when people will talk of it. Our religion holds us in superstition. Our worst side has been so shamelessly emphasized that we are denying that we have or ever had a worst side" (DuBois 876). In Randall Kenan's *A Visitation of Spirits*, Horace Cross and his narrative both hold the potential for progress despite the glaring social, sexual, racial, and religious barriers that DuBois cites within black art. However, steeped in a black southern Christian upbringing, it is Horace's own community that guides him into the alternative realm that he is unable to return from. There he is moved to find friends and foster freedom with the use of sorcery, and an unrelenting commitment to escapism.

A Visitation of Spirits chronicles young Horace's isolation, attempted transformation, and journey through escapism as a young black gay man living in the fictional black Christian community of Tims Creek, North Carolina. Horace's ventures into an alternative realm of being and experiences with mysticism, fantasy, and violence, are particular forms of escapism which offer him alternative forms of expression while also holding the power to destroy him. In Marlon Ross's article "Beyond the Closet as a Raceless Paradigm" he attempts to decenter the closet as the primary and sole foundation for understanding queer

Watermark

identities and he identifies a sort of “claustrophilia” or “a fixation on the closet as the grounding principle for sexual experience, knowledge, and politics” (Ross 162). Ross goes on to insist that this fixation actually does more to diminish and disable the potential for a more wholistic engagement with “potential insights from race theory and class analysis” (162). Randall’s text is one that unequivocally challenges the assumed universality of both the coming out process, what it means to exist within “the closet” and engages in important conversations on experiences with escapism as it pertains to black queer identities.

Horace’s particular closet is informed by religiosity, escapism, mysticism, and fear. While his community and his black Christian upbringing both position Horace within his particular closet, it is also his status as a Cross man, a scarce and prized commodity within his family and community, that binds him. Horace’s family members have poured their energy, time, and resources into his success. Horace’s memories of his late Great-Aunt Jonnie Mae illustrate this commitment to his future when he identifies her as “the one to quiz him about his schooling each week” and the person who “knit him multicolored sweaters and socks and toboggans and scarves, who made his favorite pecan pies when he made A-pluses, and who would verbally chastise him when he made less than a B on any of his tests” (74). Horace embodies the hopes and dreams of his family members and the ancestors that are long gone. Because of this, the Cross family holds high expectations for him and the position he will occupy within his church and community. This position does not leave room for a queer sexual identity or any deviations from the rigid Baptist practices that they believe Horace must adhere to.

Horace learns that coming out is not a viable option when he seeks help from his cousin Jimmy and is advised that his sexual feelings towards men are merely temporary (Kenan 113). This minimizing and dismissal of Horace’s sexual identity affirms what Horace already suspected, that his sexual identity would not be accepted by his black Christian family members and that his particular closet would be a permanent space if he could not find an alternate option for escape. In Kendall Thomas’s article “Ain’t Nothin like the Real Thing,” he argues that

Gay and lesbian African Americans have borne the heavy cost exacted by the rigid adherence to the illusory ideal of a unitary black identity. The exclusion of black gay men and lesbians from full, equal participation in African-American life has provided an epistemic standpoint for understanding and intervening in the politics of life and death. (Thomas 339)

Thomas’s assertions around the hyper-unity of the black community and the resistance to any identities which challenge said unity, are useful when unpacking Horace’s engagement with escapism as well as the circumstances that inform his choices.

Rather than coming out, Horace embraces *getting out* via a spiritual transformation. When his initial attempt at transformation fails and he is left with no other physical body to occupy than his own, Horace enters a spiritual realm that is riddled with his own demons and fears, a space that holds the capacity for re-memory and intensified self-reflection. His mystical journey leads Horace towards the confrontation of both his “true” self and his confining community. It is possible to further understand the nuances of black queer experiences inside, outside, and beyond their *own unique closets* by reading Horace’s decision to embrace escapism and *get out* rather than deciding to *come out* in the “traditional” sense.

Before Horace embarks on his mystical journey, he attempts escape via the comic book characters that he attempts to locate himself within and populates his own particular “closet” with. Horace is constantly searching for reflections of himself and for affirmation of that self. He identifies the superheroes that decorate his bedroom walls as his “friends” and describes them with an intimacy that indicates a close and personal relationship: “a Viking with long yellow hair and bulging muscles, swinging a hammer as large as he, his icy blue eyes flashing a solemn warning” (17). This description of Thor is not only somewhat erotic, it also indicates a knowledge of Thor’s desires and intentions that Horace claims to have access to. In his article “Randall Kenan Beyond the Final Frontier: Science Fiction, Superheroes, and the South in ‘A Visitation of Spirits’” Brannon Costello describes Horace as “deeply immersed in fantastic narratives of a transformed future that affect his perceptions of—and his means of resistance to— a threatening present” (130). Horace is intimately involved and invested in these characters, their desires, and their abilities to escape. He populates his own closet with figures that allow him to feel both powerful and affirmed. Through the display, alignment with, and celebration of these comic book figures, including Marvel heroes like Dr. Strange, Thor, and the Hulk, Horace attempts to harness comfort, companionship, and his own power to escape the confinement of his community.

Horace also locates, initially embraces, and eventually rejects his bodily autonomy and sexual identity through his relationship with Gideon. After initially loathing and rejecting Gideon when they were both children, Horace finds himself forced together with Gideon via a group science project. Costello identifies the Baptist understanding of the split between mind and body, Horace’s fear of his inability to control his body, and his family’s attempts to exert control over his body, a body that they view as their own and as a “carrier of his family history” (135). As Horace and Gideon move from classmates, to friends, to lovers, Horace is made to fully recognize the portion of him that is like Gideon, that has fueled his dislike of Gideon for so long, and that belongs to Horace and not his family. As an unapologetically queer young man, Gideon has always represented all that Horace attempted to deny and stifle about himself

Watermark

(100). Horace and Gideon's sexual relationship leads to an intense awakening and awareness in Horace as his assumptions and desires become reality;

If there had been any doubt about how he felt, or any notion of turning back from his reprobate mind, that experience expanded his knowledge of himself and stalled any such thought for some time. It had been somehow necessary, that touching, that closeness, that body heat, that caressing. For the first time realized the difference between knowledge and experience, and that there is more than one way to know. (155)

Knowledge becomes actualized once Horace's sexual desires move from the imagination and the emotional to the physical. Once Horace engages sexually with Gideon, denial can no longer be achieved in the same way, and this eventually leads Horace to identify transformation as one accessible mode of escape.

Horace's somewhat limited experiences with autonomy inform the particular closet that he occupies as well as his choice to transform himself rather than come out to his community. Even as he attempts to harness control of his physical appearance by piercing his ear, Horace is met with anger, resistance, and dominance by his elder relatives (183-187). This act is not received as merely a rebellious teenager's experimentation with different styles, it is seen as an affront to the entire family, their racial and cultural legacy in Tims Creek, and the body that they claimed ownership over long ago. When Horace defends his choice to pierce his ear and the white friends, he has chosen to spend time with, his family explodes with resistance: "After all the white man's done to us, you got take up behind him and do everything he tells you to do" (186). Horace does not have the space to show his relatives who he is because of the racial and religious mores of his community, and because of the fact that they have already decided who he is and who he will be. Therefore, the door of his closet is sealed shut and his choice to transform himself and escape instead of coming out is made that much clearer.

Questions of Horace's autonomy, choice, and agency are integral parts of the conversation on his engagement with escapism. It is tempting to absolve Horace of any responsibility and put him in a position of total powerlessness in the text. In fact, Horace is tempted to do this to himself. However, even as he identifies escape as his only viable option for liberation, he identifies this as his choice nonetheless. Before his attempted transformation and subsequent suicide, Horace questions his mental health, deems himself rational, and still identifies transformation as his only option:

Looking out the window, he felt a brief wave of doubt flicker within. Had he gone mad? Somehow slipped beyond the veil of right reasoning and gone off into some deep unsettled land of fantasy? The very thought made him cringe. Of course he was not crazy, he told himself; his was a very rational mind, acquainted with science

and mathematics. But he was also a believer in an unseen world full of archangels and prophets and folk rising from the dead, a world preached to him from the cradle on, and a world he was powerless not to believe in as firmly as he believed in gravity and the times table. (16)

Horace identifies his choice to engage with sorcery and attempt a transformation as his own, while also noting the limitations that contribute to his lack of options. He does not absolve himself of responsibility and readers must not do this either. Instead it is important to identify Horace's choice as his own while simultaneously noting the circumstances that contributed to that choice:

The two contradicting worlds were not contradictions in his mind. At the moment it was not the world of digits and decimal points he required, but the world of messiahs and miracles. It was faith, not facts he needed; magic not math; salvation, not science. Belief would save him, not only belief but belief in belief. Like Daniel, like Isaac, like the woman at the well. I am sane, he thought, smoothing over any kinks in his reasoning and clutching fear by the neck. He had no alternative, he kept saying to himself. No way out. (16)

Horace's "contradicting worlds," and the "powerless[ness]" that he describes as part and parcel of his religious identity, significantly contribute to his ability, or lack thereof, to effectively utilize critical thinking and identify other options for his survival.

As Horace moves through the spiritual realm and is guided to the spaces where he has previously attempted to find solace, liberation, and wholeness, he moves further and further away from himself and his closeted position, and experiences both re-memory and transformation. His family's church, First Baptist Church of Tims Creek, is the first space that Horace attempts to find comfort and meaning within his spiritual journey. However, the experience is riddled with mockery and spectacle from the very beginning; "From behind him stepped a munchkin, no more than three-feet-five, its face painted white like a clown's, its nose ridiculously red. It had a mocking expression on its face" (69). This very familiar space has been infiltrated by the "ridiculous" elements of the realm Horace has entered, and it serves as a site of re-memory where Horace has the ability to move through the past while existing partially within both the present and the future. As he approaches the church in his bare feet and feels the grass beneath him, Horace "begin[s] to miss the idea of grass" (68). Horace already misses the grass that currently sits beneath his feet in that moment. He is crossing through time and space as he continues his journey. This moment indicates an approaching separation from the materiality of the world around him.

He is moving beyond the elements of the natural, human world and into a realm that he will not be able to return from. When Horace asks the demon that

Watermark

guides him why he is showing him images of his deceased family members, the demon describes them as “The presence of the present. The very stuff of which the future is made. This is the effluvium of souls that surround men daily” (73). Life and death are collapsed as Horace is surrounded by his deceased family members. The future, present, and past combine and Horace sees his community through eyes unclouded by hierarchy or tradition. While Horace is moving through this spiritual realm, he is moving further and further away from his human, present self, and closer to the future, escape, and transformation that he so desperately longs for. Images of his family members, deceased and living, and the imagined rejection that he experiences after his second baptism, move Horace deeper into his journey of escapism. Horace’s ostracism from his church home is presented in direct opposition to the place he is expected to occupy within the community. His role and path within the church and the community has been determined for him by the generations that came before him.

Horace and his cousin James Green (Jimmy) are the two young Cross men who are left to lead the community and this scarcity and subsequent pressure moves Horace towards escape rather than leadership. In the “Holy Science” chapter, Jimmy (Horace’s cousin and a pastor in their home church) describes the death and diaspora that have contributed to the declining presence of Cross descendants in Tims Creek (115-117). War, death, movement, education, and resisting expectations has led to the scarcity that informs both Horace and Jimmy’s experiences in Tims Creek. In Lucy R. Littler’s article “The Implications of ‘Chosenness’: Unsettling the Exodus Narrative as a Model for Black Liberation in Randall Kenan’s ‘A Visitation of Spirits’” she discusses the ways that Kenan uses the black community in Tims Creek to explore the limitations of the “Exodus narrative” (and “chosenness” in particular) as a model for black liberation and highlights the need for reconfigurations within the black church that will allow for intersectional strivings and collective progress (38). While the exodus model is certainly at work within the Cross family’s understandings of their position within the community, it is also the scarcity of viable options for community and church leaders, rather than “chosenness” alone, that seems to impact Horace’s experiences in the community.

Horace reaches out to Jimmy in an effort to reconcile and express his sexual desires to his trusted cousin and pastor but because of the two men’s elevated and critical positions as Cross men, Christians, and black Americans, Jimmy must insist on Horace’s queer desires and sexual activity as merely “experimenting” and ends by insisting on the situation as “a very serious matter” (113-114). The “seriousness” of the matter is not only rooted in their religious background, it is also the embedded in the unapologetic expectations that their elder family members and community hold for both men to assume leadership roles within Tims Creek.

Just as Horace does not fit neatly or exclusively in any one box or category, the text resists portraying him as merely condemned, criticized, and crucified. Horace decides to choose escapism and journey into mysticism rather than to fall at the feet of his community's will. For him this choice is both tragic and transformational. He is at once liberated and lost to those that have loved him. His death reverberates through the community and circulates within his grandfather Zeke and his cousin Jimmy's consciousness in particular:

I will see woods at the end of the field and be saddened...not always thinking of the exact reason why; not always staring, merely knowing that if I look in will be there. The woods, the place, is enough. Sometimes I think those woods are cold and incomprehensible. Wild things happen there. When I look there I see futility and waste. As if the very air had become fetid and rank. Sometimes I just stare. (40)

As Jimmy views and describes the setting of Horace's suicide, he illustrates the ways that Horace and his death continue to haunt his surviving family members. Horace's death is the culmination of a rigid and confining community that will not accept the undesirable parts of his identity. Without ever using Horace's name, Jimmy's consciousness and senses are flooded with the memories of the suicide and Jimmy is forced to remember the tragic night. Horace's final and irreversible act of escape has the power to incapsulate and surround the consciousness of the members of his family.

The fractured identity that Horace embodies is one partially fashioned by the violent isolation that Horace experiences within a community that is so seemingly connected and safe. As Horace moves through Tims Creek on the final night of his life, he is reminded of the values and qualities that have shaped his experiences within the town:

Folks in Tims Creek were used to a sort of unworried trust among themselves. There was no reason to lock doors, no one was going to walk in uninvited; there was no reason to put away your hoe, no one was going to take it without asking; there was no reason to take your key from the ignition, no one was going to crank it up unbidden. (102)

Here Horace, a young man who has dealt with both isolation and fear continuously because of his sexual identity, reflects on the absence of fear that occupies his hometown. As he reflects on the lack of locked doors and the unafraid nature of Tims Creek's citizens, Horace moves from the material world around him and deeper into his own spiritual realm, a space where he can finally face and freely identify the parts of his identity that he has been forced to conceal for so long. By getting out rather than coming out, Horace is able to occupy a new space that is not altogether unlike Tims Creek for other citizens. In this space Horace can indulge and identify his own desires with more freedom than ever before.

Watermark

Horace's constitutive connection to his Christian faith continually shapes both his experience within his closet and his decision to escape. While Horace's room is inhabited by his comic book heroes and his books on sorcery, his Christian upbringing is still very much a part of his identity. Multiple scholars have identified the ways that Horace's religious community, rather than Horace, is in need of significant transformation. In her article Littler states that "for a community so deeply rooted in its Christian epistemology, abandoning the use of biblical narratives to interpret history and contemporary life is not a viable option" (53). She outlines Christianity and Horace's black southern community as inextricably bound and offers a womanist theological approach as an answer to this difficult assertion.

Womanism in general and womanist theology in particular have often been looked to as a potential answer for the hierarchical and discriminatory practices within the black church. In her article "Womanist Theology: Looking to the Future" Stephanie Y. Mitchem identifies the ways that "Womanist theologians continue to use race as a category, taking into account the changes of the times" and the ways that these generational shifts "demand new tools of scholarship" including the dialogical processes that have the potential to "create new strands of discourse in the broader contexts of globalization"(Mitchem 56). She goes on to outline womanist theologies as holding potential for assigning new meaning to gender, class, and race (56). While it is true that womanist theologies offer some tools to deconstruct the exclusive practices of the church, these same practices can sometimes fall into the same essentialist understandings of sex, gender, and race that the greater Black church adheres to.

Christianity has served as the cornerstone and crucible of the black community and yet the same institution has also worked to isolate and ostracize black Americans that do not fit neatly within a strictly defined margin of respectable and acceptable life. Horace Griffin illustrates this understanding in his book *Their Own Receive Them Not*: "In spite of openly or perceived gay Christians living exemplary Christian lives around them, African American heterosexual Christians generally resist a reassessing of homosexuality as sin and viewing fellow lesbian and gay Christians as moral individuals" (Griffin 111). Griffin, like Littler, identifies the resistance towards a re-imagination or reassessment of the church's stance on LGBTQIA relationships that exists within black Christian spaces. Both Littler and Griffin's words seem to suggest that the church is not a space where the kinds of shifts that are necessary to save lives like that of Horace Cross, are accessible. Kenan's text, and Horace's suicide in particular, demonstrate the dangers associated with dismissing the potential use of other lenses beyond the spiritual and biblical when working to understand the historical and cultural implications of the black American experience.

More specifically, the work of James Baldwin, one of Kenan's greatest influences, offers useful and illuminating approaches to engaging with difference

while also attempting to work for the collective good of black people. When discussing the black experience within a racist and violent 1960s United States in a letter to his nephew published in *The Fire Next Time*, Baldwin writes that: “We have not stopped trembling yet, but if we had not loved each other none of us would have survived” (Baldwin 7). Baldwin continually insists on a mutual responsibility and care for one another that privileges affirming rather than silencing the many differences (sexual and other wise) among black people. In the text Horace Cross experiences a love that binds, limits, and controls, rather than a love that liberates, empowers, and listens. In turn, he chooses to engage in a transformation that holds the potential to allow him to simultaneously exist within and apart from his family and his community. Due largely to a lack of lenses through which to approach and understand the possibilities available to him, Horace turns away from his closet and towards a spiritual realm that guides him to his tragic death.

While Horace’s life ends in suicide, his memory is sustained and depicted in the consciousness of his cousin Jimmy, and the loss experienced by his family and community. *Visitation* offers important insights on the potentially lethal, isolating, and transformational power that extreme escapism can introduce to members of a group whose corporeal, spiritual, and social history is already entrenched in narratives of resistance and escape. There is a violent disassociation that occurs when one is forced to dismember integral parts of his or her identities, namely one’s sexual identity, religiosity, and race, in the name of cloaking what are deemed one’s “worst side[s]” (DuBois 876). It is imperative to consider the stakes, scopes, limitations and radical possibilities of black escapism as an alternative approach to reading representations of black queer experiences.

A Visitation of Spirits engages with the complex experiences that surround a black Christian southern community where issues of escape, freedom, violence, and autonomy are always flowing around the inhabitants and bubbling beneath their relationships with one another. What DuBois describes as “second hand soul clothes of White patrons”, or the intersection of white supremacy and respectability politics, shape the fictional community of Tims Creek as well as the very real lives of black Americans. Horace’s story is one filled with a series of confrontations; whether it is Gideon, the elders in his family, his cousin Jimmy, or himself, Horace is constantly faced with opposition that requires his attention and reaction. His escape into mysticism and his position at the crossing of religiosity, sexuality, and race, allow for an exploration of what it means to search for oneself in a community where the Word is unflinchingly rigid and unwelcome parts of one’s own identity must remain both marginalized and unarticulated.

Works Cited

- Baldwin, James. *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction 1948-1985*, St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- . *The Fire Next Time*. Vintage International, 1993.
- Costello, Brannon. "Randall Kenan Beyond the Final Frontier: Science Fiction, Superheroes, and the South in 'A Visitation of Spirits.'" *The Southern Literary Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2010, pp. 125-50. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41057659.
- DuBois, W.E.B. "Criteria for Negro Art." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism 2nd ed.*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, W. W. Norton, 2010, pp. 870-76.
- Griffin, Horace L. *Their Own Receive Them Not: African American Lesbians and Gays in Black Churches*, Pilgrim, 2006.
- Kenan, Randall. *A Visitation of Spirits*. Grove Press, 1989.
- Littler, Lucy R. "The Implications of 'Chosenness': Unsettling the Exodus Narrative as a Model for Black Liberation in Randall Kenan's 'A Visitation of Spirits.'" *The Southern Literary Journal*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2011, pp. 37-55. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23208768.
- Mandaville, Alison, et al. "A Visitation of Narratives: Dialogue and Comics in Randall Kenan's A Visitation of Spirits." *Comics and the U.S. South*, edited by Brannon Costello and Qiana J. Whitted, UP of Mississippi, 2012, pp. 269-92. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt2tv852.14.
- Mitchem, Stephanie Y. "Womanist Theology: Looking to the Future." *New Theology Review*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2008, pp. 52-56.
- Ross, Marlon. "Beyond the Closet as Raceless Paradigm." *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*, edited by E. Patrick Johnson and Mae G. Henderson, 2005.
- Tettenborn, Éva. "But What If I Can't Change": Desire, Denial, and Melancholia in Randall Kenan's 'A Visitation of Spirits.'" *The Southern Literary Journal*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2008, pp. 249-66. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20077917.
- Thomas, Kendall. "Ain't Nothin' Like the Real Thing: Black Masculinity, Gay Sexuality, and the Jargon of Authenticity." *The House That Race Built*, edited by Waheema Lubiano, Vintage Books, 1998, pp. 116-35.
- Wester, Maisha. "Haunting and Haunted Queerness: Randall Kenan's Re-Inscription of Difference in 'A Visitation of Spirits.'" *Callaloo*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2007, pp. 1035-53. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/30132094.

“A Weapon for Liberation”: Utilizing Forum Theatre in the Promotion of Liberatory and Contact Zone Pedagogies Within the Composition Classroom

The publication of Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1968 has been widely attributed to a massive shift from what Freire refers to as the “banking method” of teaching to the “liberatory method.” Soon after Freire’s publication began transforming the world of education, the Brazilian theatre practitioner Augusto Boal saw further revolutionary implications for Freire’s text. During the 1970’s, Boal committed himself and his theatre company at the Arena Theatre in São Paulo to transfer many of the ideas in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* into the realm of theatre. Boal’s reasoning for this adoption of Freire’s theories came from how he conceived the cultural institution of traditional theatre as similarly oppressive to the institutions of education that utilized the banking method. In Boal’s text titled *Theatre of the Oppressed*, he combined his theories regarding the oppressive lineage of Aristotelian theatre, a description of his freshly conceived form of liberatory theatre that he referred to as “forum theatre”, and several accounts of his attempts at praxis, where he brought forum theatre to poor Brazilian towns in order to nourish revolutionary ideologies of power reclamation among their impoverished populations. Since the publication of *Theatre of the Oppressed*, Boal’s teachings have been utilized in communities of varying race and class in countries all over the world in an effort to promote ideas of collective agency and to foster an understanding between contentious groups of peoples.

For the most part, the scholarship surrounding Boal’s work has unsurprisingly remained with the realms of theatre and social justice. In contrast to this general trend, this essay seeks to fold the praxis of Boal’s forum theatre back into the realm of the classroom that it originally sprang from by means of Freire’s text. Although scholarship like Yael Harlap’s “Preparing University Educators for Hot Moments: Theater for Educational Development

Watermark

about Difference, Power, and Privilege” has been written about the benefits of incorporating forum theatre into the framework of educational institutions, these articles generally refer to forum theatre’s ability to reduce “conflict or tension that threatens to derail teaching and learning” (217). Alternatively, the purpose of this essay is to theorize how forum theatre can promote liberatory and contact zone pedagogies specifically within the context of a composition classroom, in an effort to assist students with their development as beginning writers. To this end, the essay will first address how *Theatre of the Oppressed* is linked to Freire’s theoretical framework. Afterwards, theoretical implications will be drawn about the application of Boal’s teachings to the composition classroom. This will be punctuated by an example of praxis that acts as a union between Boal’s work and multiple concepts rooted in composition theory, including Freire’s “liberatory theatre” and the idea of “the contact zone”.

To begin exploring Boal’s connection to Freire, each of their central tenants will be clarified. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire attacks the “banking” method of education, which he describes by saying, “Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the ‘banking’ concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filling, and storing the deposits” (53). In this practice, students are not viewed as subjects, but are instead seen as objects that may only reach a greater potential through an educator’s action of bestowing intellectual ideas onto them. Freire’s main contention with this style of teaching is that it permits only the educator to act as an agent while the students are forced into an oppressive state of submission. This passive state is formed when the educational institution denies the students from interrogating their own education. Freire condemns this as a form of human atrocity by stating that “[a]ny situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence” (66). After Freire situates the “banking concept” as a danger to its students sense of agency, he then theorizes a counterexample in the form of “liberatory education.” A major component of this theory is that power must be more evenly diffused within the classroom. Freire argues that this can be accomplished by picturing the teacher as someone who learns from their students, or what Freire refers to as a “teacher-student”, and by conceiving the student as someone who is teaching themselves, their peers, and their teachers—or what Freire refers to as the “students-teachers” (66). Freire then proposes that this action of liberating the students will therefore encourage them to embed their world with the same democratic values that they had absorbed during their liberatory education. The hope is that these students’ efforts will steadily develop a stronger realization of equality in the various communities they come from, whether that be their town, state, country, or the world at large.

In the “Forward” section of *Theatre of the Oppressed*, Augusto Boal states that “the theater can also be a weapon for liberation” (ix). While Boal incites the liberatory ambitions of Freire, he draws on language that is more directly revolutionary, even overtly claiming that the theatre can be utilized as a “rehearsal for the revolution” (122). Instead of reworking the system of oppression from the inside out for the betterment of all, as Freire advocates, Boal calls for a complete deconstruction of the Aristotelian tradition of theatre. This tradition he is tackling has dominated the form and content of works of theatre since the theories in Aristotle’s *Poetics* were circulated. To reimagine this deeply ingrained form, Boal views the actor as Freire’s teacher while the passive spectator of a theatrical performance is likened to a student within the banking system of education. Both the student and the spectator are similarly oppressed, in that they are expected to passively consume whatever ideologies that the superstructural institutions of education and theatre present to them.

After Boal’s exposure of the theatre’s operation as a component within the ideological reproduction of power is realized, he then encourages proletariat communities to reclaim the theatre for themselves. This reclaimed conception of theatre, which Boal refers to as “forum theatre,” permits the spectator to assume a sense of agency. This allows them to utilize forum theatre as a device to promote and test out ideas of revolutionary action and unity amongst the members of that community. Boal describes this process by remarking that the oppressed individual “assumes the protagonist role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change—in short, trains himself for real action” (122). Boal’s overall goal with the implementation of forum theatre, similar to Freire’s, is to give oppressed communities a tool with which they can hopefully improve the quality of their existence by working collectively against the power structures that administer their oppression.

Boal’s liberatory forum theatre is in many rather obvious ways inspired by Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. However, the differences in their separate theoretical texts allows for Boal’s work to be applied to the realm of classroom pedagogy in a way that expands upon Freire’s ideas instead of entirely replicating them. Boal’s fixation on performance also adds to the praxis of Freire’s conception of a classroom liberated from the banking method. The implementation of Boal’s theoretical framework in the composition classroom can arguably support the notion of Freire’s liberatory pedagogy, while also fostering a pedagogy that is supportive of the idea in composition theory known as “the contact zone”. To elaborate on this point, an argument for the *Theatre of the Oppressed’s* relation to a liberatory pedagogy will be established. This will then be connected to an example of praxis within the composition classroom, which will be followed by an argument of how an application of Boal’s work can place composition students within the contact zone.

Watermark

A potential application to liberatory pedagogy can be best observed in Boal's explanation of "simultaneous dramaturgy," a component of forum theatre. He defines this as when "[t]he spectator is encouraged to intervene in the action (of the performance), abandoning his condition of object and assuming fully the role of subject" (Boal 132). Here we see how Boal views the spectator and Freire's student in a similar manner. Both must undergo a transformation from "object" to "subject" so that they can become the agent in their own transformative process. The idea that the performance is "simultaneous" also invokes Freire's demand for an educational experience that is more collaborative than domineering. In a fully realized performance of "simultaneous dramaturgy," the actors—usually members from the community where the play is being acted out—develop a scene that leads to some form of crisis. These scenes typically depict some type of issue within the community, such as a problem with police violence, or if there is a shortage of food to go around. At the moment of the crisis, the spectators—who are also community members—can interrupt the action onstage in order to propose a solution to the problem. This suggestion is then taken up by the actors and earnestly played out. If that solution seems to fail, then another solution can be offered. This serves as a way to induce collective critical thinking within the community that sets the stage for a dialogue about how to address their imminent problems. In this way, simultaneous dramaturgy functions as an example of "[k]nowledge (emerging) only through intervention and re-intervention" (Freire 53).

The basic premise of simultaneous dramaturgy can function effectively as the basis for a collaborative composition activity, the aims of which would be to help develop a liberatory pedagogy within the classroom. One example of such an activity is as follows. The students in a composition course arrive having written rough drafts of an essay they will submit later in the quarter. The instructor then asks for a volunteer to read his or her own essay in front of the class. The student volunteer would then recite his or her essay draft to the class pausing at any point where they are experiencing a "crisis" in their writing process. This "crisis" would not be defined as a moment where the student-author has simply not yet thought of anything to write. Instead, it would exist as a section of the text where the student-author has sensed that their writing is not as developed as it could be but is not sure why. At this point in the activity, any student in the classroom can make a suggestion as to what the issue within this section of the essay might be. Once a problem is identified, any student may improvise a potential means of rectifying it. That potential solution is then immediately applied by the student-author, who would then read through the problematic passage with its new alterations. At this point, the class would then determine if the dilemma within the student-author's composition had been improved. If not, then another student may suggest a different potential solution.

Throughout the activity, the teacher can help guide students toward suggestions, but should refrain from making any concrete suggestions.

The process of this activity, which I am calling “simultaneous composition,” reconfigures Boal’s simultaneous dramaturgy so that it can be applied to a composition classroom, while still having the same theoretical implications for both the participants and the power dynamics within the room. Just as Boal encourages his spectators to feel liberated in utilization of a newfound agency in order to visualize change onstage, so do the composition students with their writing. These theoretical implications are supported in Chan Ching-kiu Stephen and Law Yuen-fun Muriel’s article “Narrative and Performative Acts in Cultural Education.” Working with composition students at Lingnan University in Hong Kong, Stephen and Muriel carried out an activity that was similarly based on Boal’s liberatory theatre. Following the positive results of their activity, Stephen and Muriel remarked that “[t]he dramatic act and its pedagogic insight offered this student a discursive space, as much for the exploration and representation of the self, as for the critical understanding of the social and the collective, thus fashioning the condition for performing the writerly task as an act—and indeed an art—of critical communication” (220). These findings provide support for the use of Boal’s theories to create a “discursive space” in the writing classroom, and while helping the composition student develop remain attentive to the idea that they are addressing a particular audience with their writing.

It could be argued that the only real progress being made from the “simultaneous composition” method is to the student volunteer’s paper. However, every student in the classroom—especially those who make suggestions—is experiencing Boal’s “rehearsal for the revolution” by thinking critically about how to address writing concerns generally through offering suggestions or even listening to others’ suggestions. Instead of revolutionizing a community’s quality of life, as is the objective of *Theatre of the Oppressed*, these students are rehearsing for a revolution in their own capabilities as writers. In this way, the entire class is learning useful composition strategies from the volunteer’s example. This can be compared to how the various papers that are published in Cal Poly’s *Fresh Voices* might be reviewed and revised at the Writing and Rhetoric Center between a tutor and their tutee. However, the “simultaneous composition” method is potentially more impactful than the Writer and Rhetoric Center example because it occurs within a community of students who can provide an assortment of suggestions, many of which a tutor and tutee may have never considered.

The ability for “simultaneous composition” to develop a liberatory classroom can be observed in a few ways. First, the text under consideration is liberated from the instructor’s power, as it is a student-written text that has not been previously chosen by the instructor. Second, the instructor takes the position of an indirect facilitator of the conversation, instead of directly telling the students what to focus on and how to respond to the text. Finally, the students gain a

Watermark

liberated sense of agency in hearing their suggestions “acted out” by the volunteer student. This last effect of “simultaneous composition” nurtures a realization amongst the students that their ideas can have a concrete impact on an example of writing, as opposed to how students are taught to approach published texts as being untouchable.

The work of both Boal and Freire emphasizes liberation and agency, which, as the previous example illustrates, can be incorporated into a composition classroom to help students establish a greater sense of agency in their writing. The point where Boal’s work can more easily expand beyond Freire’s focus is with the inclusion of the contact zone. The idea of the contact zone resulted from the tenets of social constructivist theory, which Lester Faigley identifies as “(rejecting) the assumption that writing is the act of a private consciousness and that everything else—readers, subjects, and texts—is ‘out there’ in the world” (659). In one way, the inclusion of readers within the writing process has already been established in previous discussion of Boal’s application to “liberatory pedagogy.” It can be observed in how the students’ collective contribution to the composition of a text can help them understand that one’s writing must necessarily be mindful of their audience of readers. The concept of the contact zone expands beyond this to address issues of class and culture difference, such as the situation described by Kelly Maxwell and Patricia Gurin in their article “Using Dialogue to Create Inclusive Classrooms: A Case Study from a Faculty Institute.” After receiving input from students on a college campus, Maxwell and Gurin share their observation that “[s]ome students, particularly those from underrepresented groups, report that classrooms are among the most difficult spaces on campus. They describe feeling invisible, not listened to, and as though they do not belong” (10).

As a response to the educational atmospheres like the one observed by Maxwell and Gurin, the contact zone, as theorized by John Trimbur, “(represents) the classroom as a site where two cultures collide, where apparently incommensurable discourses and life-worlds encounter each other” (113). Boal’s *Theatre of the Oppressed* has been consistently utilized in a diverse range of communities for this exact purpose. The performances of forum theatre necessarily unite people coming from entirely different backgrounds, classes, and races in an effort to unite a separated community. Jane Plastow cites an example of this phenomenon in her article “Practicing for the revolution? The influence of Augusto Boal in Brazil and Africa”, where she cites an example of forum theatre that brought average citizens and members of the police force in an Ethiopian community together to perform scenes depicting police brutality. Plastow relates the success of the performance in how the police force thereafter adopted the forum theatre performance into their cadet training program (300). The contact zone that the forum theatre facilitated between the citizens and police within this village successfully allowed for two “life-worlds”, to use Trimbur’s words,

to experience each others' exigencies, which culminated in a positive instance of change for the entire community.

Activities utilized in the composition classroom that are based on forum theatre—such as the “simultaneous composition” activity—can lead to vitally important instances of the contact zone, which writing students must then grapple with, thereby expanding their conception of their underrepresented peers. For instance, a student from an underrepresented group on a particular campus might choose to be the student volunteer in order to read an essay about their experience as an underrepresented person within the educational community. The ability to speak in front of the entire class gives that student a platform to express their voice to a crowd of people who may not have considered their particular difficulties. The volunteers' peers must then attempt to place themselves in the position of the underrepresented student volunteer, in order to assist them with their essay. If a student from an underrepresented group does not feel comfortable with sharing his or her essay, then the contact zone can still be created by the student's—or anyone else's—decision to focus on a moment of potential prejudice or cultural misunderstanding that is displayed within the essay of another student volunteer. Stephen and Muriel emphasize the impact of the contact zone from their own experience applying forum theatre activities to a group of composition student: “The performative acts in critical discourse may engage the writer dialogically with the potential reader and allow the practical work of cultural criticism to set the platform for the representation and exchange of diverse viewpoints” (221). From this “exchange of diverse viewpoints,” the contact zone is given room to be established.

Studies such as Stephen and Muriel's provide scholars and instructors with evidence of the benefits that activities inspired by Boal's forum theater can nurture within a composition classroom. Furthermore, it has been theorized in this essay how these types of activities can successfully incorporate and unify the theories of composition scholars like Freire, Trimbur, and others to allow for the creation of the contact zone and the promotion of liberatory pedagogies. In general, there could be more of an effort amongst scholars and educators alike to incorporate Boal's forum theatre into their work. There is so much untapped potential for Boal's influence to fold back into the realm of education—especially in composition instruction—from which it was first conceived.

Works Cited

- Boal, Augusto. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Theatre Communications Group, 2013.
- Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process." *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*, edited by Susan Miller, W. W. Norton & Company, 2009, pp. 652-666.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum, 2012.
- Harlap, Yael. "Preparing University Educators for Hot Moments: Theater for Educational Development about Difference, Power, and Privilege." *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2014, pp. 217-228.
- Maxwell, Kelly and Patricia Gurin. "Using Dialogue to Create Inclusive Classrooms: A Case Study from a Faculty Institute." *Liberal Education*, vol. 103, no. 3/4, 2017, pp. 10-15.
- Plastow, Jane. "Practicing for the Revolution? The Influence of Augusto Boal in Brazil and Africa." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* (Routledge), vol. 7, no. 3, 2009, pp. 294-303.
- Stephen, Chan Ching-kiu and Law Yuen-fun Muriel. "Narrative and Performative Acts in Cultural Education: The Teaching of Writing as Critical Communication." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2013, pp. 213-227.
- Trimbur, John. "Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1994, pp. 108-118.

Confronting the White Gaze: Examining the Pliability of Photographs and Constructing a Self-Defined Collective Consciousness in Richard Wright's *12 Million Black Voices*

In his essay “Blueprint for Negro Writing,” Richard Wright calls into question the role of the Negro writer, addressing the gap between Negro writers and the black community as a result of “pleading with white America for justice” rather than writing for their community in efforts to self-define a collective consciousness that could spiritually unite and make possible the reclaiming of suffering that is denied to them (404). When addressing this gap, Wright recalls the “psychological importance” that can result from an oppressed people reproducing and reinforcing the inequalities forced upon them if they cannot spiritually unite and recognize their conditions; it is what Wright suggests can be worked against if writers belonging to the oppressed community work to access “a wide social vision and a deep social consciousness,” one that challenges dominant narratives and calls for a collective mobilization (404). In his autobiography *Black Boy*, Wright describes his own struggle to foster this type of consciousness through his writing; he states, “I spent my days in experimental writing, filling endless pages with stream-of-consciousness Negro dialect, trying to depict the dwellers of the Black Belt as I felt and saw them,” and in similar attempts, he “strove to master words, to make them disappear, to make them important by making them new, to make them melt into a rising spiral of emotional stimuli” (*Black Boy* 284, 280). This necessity to make words and experiences new, to bring them to the spiritual, emotional, and psychological forefront in the effort of reclaiming and self-defining experience is what is involved in Wright’s *12 Million Black Voices*.

In the photo documentary book, the black body’s suffering is traced from slavery to modern methods of bondage, particularly the violence inflicted onto black bodies by institutions. Therefore, the text becomes part of the process

Watermark

necessary to readdress and unknot cultural trauma, which “refers to a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion” whose approach must be taken “as reflective process” through “representations and imagination” (Eyerman 2-3). In order to examine the strain of resistance in *12 Million Black Voices*, I will make use of George Lipsitz’s possessive investment in whiteness to discuss the ways in which black bodies are constructed, stigmatized, and whose circumstances are seen as natural or “just the way it is.” I will also use George Yancy’s notion of the “white gaze” to examine the filter through which this racializing and othering of the black body occurs as it maintains and upholds America’s possessive investment in whiteness. Furthermore, in addressing the white gaze as part of this process of othering and benefiting from this othering, I suggest that the suspicion of the white gaze in the photographic and textual representations of the black community in *12 Million Black Voices* works to challenge the white viewer/reader where it invites the black viewer/reader to revisit and rewrite the generational trauma of America’s objectification of the black body and to create a sense of social consciousness.

As a photo documentary book, *12 Million Black Voices* is comprised of text supplied by Wright and photographs supplied by the Farm Security Administration (FSA), selected and arranged by Edwin Rosskam. According to Rosskam’s note at the end of the book, the photographs were not specifically chosen for the book but were originally part of a photo-documentary project given to the photographers under the FSA, a state-operated program previously titled Resettlement Administration functioning under the New Deal for the purposes of “exposure of the ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed in need of agency assistance; [...] exploration of the social, economic, and cultural processes” (Natanson 4). These photographs, taken under various assignments, were spread via magazines and newspapers, or were used to comprise the majority of photo documentary books such as *12 Million Black Voices*. The photographers that were given these assignments and who contributed to the photographs assembled under Rosskam for *12 Million Black Voices* included Jack Delano, Dorothea Lange, Russell Lee, Arthur Rothstein, and Rosskam himself among other white photographers. It is significant to note that the widespread use of these images via modern media, such as magazines and newspapers, became a major influence under what subjects photographers should hail and how the subjects would be framed; this, in the end, did not account for the ways in which the modern media would further construct the subject to mass audiences.

Charles Cunningham marks one of these instances where Dorothea Lange, whose several photographs were chosen for Wright’s photo documentary book, had a photograph of hers originally titled “Ex-tenant farmer on relief grant in the Imperial Valley, California” cropped to include only one person rather than the three that appear and retitled to “Dust Bowl Farmer is New Pioneer”

(278-80). Thus, the ease that modern media had to manipulate images and change an image of an unemployed man with others alongside him to an image of hope embedded in American individualism demonstrates a growing suspicion of the use of the photograph. This is especially true when one notes that the director of the FSA's photography section, Roy Stryker, urged Dorothea Lange to "take [photographs of] both black and white [tenants] but place the emphasis upon the white tenants, since we know they will receive much wider use" (qtd. in Cunningham 280). Here, there is a suggestion made about the consumption of photographs and upon which type of subject will be constructed in certain ways, for Director Stryker suggests that magazines will make more use of depictions of poverty as consumable images if they are white—thus, the image of the poor white farm worker "were, and still are, icons of Depression culture, receiving extraordinary public attention in the press as well as in fiction and film" (280). Moreover, white audiences of media (magazines, newspapers, fiction, film) and their gaze are catered to as their depictions were rendered sympathetic, critics argue that Richard Wright, while working on *12 Million Black Voices*, was well-aware of the pervasiveness of media and what it, filtered through the white gaze, could do when hailing the black subject. The work of undoing the white gaze, as a response to a suspicion of media, becomes the responsibility of the writer in *12 Million Black Voices* who, referring to the task of Negro writers stated in "Blueprint for Negro Writing," is tasked with revealing the conditions of the black community and giving it a voice.

The white gaze, defined by George Yancy, is "the performance of distortional "seeing" that evolves out of and is inextricably linked to various raced and racist myths, white discursive practices, and centripetal processes of white systematic power and white solipsism [...] an important site of power and control" (xviii). The white gaze is one of the vehicles through which America's possessive investment in whiteness occurs, since the possessive investment in whiteness means securing domination in the racializing of others to "stigmatize and exploit them" as whiteness "depend[s] not only on white hegemony over separate racialized groups, but also on manipulating racial outsiders to fight against one another, to compete with each other for white approval, and to seek rewards and privileges of whiteness for themselves at the expense of other racialized populations" (Lipsitz 3). On a national level, America's possessive investment in whiteness means to look at black bodies and distort them through the white gaze; it means that black people are not seen as individuals, rather they are collectively unseen and misrecognized through Western binary logic that makes it so that they are rendered object to the white subject, marked to the white unmarked, and abnormal or monstrous to the white, human norm. In regards to the FSA photography that is contributed and assembled to make up *12 Million Black Voices*, the black body is at risk of being turned into an object by the white gaze that frames and takes the photograph in addition to

Watermark

consuming the photograph. Work on both sides of the camera—through the white photographer and the white viewer—the black subject could be turned into an object to facilitate America's possessive investment in whiteness, to look at the conditions of black folk as a “quintessential object of the ethnographic gaze, the “strange,” exotic, and fascinating object of anthropology” or to suggest that their conditions are “just the way it is” (Yancy xvi). The black body could then encounter easily a series of Mary Daltons who want to “just *see* how [black] people live” (*Native Son* 510).

In addressing the distrust of media, specifically the circulation of photographs, Jason Puskar argues that Wright has divorced the photographs from the text in order to place more focus and importance on the written word and oratory voice that is implied through what critic John M. Reilly calls the “preacher-narrator.” Aligning the written and oral tradition in the black community with narratives of liberation, Puskar highlights the significance of control over identity that writing offers which the circulation of a photograph does not. Motivated by a suspicion of images, Wright does not seek to control them with captions because it might add more to the falsity of images and the fact that they could be changed to the holder's liking. However, there are still captions, and when captions are used, they are to recall names to laborers and to address emotion rather than an attempt to objectively address the image itself. Therefore, words here are used as instruments to manipulate media that already manipulates through techniques such as framing or even with the titles that photographers give the images. The images of the black laboring body are simplistic, detailing only the names by which they are hailed as subjects before they can be turned into objects by the viewer. In “the black stevedore” and “the black dancer,” the black laboring body is called to the viewer's attention as a body performing their role rather than looking the viewer in the eye; the simplistic nature with which they are viewed is aided by the text provided (*12 Million* 20-1). By adding simplistic captions addressing the role that the black individual is performing in the very moment of the photograph, Wright is “clearly concerned about the power of the dominant culture and its institutions to control the empire of images, but at the same time he also implies that there is something false about picture-making in general” (Puskar 177). In fact, the original names of these images provided by the photographer are not far off from the name that Wright gives them— “Stevedores” becomes “the black stevedore” and “Entertainers in night club, Chicago, Ill.” becomes “the black dancer” (*12 Million* 20-1, 149-50). An emphasis to the singular, individual yet collective nature of the renaming of the photographs by Wright can signal to the reader/viewer as an effort to address the racialization of labor and to further focus on the black individual body while he uses the plural “we” narrator to call for a collective consciousness. Thus, it is through the written word that Wright recontextualizes the photographs' emphasis on the racialized, individual laboring

body while expressing the falsity and futility of photographs to capture the entire black experience as the captions he provides are scarce throughout the book and simplistic.

Wright takes an extra step to ensure a claim of experience, using the text as a conduit for a collective-individual voice that accounts for the sociological and the psychological—that which is beyond the reach of the photograph. Examining the material and psychological effects of the legacy of bondage that slavery has marked the black body, Wright confronts the reality of this shared traumatic history by focusing in on the word “Negro,” which carries the history of violence and is a “psychological island whose objective form is the most unanimous fiat in all American history” that “limits in scope of meaning the vital contours of our lives, and the lives of our children and our children’s children” (*12 Million* 30). Similar to the simplified but racialized captions of the black laborers, Wright explores the ways in which photographs condense experience into one shot by looking into “the most unanimous fiat” that is the word “Negro” as a summation of violence and shared trauma inflicted against the black body (30). Thus, the word “Negro” challenges what photographs intend to do, which is to capture entire moments onto one scene through framing. Where photographs are static and can only show one moment at a time—and those moments can be adjusted through framing and interpreted through the white gaze—the word “Negro” can move across time and space to stand as a “psychological island” in “all of American history” (30). Its limiting effect on the black body is discussed here as well since the psychological island has its material consequences, which can be captured through the photograph (through space) but cannot capture the psyche.

It is significant to note that the word “Negro” has both an oratory and textual aspect that is not easy to capture due to its expansive generational history. Transcending the abilities of the photograph, Wright permits the narrator to construct a “we,” both inside and outside those photographs, as a reaction against the attempts to relegate and manipulate the black body. It is an echo of the opening of the book, in which the sufficiency of image and depiction of the black body in a photograph and its ability to objectively define is challenged because “when you see us black folk upon the dusty land of the farms or upon the hard pavement of the city streets, you usually take us for granted and think you know us, but our history is far stranger than you suspect, and we are not what we seem” (10). Specifically placed below a photograph of a black sharecropper, Wright addresses the separation between the black viewer, who may identify with the narrator, and the white viewer whose understanding of the subject of the photographs is questioned. Thus, the collective voice that recalls a shared trauma works to show the toll that the white gaze has had on psyche which cannot be relegated to the body and can be traced sociologically in the lives of black folk

Watermark

as well as psychologically in the shared consciousness of a people, down to the individual.

The individual subject is recovered through the collective orator voice through the images that challenge the white gaze such as Bill Shahn's portrait of the "Cotton pickers" and Russell Lee's depiction of the "Roller-skating rink" (34, 127). Shahn's "Cotton pickers" depicts three older adults in the rural South, two men and one woman (127). The man is in the background off to the side, and appears to be looking away; meanwhile, the man and woman in the foreground, who are similarly decentered, stare directly at the viewer. This image confronts the white gaze as the decentered individuals stare directly into the camera; in the context of this book however, the image has been contextualized with passages of dispelling myths of the pastoral South. By being placed next to this section of text, the photograph is further manipulated as the viewer is forced to see another side as their presence is acknowledged rather than unseen and unmarked. Lee's image of the "Roller-skating rink" does similar work where the viewer is confronted once again, but this time it is by a group of young people who appear to be smiling and laughing together (34). Here, the image is contextualized by the text in a setting of song and dance, so the viewer then is brought into what they can assume—without looking at the title provided by the photographer as "Roller-skating rink"—is a scene of song, dance, and liveliness. The text further manipulates the image in this way, or as I argue, the text recontextualizes the image, and the inclusion of viewer makes them participate in the image rather than simply staying in the role as the viewer. This contextualization and manipulation of images, some critics argue, offers a fluidity to the photo documentary book; Jack B. Moore calls it a "seamless fusion of pictures" or a "smooth visual continuity" (423). While I agree that the book's further manipulation of pictures paired with the text does offer a smooth continuity, I argue that this fluidity is only made possible with the recontextualization of the photographs as a result of the suspicion of media. It is also significant to note that although white photographers are the ones taking the photographs of black folk, it is Wright, an African American writer, who is recontextualizing how the photographs are interpreted. Puskar recognizes the work that words do to carry the photographs in *12 Million Black Voices* and states that "Wright's book suggest[s] that if you want to challenge the pictures that white people generate without being contaminated by their methods, do not make more pictures. Make more words" (177). Although Wright is using writing against photographs to reclaim subjectivity, it is not without recontextualization of the photographs that he is able to do this; the text not only carries the significance of the photographs for the reader, but it is a textual reconfiguration of how certain media should be examined.

Through this further reclaiming of the photograph and confronting of the viewer, the black body is able to resist the distortion of the white gaze

and question America's possessive investment in whiteness. The black body's constant presence in the text when referencing the conditions of the kitchenettes is a reminder to America of what it exploits and expels in order to maintain the formation of whiteness. Depicted as an assault against the black body, the kitchenettes are "our prison, our death sentence without a trial, the new form of mob violence that assaults not only the lone individual, but all of us, in its ceaseless attacks" (*12 Million* 106). While there is no black body in the photograph above this statement, there is a black body inside the text. On the other hand, the photograph on the next page shows a sleeping black family decentered within the frame while the focal point is the dirty floor they are sleeping on. This focus on the conditions in a rather intrusive and intimate photograph where the black individuals are sleeping and unaware of the gaze could risk the possibility of forming an "all-knowing" viewer. However, what prevents this from happening is the text that Wright provides above, which, in detailing birth rates and death rates, brings up the mortality and physical (albeit waning) presence of the black body. With constant mention of the black body in these passages, the viewer/reader is able to place the black body in the photographs focusing on the insides and outsides of the kitchenette; when there is no black body in the photographs, there is one in the text to confirm its presence and make undetachable the material effects of exploitation and America's antiblackness.

By placing the black body in the text consistently throughout space and time, via both text and photograph, *12 Million Black Voices* captures what Richard Wright later refers to in *Black Boy* as "psyche pain," or the conditions in which a black individual must live their life and to which the text grapples with, giving voice to consciousness in response to a life in America that "was a sprawling land of unconsciousness suffering" (*Black Boy* 267). In providing words to the cultural trauma that has created this "sprawling land of unconsciousness," Wright essentially gives voice to the black experience in the face of potential objectification that can occur through the white gaze from both sides of the camera. This potential objectification of the body—a body ready to be objectified—is combatted against by the further manipulation or recontextualization of the photographs which results in a reclaiming of the black body and confrontation of the potential act before it occurs. Thus, a consciousness is created, and it stands as one that stares and questions the distortion of the white gaze.

Works Cited

- Cunningham, Charles. "To Watch the Faces of the Poor: 'Life' Magazine and the Mythology of Rural Poverty in the Great Depression." *Journal of Narrative Theory*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1999, pp. 278-302.
- Eyerman, Ron. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*, Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Lipsitz, George. "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness." *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, Temple UP, 2006.
- Moore, Jack B. "The Voice in *12 Million Black Voices*." *The Mississippi Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 4, Mississippi State UP, pp. 415-24.
- Natanson, Nicholas. *The Black Image in the New Deal: The Politics of FSA Photography*, U of Tennessee P, 1992.
- Puskar, Jason. "Black and White and Read All Over: Photography and the Voices of Richard Wright." *Mosaic*, vol. 49, no. 2, June 2016, pp. 167-83.
- Reilly, John M. "Richard Wright Preaches the Nation: *12 Million Black Voices*." *Black American Literature Forum*, vol. 16, no. 3, Fall 1982, African American Review, pp. 116-19.
- Wright, Richard. *12 Million Black Voices*, Basic Books, 1941.
- _____. *Black Boy*, Harper Collins P, 2005.
- _____. "Blueprint for Negro Writing," *New Challenge*, 1937.
- _____. *Native Son*, Harper Collins P, 1991.
- Yancy, George. *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race*, Rowman Littlefield Publishers, 2008.

The Re-organizing Principle of Memory in *Mrs. Dalloway*

Introduction

A traumatic event's ability to "confound narrative knowledge" renders the transmission of trauma to narrative prose in the "emerging genre" of the trauma novel particularly complex (van der Kolk 1). Trauma is, by Bessel van der Kolk's definition, "...unbearable and intolerable" (1). Trauma consists of an event that overwhelms the central nervous system, an overtaking that engenders physiological changes that not only affect the mind's registration and recollection of memory, but also result in a "...fundamental reorganization of the way mind and brain manage perceptions" (21). Post trauma, one experiences the world with "...a different nervous system" that remains activated in a continual state of defense against potential succeeding traumas (21). The foundational traumatic event consequently becomes an experience that the trauma victim may repeatedly relive, if not in the form of visceral flashbacks or haunting nightmares, then in the body's newfound hyper-vigilance.

To reduce trauma to a singular constitutional traumatic event is to minimize the prodigious nature of trauma's permanent and resonant psychological alterations. Trauma, as van der Kolk notes, is not isolated within a singular traumatic occurrence. Van der Kolk writes "...trauma is not just an event that took place sometime in the past: it is also the imprint left by that experience on mind, body, and brain. This imprint has ongoing consequences for how the human organism manages to survive in the present" (21). In trauma's ability to elude even the consciousness of the trauma victim, trauma emerges as a comprehensive restructuring of the mind that functions on a massive scale, subjecting the body to a total and involuntary reprogramming.

Watermark

The authorial desire to encapsulate trauma within a narrative therefore represents a considerable challenge: how to translate trauma into prose. Roger Luckhurst argues that the trauma novel must acknowledge trauma's confounding nature "...in different kinds of temporal disruption" meant to mimic trauma's memorial "disruption" of the mind (Luckhurst 88). Luckhurst's assertion is the derivative of his contemplation of Anne Whitehead's stance on trauma narratives. "If trauma is at all susceptible to narrative formulation," Whitehead writes in *Trauma Fiction*, "then it requires a literary form which departs from conventional linear sequence" (Whitehead 6). Laurie Vickroy offers another perspective on the trauma narrative: "Trauma narratives go beyond presenting trauma as a subject matter or in characterization; they also incorporate the rhythms, processes, and uncertainties of trauma within the consciousness and structures of these works" (Vickroy 14). If a novel catalogued as a "trauma novel" seeks to present an authentic portrayal of trauma, then that narrative must engage with trauma not merely in its content, but in its overarching narrative structure. The work must embody a narrative organization that reproduces the psychological impact of trauma in a written form. It is in this sense that the conventional narrative landscape of fiction needs also to undergo a reorganization as transformative in nature as that of the traumatized body.

The causally recursive narrative structure represents a starting point for such reorganization. The traditional ordering methodology of fiction, the causally recursive structure creates a chronological sequence of events where one event naturally and clearly catalyzes another (Talib). This causally recursive approach evokes Wolfgang Iser. "The reader of a fictional narrative strives to fit everything together in a consistent pattern," Iser states (Iser 219). Yet the events of a trauma narrative cannot align in such a "consistent pattern" if the narrative is to accurately illustrate trauma, for trauma is defined by its disordering. The trauma novel thus necessitates the very sort of "temporal disruption" that Luckhurst references to effectively disjoint the chronological sequence of narrative events.

Narrative anachrony represents a formidable source of such temporal disruption. A "Discrepancy between the chronological order of events and the order in which they are related in a plot," anachrony enables the author of a trauma novel to relay the narrative's events in a discontinuous manner commensurate with the traumatized mind's disunited processing of events ("anachrony"). Published in 1925, Virginia Woolf's novel, *Mrs. Dalloway*, achieves its sweeping temporal mobility through its anachronous structure. The Modernist text utilizes narrative anachrony to navigate the characters' past experiences and associated memories spanning the recent to dated past. *Mrs. Dalloway's* anachronous temporal organization facilitates a wide ranging temporal mobility that the plot's temporal brevity renders astonishing, seeing that the novel recounts the present events of a singular day in post-World War I London.

Mrs. Dalloway's narrative anachrony provides a structuring that is deeply invested in reminiscence; the novel's protagonists and fleeting strangers alike return to the past through memory, motivated by the act of recollection. While the characters of *Mrs. Dalloway* exist in different degrees of independence from each other, the characters of the novel—however disparately scattered across London—are unified by these collective acts of reflection. Memory is indissoluble from anachrony in the context of Woolf's narrative; anachrony forms a regressive contract with memory in which the anachronous organization of the novel facilitates the characters' respective abilities to vividly recall and re-experience the past. Consequently, the present events of the novel become temporally intertwined with the past.

Within *Mrs. Dalloway*, the present is very much shaped by the past, and memory thus proves to be an organizing temporal principle of *Mrs. Dalloway*. Narrative anachrony is then not unlike trauma in its textual operation. A traumatic event is reorganizational in much the same way that anachrony is within the novel. Just as a traumatic event is psychologically re-structural, informing the body's present and future actions and reactions based on the memory of the traumatic experience, so too is anachrony. Woolf's use of narrative anachrony elicits a similar, repeated return to the past in the context of the novel, where memory of past experience likewise informs the present events and characters' characterization within the narrative. Van der Kolk's text, *The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and the Body in the Healing of Trauma* provides a definition of trauma that helps to elucidate the structural similarities between trauma and the narratively anachronous temporal structure of *Mrs. Dalloway*.

Memory in Mrs. Dalloway

Memory is integral to the intrinsic mental processes of the characters of *Mrs. Dalloway*. The medium permits the novel's central characters to "... move repeatedly in their minds from their middle-aged present, on a single day in London, to intense late-adolescent episodes experienced in the country at Bourton" (Scott xlv). The vast range of memories that *Mrs. Dalloway's* anachronous narrative structure renders visible inform the present events of the novel, providing a context for characters' individual emotional and contemplative responses that would otherwise remain absent, or at the very least opaque. *Mrs. Dalloway* initiates its first anachronous turn on the very first page of the novel, where the narrative's initial presentation of Clarissa Dalloway demonstrates a dependence on a narrative structure that allows for the memorial return to one's past. Situated in Clarissa's London home, *Mrs. Dalloway* opens in the present. The narrative's orientation in the present proves premature, as the text swiftly—albeit temporarily—leaves Clarissa's London home. This narrative departure is the product of a particular sound. The "...squeak of [door] hinges" transports Clarissa to her youthful days at Bourton in what is only the second paragraph

Watermark

of *Mrs. Dalloway*: "...with a little squeak of the hinges, which she could hear now, she had burst open the French windows and plunged at Bourton into the open air" (Woolf 1). A girl of eighteen in this isolated recollection, Clarissa seamlessly moves between temporal period to psychologically submerge herself in the past, thereby effecting a spatial shift from London to Bourton. Reveling in the temperate Bourton air, Clarissa turns further 'inward' in her reference to Peter Walsh, a character who is fascinating for the nature of his first textual introduction: memory. *Mrs. Dalloway* develops Peter in the recesses of Clarissa's memory before Peter ever physically enters the novel's present course of events. Still enveloped in the expansive Bourton air, Clarissa first recalls one of Peter's peculiar remarks—"I prefer men to cauliflowers"—determining that Peter "... must have said it at breakfast one morning when she had gone out to the terrace" (1). Clarissa's use of the phrase "must have" is significant to the construction of this sentence, as the utterance is indicative of Clarissa's strain to situate the statement at its exact point of remark. Clarissa's ability to recall the content of Peter's comment contrasts with her inability to remember its specific temporal setting, indicating that while there is a general and irrefutable preservation of the past in Clarissa's memory, that past is accessible in differing degrees of precision. Woolf writes, "...when millions of things had utterly vanished [from recollection]—how strange it was! —a few sayings like this about cabbages" (2). Clarissa's surprise that she should remember such a remark further elucidates memory's simultaneous and paradoxically elusive and definite quality.

Mrs. Dalloway facilitates Peter's initial introduction to the text through Clarissa's memory of Peter in Bourton, a crystallization of his character that progresses beyond mere quotation. Clarissa reflects "...Peter Walsh. He would be back from India one of these days, June or July, she forgot which, for his letters were awfully dull; it was his sayings one remembered; his eyes, his pocket-knife, his smile, his grumpiness (1). Peter grows more sharply defined through Clarissa's memory, a psychological space that serves as a resource for Peter's character development prior to the text's frontal, present encounter with Peter on page 39: Clarissa's description of Peter, grounded in the past, anticipates Peter as he exists in the present. For indeed, once Peter strides through the doors of the Dalloway home in his unannounced visit to Clarissa, back from India with that character defining pocket-knife in hand, Clarissa observes Peter to be "Exactly the same" as he is in her memory, wearing "...the same queer look; the same check suit...just the same" (39).

Memory is an organizing principle of *Mrs. Dalloway* that can be equated in function to van der Kolk's definition of trauma. Clarissa's thought processes are organized around the past; she "...could remember scene after scene at Bourton," scenes that elicit Clarissa's reflexive re-visitation of memory (6). A traumatic event places an "imprint" on the "...mind, body, and brain" of the trauma victim that continually reroutes the victim's thought processes, organizing the

victim's perception around the traumatic experience (van der Kolk 21). The psychological imprint of such trauma serves as the mental site to which the victim continually returns via reminiscence, underscoring the re-organizational aspect of trauma. *Mrs. Dalloway's* representation of the past is correspondingly re-structural; Clarissa's thoughts are arranged around the past, rendering past memory inextricable from present perception. A register of previous experience, memory is the temporal imprint to which Clarissa—like other characters in the narrative—repeatedly return. Such return is made possible by the novel's anachronous temporal organization; too easy, and yet so fluid, is Clarissa's navigation of temporal space via memory.

The depth of memory's existence as a temporal imprint within the text is evidenced in both the ease and frequency with which Clarissa evokes the past. The omnipresence of the past as it thrives in memory is exemplified in Clarissa's unresolved, yet pondering question, "If he were with me now what would he [Peter] say?" (Woolf 7). But the past transcends mere recollection: memory of the past can incite Clarissa to action, and so "...she would still find herself arguing in St. James's Park, still making out that she had been right—and she had too—not to marry him" (7). A fateful choice made years earlier, Clarissa's decision to marry Richard Dalloway requires her rejection of Peter, a denial that proves to be a contemplative crux for Clarissa within the present temporal landscape of *Mrs. Dalloway*. Despite her self reassurance that she "had been right" not to marry Peter after their summer together in Bourton, threads of profound emotion stitch together the memory of Clarissa's past refusal of Peter, and her present recollection thereof (7). Clarissa "...had borne about with her for years like an arrow sticking in her heart the grief, the anguish, and then the horror of the moment when someone told her at a concert that he has married a woman [he] met on the boat going to India! Never should she forget all that!" (8). Clarissa's closing exclamation underscores the permanence of "...the grief, the anguish...[and] the horror" of the news that she receives regarding Peter's marriage, for as Clarissa herself notes, "...when millions of things had utterly vanished [from recollection]," the ache induced by the information is "never" forgotten (2, 8). An unmentioned—but no less applicable—source of pain lies within Clarissa's recognizance of Peter's romantic detachment from her, a severance grounded in Peter's act of marrying, years later.

When *Mrs. Dalloway* introduces Peter, he likewise proves to be a character equally invested in the past, and much like Clarissa, Peter too can evoke the past with ease. In response to Clarissa's errant question—"Do you remember, how the blinds used to flap at Bourton?"—Peter seamlessly regresses from present to past as Clarissa's reference to blinds conjures the memory of a morning at Bourton spent in the company of Clarissa's father: "...he remembered breakfasting alone, very awkwardly, with her father; who had died" (41). Clarissa's mention of their time at Bourton leads Peter to engage more intimately

Watermark

with that snippet of the past as he recalls his previous hope to marry Clarissa, the desire responsible for Peter's "awkward" socialization with Clarissa's father (41). Years later, the recollection of his longing to marry Clarissa still stings: "... it almost broke my heart too, [Peter] thought; and was overcome with his own grief, which rose like a moon looked at from a terrace, ghastly beautiful with light from the sunken day" (41). Peter and Clarissa are likened by their shared ability to seamlessly regress from present to past. Once there—the past—both characters exhibit their capacity to re-experience the sorrow of the past as if that sorrow were new. It is in the past that "...she survived, Peter survived, lived in each other" (9). The past links Clarissa and Peter, and both characters are acutely aware of this connection. The narrative description that follows Peter's remembrance illustrates this shared sensibility: "There above them it hung, that moon. She too seemed to be sitting with him on the terrace, in the moonlight" (41). Peter uses a simile to equate "...his own grief" to a moon that is suspended above them (41). That this moon hangs "...above them" indicates that both characters are not only conscious of Peter's grief, but can also access this grief, as its source is embedded in each of their memories. Clarissa accordingly seems "... to be sitting with him on the terrace, in the moonlight," reminiscing (41).

The echo of his question—"For why go back like this to the past? — dissolving in Big Ben's "...leaden circles" as he leaves the Dalloway home, Peter walks to Regent's Park, and slips back into Bourton as he strolls: "It became clearer; the scene, the room, the past he had been dreaming of" (57). As the anachronous structure of *Mrs. Dalloway* propels Peter to submerge himself once more in his memory of that sweet summer at Bourton, the narrative further evinces the past's potential to inform the present. Just as Clarissa's memory is apprising in its presentation of the details necessary to draw a partial character sketch of Peter prior to his textual introduction, so too does Peter's memory inform Clarissa's character. Bonnie Kime Scott writes, "When we visit Bourton in Peter's memory, more of Clarissa is exposed" (Scott lvii). *Mrs. Dalloway's* anachronous structure continues to inform Clarissa and Peter's present characterizations, allowing the characters to access memories of the past that effectively expand the outline of the other; the past offers the character related descriptions that the present cannot.

The text illustrates Clarissa to be an introspective, sentimental, and somewhat anxious young woman of elevated socioeconomic status. *Mrs. Dalloway* moves in sync with Clarissa as she travels up Bond Street to purchase flowers at Mulberry's, mentally critiquing Miss Kilman's ostentatious green mackintosh coat while en route to the florist. The novel's focus on Clarissa's party and other aesthetic elements—the glimmer of the newly polished silver in the Dalloway home, Clarissa's array of evening dresses, the crystal dolphin decoration—all "...for the party," subject Clarissa to classification as a superficial character fixated on material items and reputation (37). While not unwarranted,

designation of Clarissa only as a superficial being ultimately minimizes the complexity of Clarissa's character. Peter's recollection lends a depth to Clarissa's characterization that extends her characterization beyond frivolity. Peter's reflection transports him to his place by Miss Parry's chair in the Bourton drawing-room, just after Richard Dalloway's introduction to the Bourton group. Peter rouses the memory: "Clarissa came up, with her perfect manners, like a real hostess, and wanted to introduce him to some one [Richard]—spoke as if they had never met before, which enraged him. Yet even then he admired her for it. He admired her courage; her social instinct; he admired her power of carrying things through" (60). Peter goes on to describe Clarissa as "maternal" and "gentle," adjectives that the present state of the novel does not demonstrate as descriptors applicable to Clarissa (60). Peter's account of Clarissa's confidence in her attempt to acquaint him with Richard elevates Clarissa beyond her presently perceived self absorption, exhibiting her to be a character conscious of those around her. Clarissa is so conscious, in fact, that she even addresses Peter "...as if they had never met before"; the detached manner with which Clarissa engages Peter functions an early indication of her budding interest in Richard (60).

Peter delves deeper into the memory to reference the Bourton group's plan to go "...boating on the lake by moonlight" (61). Peter recalls being "...left quite alone," seemingly forgotten by the party until Clarissa ventures back to the house to retrieve Peter from his solitude (61). In response to Clarissa's "Come along, they're waiting," Peter feels "...overcome by her generosity—her goodness," an expression of emotion that characterizes Clarissa as a sympathetic and considerate character determined not to exclude Peter from the group's evening expedition (61). That Peter is "overcome" by Clarissa's "generosity" and "goodness" further extends the idea that Clarissa is, for Peter, an imposing presence capable of consuming Peter with emotion. Peter is notably also "overcome" with grief during his visit at the Dalloway residence (41).

Mrs. Dalloway's anachronous narrative structure enables its characters—most prominently, Clarissa and Peter—to "...get outside [their] bodies, [and] beyond [their] houses, by means of thought" (27). When localized within the past, "thought" becomes synonymous with "memory," and it is accordingly Peter's memory that not only informs Clarissa's present characterization in particular, but also catalyzes the text's temporal movement (27). From a present vantage point in Regent's Park, Peter remains physically stationed in the environment of the park as he simultaneously roams the memorial grounds of the Bourton summer house. Van der Kolk's definition of trauma designates the traumatic experience as the catalyst for continual reversion to the past, which re-orientes the central nervous system around the past traumatic experience. Peter's mental processes demonstrate a comparable centering around past experience, further exemplifying the similarity in function between van der Kolk's understanding of trauma and *Mrs. Dalloway's* depiction of memory. Memory within *Mrs.*

Watermark

Dalloway reflects trauma's regressive and psychologically overpowering course, as evidenced in Peter's admission of mental subjugation: "He only felt...unable to get away from the thought of her; she kept coming back and back like a sleeper jolting against him in a railway carriage; which was not being in love, of course, it was thinking of her, criticizing her, starting again, after 30 years trying to explain her" (65).

Clarissa and Peter, however, are not the sole characters of the narrative for whom memory proves mutually informing in relation to characterization. Bonnie Kime Smith notes in her introduction to *Mrs. Dalloway*, "Only Lucrezia Smith knows her husband well enough to present him thoroughly, tunneling to the surface during the war, when they met in Italy, and bringing to light incidents of their marriage" (Smith lxi). Smith's assertion is a testament to the text's engagement with Lucrezia's memory. Lucrezia's memory is an invaluable resource within the context of the novel, given that it is "only" Lucrezia who "... knows her husband well enough to present him thoroughly" (lxi). Lucrezia's qualification to act as an expanding agent of Septimus' characterization rests in her storied intimacy with her spouse; this accreditation correctly reads Lucrezia's familiarity with Septimus as the basis for her "thorough presentation" of his character. Like that of Clarissa Dalloway's character, Septimus' characterization is limited in its scope. *Mrs. Dalloway* depicts Septimus as a shell shock stricken World War I soldier prone to flashbacks and delusional but poetic outbursts. The novel directs its characterizing focus to Septimus's post-war psychological experiences, offering intricately detailed scenes illustrative of Septimus's mental disturbance:

Heaven was divinely merciful, infinitely benignant. It spared him, pardoned his weakness. But what was the scientific explanation (for one must be scientific above all things)? Why could he see through bodies, see into the future, when dogs will become men? It was the heat wave presumably...scientifically speaking, the flesh was melted off the world. His body was macerated until only the nerve fibers were left. It spread like a veil upon a rock...He lay very high on the back of the world. The earth thrilled beneath him. Red flowers grew through his flesh; their stiff leaves rustled by his head (Woolf 67).

Mrs. Dalloway's elaborate exhibition of Septimus's compromised psychological state is situated in the present course of the narrative's events. The text's characterization of Septimus, however, would be fragmentary and one-sided without Lucrezia's recollections of Septimus as he used to be. The utility of Lucrezia's memory is comparable to that of Peter's in that Lucrezia's memory offers a fuller, more dynamic characterization of Septimus, much in the same way that Peter's memories expand Clarissa's character beyond a superficial surface level. Lucrezia's first impression of Septimus, formed in a café, offers a glimpse of his character prior to his total mental disorientation. Lucrezia recalls

entrance in the café, how “...his hat had fallen when he hung it up,” and his “hunched” posture during the game of dominoes that he played with his friends (143). Lucrezia remembers Septimus’s composure: “She had never seen him wild or drunk, only suffering sometimes through this terrible war, but even so, when she came in, he would put it all away” (143). Lucrezia’s identification of Septimus’s ability to subdue and obscure his war related distress underscores him as a previously self possessed character. This isolated memory of Septimus further functions to accentuate his—and by extension, Lucrezia’s—ensuing loss of this equanimity, the consequence of his mental degeneration.

Lucrezia reflects on the psychological connection that she once shared with Septimus, the absence of which leads Lucrezia to feel increasingly solitary, and even prompts her to loudly lament in Regent’s Park, “I am alone; I am alone!” (23). Prior to the onset of Septimus’s shell shock, “Anything, anything in the whole world, any little bother with her work, anything that struck her to say she would tell him, and he understood at once. Her own family even were not the same” (143). Lucrezia’s statement, “Her own family even were not the same,” imparts the depth of Lucrezia’s psychological connection with Septimus—their bond is so profound that it transcends even the one that she has forged with her own family (143). Lucrezia’s recollection of the strength of this previously existent psychological link further elucidates the magnitude of its loss.

Peter’s memory contains details that enable him to classify Clarissa as “generous” and “good,” characteristics that the present situation of *Mrs. Dalloway* does not assign to Clarissa (41). Peter’s reminiscences of Clarissa as such accordingly expand the outline of her character, causing her to become a ‘rounder’ figure. Lucrezia accesses memory in a similarly dilantant manner, remembering Septimus to be both “clever” and “serious” (143). These qualities further delineate and enlarge his character, being that the narrative’s present state does not attribute these characteristics to Septimus (143). Lucrezia’s memory augments Septimus’s characterization. *Mrs. Dalloway’s* narrative organization facilitates Lucrezia’s remembrances of Septimus prior to his debilitating shell shock, creating the illusion that there are two Septimus’s: a pre-shell shock, “clever,” rational, and “serious” Septimus, and a shell shock riddled Septimus who cannot distinguish delusion from reality (143). Lucrezia’s memory is not solely a broadening agent of characterization; it is also a divisional one, as apparent in Lucrezia’s avowal in Regent’s Park: “He was not Septimus now” (22).

The past and present represent a dichotomy of identity not just for Septimus in the context of pre and post psychological disruption, but additionally for Lucrezia, the witness of Septimus’s progressive mental disorientation. Lucrezia’s memory of her relationship with Septimus prior to his shell shock shows Lucrezia to be content with her marriage. Lucrezia becomes a character deeply dissatisfied with her marriage in the wake of Septimus’s psychological affliction.

Watermark

“It’s wicked, why should I suffer?” Lucrezia questions, “...for herself she had done nothing wrong; she had loved Septimus; she had been happy; she had had a beautiful home...why should *she* suffer?” (63-64). Lucrezia’s discontent extends beyond her marriage to swath her life in a shroud of gloom: “...why should *she* be exposed? Why not left in Milan? Why tortured? Why?...To be rocked by this malignant torturer was her lot. But why?” (64). *Mrs. Dalloway’s* structure allows Lucrezia to compare the past satisfaction of life with its present misery. The binary of past and present constructs a correspondingly characterizing binary for both Lucrezia and Septimus: happy and unhappy, psychologically sound and psychologically affected.

While Lucrezia and Septimus are duly—and at times, similarly—oriented around the past, this orientation ultimately functions more intensively for Septimus, as his relationship to the past is forged by trauma. Roger Luckhurst identifies narrative anachrony as a “...symptom of buried trauma,” a literary diagnosis that only further illuminates the structural similarity of memory and trauma (105). If narrative anachrony is symptomatic of “buried trauma,” then it is anachrony that must excavate that repressed trauma through repeated narrative returns to the past, but more specifically, to the prior temporal point when such “buried trauma” was first “buried” (105). We can read *Mrs. Dalloway’s* anachronous narrative structure as indicative of trauma buried within the character of Septimus Smith, and the novel’s anachronous organization a broad attempt to unearth and explicate that trauma in the story’s present context.

Mrs. Dalloway’s anachronous structure depends on the simple act of recollection, an act that is *mostly* voluntary for Clarissa, Peter, and Lucrezia. Although these characters’ respective memories of the past might be melancholic, Clarissa, Peter, and Lucrezia willingly, and sometimes even absentmindedly, slip into reminiscences from which they always eventually rise, to return to the narrative’s present course of events. Memory is intrusive for all characters, but is comparatively wholly forceful with respect to Septimus. Whereas Clarissa, Peter, and Lucrezia appear to make the conscious choice to reflect, calling memory forth in some moments, while involuntarily “overcome” with memory in others, Septimus is completely at the mercy of his memory. The trauma of Septimus’ past resurges not through voluntary recollection, but through sporadic and immersive flashbacks that dominate the flow of Septimus’ thoughts (41). Septimus experiences such a flashback in Regent’s Park:

He sang. Evans answered from behind the tree. The dead were in Thessaly, Evans sang, among the orchids. There they waited till the War was over, and now the dead, now Evans himself— “For God’s sake don’t come!” Septimus cried out. For he could not look upon the dead. But the branches parted. A man in grey was actually walking towards them. It was Evans! (68).

Septimus' mention of Evans serves as the main indicator that Septimus is in the midst of a flashback: Evans' death renders his ability to enter the novel's present course of events impossible; Evans can only enter the text via Septimus' memory, and his flashback materializes an offshoot of that memory. Septimus' flashback is evocative of van der Kolk's identification of traumatic memory as an actor that performs long after the traumatic experience has passed. Septimus's intrusive flashbacks are the "work" of his traumatic memory, and yet despite the flashbacks' intermittent quality, it is unclear whether Septimus ever fully separates himself from the traumatic memory of his past. Septimus experiences numerous flashbacks; each lived flashback denotes a return to the past. The recurrent nature of the flashbacks accords with van der Kolk's statement that trauma leaves an imprint on the body that has "...ongoing consequences for how the human organism manages to survive in the present" (van der Kolk 69). The consequences of Septimus' war trauma are permanently imprinted memories of the past that complicate his perception of the present. Psychological pieces of Septimus' past integrate with the present, as he continues to endure involuntary and habitual flashbacks. Evans functions as one such fragment. Septimus continues to see Evans as Lucrezia interrupts his flashback to ask the time: "I will tell you the time," said Septimus, very slowly, very drowsily, smiling mysteriously. As he sat smiling at the dead man in the grey suit the quarter struck—the quarter to twelve" (Woolf 69). Evans remains visually present for Septimus as he corresponds with Lucrezia. Septimus smiles at Evans, and before Lucrezia poses her question, Septimus speaks to Evans: "For God's sake don't come!" (79). Even while Peter Walsh passes by Septimus and Lucrezia in Regent's Park, Septimus sees and engages with two people other than himself.

Septimus continually interacts with this psychological figment of Evans: "A voice spoke from behind the screen. Evans was speaking. The dead were with him. 'Evans, Evans!' he cried" (91). Septimus again calls out to Evans when Dr. Bradshaw comes to commit Septimus to one of his psychiatric homes. "Evans!" Septimus "cries" (142). While Evans is not always visually visible to Septimus, Evans nevertheless remains a present entity, and notably one with whom Septimus repeatedly attempts to connect.

Erich Lindemann's model of acute grief as it manifests in those who encounter a traumatic loss offers a useful conceptual basis by which to evaluate Septimus' flashbacks. A "...definite syndrome with psychological and somatic symptomatology," acute grief can appear "...immediately after a crisis," or can alternatively be "delayed" (Lindemann 141). Whereas acute grief can be "exaggerated" in nature, Lindemann notes that acute grief too can appear to be "absent" (141). When acute grief becomes visible, it typically becomes so in the wake of a death, prompting the bereaved person who mourns the deceased to become despondent and socially resistant. The mourning individual additionally finds "the sensorium...somewhat altered," in which there is a "...slight sense of

Watermark

unreality, a feeling of increased emotional distance from other people, and there is intense preoccupation with the image of the deceased" (142). We see these qualities reflected in Septimus.

Septimus displays many of the behaviors that Lindemann outlines as those reflective of a grief reaction. The "...slight sense of unreality," however, is magnified in Septimus: his sense of unreality is comparatively exaggerated, given his WWI induced trauma (142). The vivid quality and focus of Septimus' flashbacks involving Evans suggests that Septimus is perhaps suffering not only from shell shock, but also coping with an emotional grief reaction to Evans' death. Acute grief can immediately follow the occurrence of the "crisis" (141). Alternatively, it can "be delayed...or apparently absent" in its appearance (141). Septimus' grief reaction to Evans' death, however, does not promptly follow the casualty. Instead, the response appears to be correspondingly "absent," for "...when Evans was killed, just before the Armistice, in Italy, Septimus, far from showing any emotion or recognising that here was the end of a friendship, congratulated himself upon feeling very little and very reasonably" (Woolf 84). Septimus' lack of an emotional response to the officer's death suggests that the death is perhaps too overwhelming a loss to register, thus signifying that Septimus will naturally process and react to the loss at a later time. Post war, Septimus remains devoid of emotion; "For now that it was all over, truce signed, and the dead buried, he had, especially in the evening, these sudden thunderclaps of fear. He could not feel" (85). Septimus "...could not feel" in the wake of the war's end, and continues to exhibit "emotional distance" thereafter, particularly in his interactions with Lucrezia (Lindemann 142; Woolf 84). The "emotional distance" between Septimus and Lucrezia is partly the product of Septimus' social resistance, which is also emblematic of a grief reaction. "Interrupted again! She was always interrupting," Septimus exclaims when Lucrezia disturbs his flashback of Evans in Regent's Park ("Evans was behind the railings!") (24). Septimus views Lucrezia as a meddling force, and in accordance with Lindemann's description of the bereaved, "...does not want to be bothered" by Lucrezia (Lindemann 144). Once Lucrezia interjects, Septimus grows increasingly socially resistant as he emphatically expresses his desire to be removed from others: "Away from people—they must get away from people, he said (jumping up), right away over there, where there were chairs beneath a tree" (Woolf 24).

Septimus' general social evasion and "emotional distance" manifests quite clearly in his behavior throughout *Mrs. Dalloway*, suggesting that the once absent grief reaction to Evans' death does eventually commence (Lindemann 142). Lindemann's mention of the bereaved's "...intense preoccupation with the image of the deceased" directly correlates with Septimus' flashbacks of Evans; Septimus becomes fixated on Evans' "image" as he attempts to carry out the reaction's "grief work" (142). The length of the bereaved's "grief reaction" is

largely dependent on the rate at which the person performs what Lindemann terms the “grief work” (143). The “...emancipation from the bondage to the deceased, readjustment to the environment in which the deceased is missing, and the formation of new relationships,” “grief work” is a necessary labor that enables the bereaved to adapt to this new “environment,” in which the deceased can no longer be found (143). While the completion of such “grief work” allows the person that exhibits a grief reaction to progress beyond bereavement, those that experience a traumatic loss do not always quickly accomplish their grief work (143). Lindemann observes that “One of the big obstacles to this work seems to be the fact that many patients try to avoid the intense distress connected with the grief experience and to avoid the expression of emotion necessary for it” (143). A patient’s initial rejection of “grief work” notably does not translate to a general failure to accomplish the work; patients can later become “...willing to accept the grief process and to embark on a program of dealing in memory with the deceased person” (143). Confronting the troubling recollections of the deceased, however, or in other words, performing this inevitable emotional labor, will not necessarily—or always—liberate the bereaved of the psychological fetters, which manifest as flashbacks in Septimus’ particular case.

Erich Lindemann’s theory of acute grief can advance both an analysis of Septimus’ flashbacks and a study of Clarissa and Peter’s experiences with loss, and memory’s relation to these experiences. While Clarissa and Peter jointly feel the loss of the other, neither Clarissa nor Peter appear to display grief reactions; Clarissa and Peter do not arise as “irritable” characters who evade “...former social activities,” as one in the midst of a grief reaction characteristically would (144). Clarissa remains characteristically preoccupied with the preparations for her party, exclaiming to Peter “My party to-night! Remember my party to-night!” (Woolf 47). Clarissa’s parties are antithetical to the social avoidance that characterizes a grief reaction; the parties are “...an offering; to combine, to create” (119). Clarissa muses “Here was So-and-so in South Kensington; some one up in Bayswater; and somebody else, say, in Mayfair. And she [Clarissa] felt quite continuously a sense of their existence...and she felt if only they could be brought together; so she who it” (119). It is Clarissa who organizes the socially interactive events, and it is ultimately Peter that does in fact “remember” and attends Clarissa’s party that night (47). Both characters exhibit an interest in socializing not only with each other, but with others, negating the presence of the socially avoidant conduct that Lindemann outlines as a behavioral response to traumatic loss. Clarissa and Peter’s mutual loss of the other does not appear to function on Lindemann’s scale of grief; however, this does not mean that Clarissa and Peter’s shared loss is not impactful. Joshua Pederson poses the question, “Do our moments of deepest pain remain available to us?” in his article, “Speak, Trauma: Toward a Revised Understanding of Literary Trauma” (Pederson 333). In the textual landscape of *Mrs. Dalloway*, the answer is indeed

Watermark

“yes, it does,” for both Clarissa and Peter can access—and do regularly access—certain moments of past profound pain.

Luckhurst traces “Exemplars of the trauma novel” to the late 1980s and 1990s in his recapitulation of the emergence of trauma literature (Luckhurst 87). Central to Luckhurst’s recounting of the rise of the trauma narrative is literature’s “[exploration of] ‘new modes of memory’” (87). Memory’s function in relation to Clarissa and Peter can be viewed as Woolf’s corresponding “exploration” of a “new mode of memory,” where memory for Clarissa and Peter is certainly not traumatic in the same way that it is for Septimus, but is still irrefutably impactful (87). Each character’s memory of the past is sharply preserved, the emotion still acutely felt. Clarissa’s memory of Peter still causes her to argue that “she has been right...not to marry [Peter],” and likewise, Peter’s memory of Clarissa still “overcome[s]” him with grief (Woolf 7, 41). There is indeed a traumatic quality to Clarissa and Peter’s memories, but this ‘traumatic’ nature is markedly less severe than that of Septimus’ memory. In the context of Clarissa and Peter’s memories, the application of the title “traumatic” might best be interpreted with Pederson’s question in mind, to yield the conclusion that the “traumatic” for Clarissa and Peter is the omnipresence of the characters’ “...moments of deepest pain” (Pederson 33).

It is furthermore important to note that although Woolf does use the term “grief” in relation to Peter, Woolf’s use of the word does not bear the same denotation of Lindemann’s. In the context of Woolf’s implementation of the term, “grief” speaks to the poignant flood of emotion that Peter experiences when Clarissa “[reminds] Peter that he had wanted to marry her” (41). Woolf’s use of “grief” refers to a strong emotional reaction to a past memory situationally recalled, rather than to a developed and “...definite syndrome” as in Lindemann (Lindemann 141).

Roger Luckhurst highlights the individual texts that collectively form an archive of trauma literature as those that “‘have been particularly effective at tracing the consequences of living out the belief in, say, traumatic memory’” (Luckhurst 87). *Mrs. Dalloway* is “belief” in such traumatic memory in tangible novelistic form. The trauma narrative evinces not only the existence of traumatic memory, but its varying degrees and forms. *Mrs. Dalloway* is perhaps disposed to be a trauma narrative given what Luckhurst phrases Modernism’s recent “recasting” as a “...species of trauma literature” (79). The Modernist style emerges as a literary approach that is particularly conducive to the trauma novel, given the Modernist tendency to distort the temporal, to act as a “...prodigious workshop for experiments in the...expression of time” (85). Modernism by nature thwarts the notion that narrative is merely “...a simple act of exercising order over chaos,” for Modernist literature localizes its distinction from other literary forms in its deliberate alteration of temporal structures and eventual order (84). Furthering Modernism as a particularly fertile format for trauma literature is Modernism’s

gravitation towards the inward turn. A departure from the external orientation of realist and naturalist texts, this inward turn emphasizes a comparative investment in “...psychological depth and complexity” in terms of a novel’s representation of characters’ psychological and emotional interiorities (Conroy 3). This inward turn fosters a preoccupation with internal thought, allowing the author of a Modernist text to effectively focus on the internalized physiological effects of trauma. A hallmark of the Modernist canon, *Mrs. Dalloway* too arises as such an “exemplar” of the trauma novel: the narrative’s use of a narratively anachronous temporal structure is duly a convention of Modernist technique, and a distortion of the causally recursive temporal structure so common to fiction. It is in this dismantling of the causally recursive temporal structure that Woolf’s work mimics trauma as defined by Bessel van der Kolk, leading the anachronous organization of narrative events within *Mrs. Dalloway* to closely resemble trauma’s re-organization of the mind in the wake of a traumatic experience. *Mrs. Dalloway* thus materializes as a narrative of an emergent class of trauma literature that derives recognizance through its Modernist aesthetic, a style that primes the novel for its designation as a trauma narrative.

Works Cited

- “Anachrony.” *The Free Dictionary*, Farlex, www.thefreedictionary.com/anachrony.
- Conroy, M. “Before the ‘Inward Turn’: Tracing Represented Thought in the French Novel (1800-1929).” *Poetics Today*, vol. 35, no. 1-2, 2014, pp. 117–171., doi:10.1215/03335372-2648377.
- Lindemann, Erich. “Symptomatology and Management of Acute Grief. 1944 [Classical Article].” *American Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 151, no. 6, 1994, pp. 155–160., doi:10.1176/ajp.151.6.155.
- Luckhurst, Roger. *The Trauma Question*. Routledge, 2013.
- Talib, Ismail S. “Chapter 5: Events - National University of Singapore.” *Narrative Theory: A Brief Introduction*, 14 Apr. 2017, courses.nus.edu.sg/course/ellibst/NarrativeTheory/chapt5.htm.
- Van der Kolk, Van. *The Body Keeps The Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma*. Penguin Books, 2014.
- Woolf, Virginia, and Bonnie Kime Scott. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Co., 2005.

The Reclamation of Identity Rests in the Power of Naming

Naming is an important aspect in the formation of identity. Not only is it a crucial factor in developing one's sense of self, but it also influences the ways in which that self is perceived by others. For Black slaves, the various names that have been used to define, interpret, and conceptualize their identities throughout history have been fundamental in their struggles for liberation. In his essay, "The Naming: A Conceptualization of an African American Connotative Struggle," Anthony Neal discusses how the term *slave* is never mentioned in the U.S. Constitution even though slavery was in effect at the time of its composition. The Constitution does not mention the terms *Black* or *African*, but instead, refers to "enslaved Africans as 'other persons' or 'such persons'. . .[and] define[s] or interpret[s] [them] as being only three fifths human" (50). The effects of this erasure of Black identity and the minimization of Black humanity is one of the many issues explored in Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. In Part II of her novel, Morrison examines how the process of naming is used as a tool of oppression, as well as the implications this process has on Black slaves as they attempt to attain subjectivity within an institutionalized system designed to strip them of identity.

One of the challenges Morrison's characters face in their search for identity is coming to terms with the fact that their existence has been solely defined by White people. One question Neal presents is: "Does the name determine the status or reality of a thing?. . . [or] does the reality of a thing determine the name, definition, conceptualization, and interpretation?" (52). In other words, does the naming of something determine its existence? And does the power to name lie with the definers or those being defined? Morrison seems to imply the former, and she provides several examples throughout *Beloved* to illustrate the effects on Black identity when White people hold the power of naming. For

Watermark

instance, when Sethe is cutting vegetables in the yard one day, she overhears Schoolteacher mention her name to one of his pupils. After listening more closely, Sethe realizes that Schoolteacher is instructing his students to create a chart that “put[s] her human characteristics on the left; [and] her animal ones on the right” (Morrison 193). At first, she is confounded by this interaction; however, after receiving further clarification from Mrs. Garner, she becomes aware of her sub-human status in the eyes of White society. Schoolteacher’s naming of Sethe as part animal is what ultimately leads his nephews to rape her and steal her milk. Sethe describes how “they handled [her] like [she] was the cow, no the goat back behind the stable because it was too nasty to stay in with the horses” (200). In the same way animals are exploited by humans for their resources, Schoolteacher and his nephews’ dehumanization of Sethe allows them to justify their mistreatment of her. They feel entitled to her body—and everything produced by that body—because her existence, according to their definition, is not equivalent to that of a woman, a mother, or a source of human life, but rather, to an object of which they have primary ownership.

Not only does Schoolteacher designate Sethe and the other slaves to a less-than-human status, he relegates them to a position that is even subordinate to animals. Paul D. reflects on this subordination when describing to Sethe the humiliation of having the bit in his mouth, a punishment used by white slaveholders to take away a slave’s humanity and replace it with “a wildness where before there wasn’t any” (72). Paul D. explains how it wasn’t the bit that broke him, but rather, the image of Mister, one of the roosters, as he walked the yard freely which troubled him so deeply. He claims:

Mister was allowed to be and stay what he was. But I wasn’t. . . even if you cooked him you’d be cooking a rooster named Mister. But wasn’t no way I’d ever be Paul D again, living or dead. Schoolteacher changed me. I was something else and that something was less than a chicken in the sun of a tub (72).

Just as Sethe becomes aware of her sub-human status after overhearing Schoolteacher, Paul D. similarly comes to this understanding when he realizes that the animals on Sweet Home are granted more respect, dignity, and self-worth than the slaves. Even in their naming, they are afforded a distinguished title, one that elevates them to a status greater than their being. Black slaves, on the other hand, are stripped of their African names and instead called by the names of their masters, “thus mark[ing] them as the property of another” (Xu 102). Morrison highlights this reality through the three brothers at Sweet Home: Paul A, Paul F. and Paul D. who are each given the same name with only a single letter added to mark their distinction. This erasure of their individual identities not only shows how little thought is placed into their naming by Mr. Garner, their master, it also shows how the three Pauls, like most slaves, are seen as nothing more than nameless, homogenized articles of property.

For Sethe, the Pauls, and many of the Black characters in the novel, the transition from object to subject presents many obstacles. This lack of acknowledgment toward Black individuality is rooted in one of the fundamental assumptions of slavery: the association of Black beings with Black bodies. This belief essentially denies slaves of their emotions and intellect and assumes they are no more than “the sum total of [their] visible physicality” (Dobbs 564). Morrison draws attention to this assumption when she describes the moment that Paul D. first learns of his worth: a price of nine hundred dollars to appraise the “value of his weight, his strength, his heart, his brain, his penis, and his future” (226). Although Paul D’s price was considered more “valuable” in comparison to some of the other slaves, he recognizes that Sethe’s “price was greater than his [because hers was a] property that reproduced itself without cost” (228). Paul D’s acknowledgement of Sethe’s worth highlights the “insidious notion of [Black] bodies as mere commodities and units of (re)production” (Dobbs 564); an idea that is further stressed in Denver’s objection to the nature of Sethe’s relationship with Paul D. Denver claims:

Slaves not supposed to have pleasurable feelings on their own, their bodies not supposed to be like that, but they have to have as many children as they can to please whoever owned them. Still they were not supposed to have pleasure deep down (209).

Since sex for pleasure is a uniquely human activity, Sethe’s ability to experience sexual pleasure is looked down upon because it is a clear rejection of White society’s belief that Black bodies are biologically different. Denver’s severe judgment of her mother also reveals that White people are not the only groups of people to subscribe to this belief.

While the delineation of Black beings to animals or mere bodies dictates White slaveholders’ conceptualization of slaves, Morrison also reveals the implications of this delineation on Black slaves’ sense of self and their attempts to attain subjectivity. She reveals how difficult it is for slaves to carve out an identity separate from the one that has been imposed upon them because it is impossible to escape the “jungle white folks planted in them” (198). The harder Black people try to “convince [White people] of how gentle they [a]re, how clever and loving, how human. . .the deeper and more tangled the jungle gr[ows] inside,” changing and altering them from within (198). Their struggles to detach from their prescribed identities essentially causes Black slaves to reinforce White slaveholders’ naming of them, rather than breaking free from these perceptions. This is not only evident in Denver’s harsh reaction to Sethe’s relationship with Paul, but also in Sethe’s decision to commit infanticide. Although Sethe tries to defend her actions; to explain the circumstances that left her with no choice but to kill her own child, Paul D. draws attention to the savagery of her actions by reminding her, “You got two feet, Sethe, not four” (165). In her attempts to prove her humanity and protect her children from the brutalities she has experienced,

Watermark

Sethe ultimately ends up behaving like an animal; hence, reinforcing the beastly traits ascribed to her by Schoolteacher.

Sethe is not the only character forced to question her humanity. Even Paul D. begins to doubt the source and status of his manhood after he falls weak to Beloved's seductions. His inability to resist Beloved's advances causes him to question whether or not he is really a man or only made to believe this because of Mr. Garner's naming: "Oh, he did manly things, but was that Garner's gift or his own will? What would he have been anyway—before Sweet Home—without Garner?. . . Did a whiteman saying it make it so?" (220). Even the process by which he has inherited his manhood is futile because his identity as a man only exists on Sweet Home with Garner's permission. Paul D. wonders what would happen if "Garner woke up one morning and changed his mind? Took the word away," and he receives his answer once Garner passes away (220). Garner's death also takes with it Paul D's manhood because as soon as Schoolteacher arrives, Paul D's identity as a man vanishes. It is in this moment that Paul D. realizes that his identity is nothing more than a creation, "produced in the perceptions of others and rendered 'real' to him through linguistic mechanisms—a slaveholder's descriptions, definitions, and boasts about his slaves" (Boudreau 458). The essence of man, however, never really exists within him because "the self, he comes to understand, is located in the word, so that when that word changes, so, too, does identity" (458).

Despite Paul D's acknowledgement of the transient, shifting nature of identity, Morrison maintains that subjectivity can still be attained for her characters. The freedom of selfhood, she argues, can only exist when Black people reclaim the power to name themselves. For instance, when Baby Suggs is freed, Mr. Garner advises her to keep the name given to her by her previous owner: "If I was you I'd stick to Jenny Whitlow. Mrs. Baby Suggs ain't no name for a freed Negro" (142). Despite Garner's suggestion, Baby Suggs chooses to rid herself of her slave name, and instead replaces it with one that is intertwined with her own identity as a caretaker and a grandmother, while at the same time linking her to the "'husband' she once claimed." In her article, "Pain and the Unmaking of Toni Morrison's *Beloved*," Kristin Boudreau asserts that "In order to rise, fully human, above the world. . . outside, hungry as a tiger, the narrator must make [the world] his" (449). We see Sixo achieve this rise when he names his unborn son Seven-O right before he is burned to death by Schoolteacher and his men. Although Sixo dies in a manner that befits Schoolteacher's perception of him, he refuses to grant Schoolteacher the permission to define his son's identity as well. Therefore, Sixo reclaims this power by choosing a name that not only links him to his son, but also one that places his son in a position one higher than his own. The final character who attains a sense of self through his renaming is Stamp Paid. In a conversation outside the church, Stamp reveals to Paul D. that he used to be called Joshua, but he renamed himself after his

master's son began sleeping with his wife. After almost a year of watching his wife disappear each night, he felt a sudden urge to snap her neck. He claims, "I been low but that was as low as I ever got" (233). Unlike Sethe, Stamp resists the urge to carry out this violence against his wife. He refuses to become the beast that his masters view him as, so he chooses to run away instead and create a new identity. Similar to Baby Suggs and Sixo, Stamp Paid attains freedom through his renaming, a name signifying that "whatever his [past] obligations were" he has successfully paid them off (185).

Throughout Morrison's novel, it is evident how Schoolteacher, the Garners, and other White characters use the process of naming as an instrument to maintain their dominance over Black slaves. Neal states, "By defining to their own satisfaction the identity, status, and destiny of the oppressed, the historic oppressors consciously or unconsciously celebrate the insult and compound the injury to their victims" (52). While the struggle to ascend these ascribed names have no doubt created major obstacles in the formation of Black identity, Morrison shows how the freedom of self ultimately rests with the one who is granted the power of naming. In response to Neal's proposed question, Morrison claims that the name unequivocally determines the status or reality of a thing; thus, the first step to attaining subjectivity within a system intent on erasing Black identity is to reclaim the power to name oneself.

Works Cited

- Boudreau, Kristin. "Pain and the Unmaking of Self in Toni Morrison's 'Beloved.'" *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1995, pp. 447–465. *JSTOR*.
- Dobbs, Cynthia. "Toni Morrison's *Beloved*: Bodies Returned, Modernism Revisited." *African American Review*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1998, pp. 563–578. *JSTOR*.
- Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. New York, Knopf, 1988.
- Neal, Anthony. "The Naming: A Conceptualization of an African American Connotative Struggle." *Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2001, pp. 50–65. *JSTOR*.
- Xu, Gang. "'The New History' in Toni Morrison's *Beloved* and the Construction of the Black's Subjectivity." *English Language & Literature Studies*, vol. 4, no. 4, Dec. 2014, pp. 100-07.

Ishmael's "(Un)Equal Eye" and the Overlapping Images in Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick*

In the famous opening line of Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick*, the narrator states, "Call me Ishmael," an introduction to an unreliable narrator who provides a one-sided, and therefore questionable, account of Captain Ahab's quest for revenge against the infamous white whale. As the narrative continues, Ishmael, once considered to be the main character and the protagonist of the story, retreats into the background of the narrative. Combined with his obsession with Ahab, Ishmael overlays his own "truth" concerning the events aboard the Pequod with actual experiences, obscuring the real facts from the reader. In the same way that a whale "can never see an object which is exactly ahead, no more than he can one exactly astern" due to its eye placement (Melville 251), the readers cannot obtain a full view of Ahab, Ishmael, or the events that take place on the Pequod due to Ishmael's unreliability. Readers must overlap the various images Ishmael places before us to create a singular, unified image using an "equal eye" (Melville 280). Although Ishmael uses this phrase to describe one's skeptical view of earthly and heavenly things, it can also be applied to the balance that must be obtained between the narrative perspectives that are at odds with one another, as well as the physical and philosophical representations of the whale itself.

In Ishmael's endeavor to portray his own active shaping of his story as being a true account, he ultimately ends up further discrediting himself as a reliable source. This forces the reader to distinguish between the appearance Ishmael creates, and the reality of the events. Readers must therefore discern how to strike a balance between these two ideas to potentially obtain true knowledge. However, the closest we are given for a second image is that which comes from a separate perspective of an unknown, seemingly omniscient narrator, or perhaps the projection of Ishmael's own thoughts onto others. This separate narrator is one who is distanced from Ishmael, yet intimately aware of the other characters'

Watermark

inner thoughts and feelings. My argument is twofold as first I establish Ishmael's unreliability, and ultimately relate this fallibility manifest throughout the novel to the anatomy of a whale, revealing the inability to fully comprehend nature or human nature. Ishmael is a dualistic character. He is multi-faceted, at once personal and homodiegetic, but also an omniscient outsider. This combination presents him as both the holder and obstructor of true knowledge. The reader must then reconcile between his fallibility and potential for true knowledge, hinting that the quest for knowledge may be futile, but the knowledge itself is not. Although one may not be capable of obtaining a full understanding, it is still important to obtain the most well-rounded understanding possible. The reader's inability to fully trust and know Ishmael and exactly what did or did not certainly occur throughout this novel contributes to the significance of the overlaid perspectives to obtain a more balanced comprehension. An understanding of the psychology surrounding Ishmael's character will illuminate him as being untrustworthy in his representation of his quest for true knowledge.

Critics Greta Olson and Henrik Nielson analyze the differences in narration techniques. Olson focuses on unreliable narrators in general, and Nielson cites *Moby-Dick* as an example of using the impersonal voice as a first-person narrator. Olson makes an astute distinction amongst the unreliability of narrators in any given text. She distinguishes that the unreliability and fallibility of a narrator falls on a spectrum, as opposed to a black and white, straightforward understanding in which a narrator either is or is not unreliable. Olson argues that a narrator may begin fallible, but gradually shift to untrustworthy, or vice versa. However, Olson also points out that a fallible narrator is not necessarily an untrustworthy one. Just because one is fallible does not necessarily make them untrustworthy. Henrik Nielson does not touch upon the notion of reliability, but rather analyzes the different types of narrators, specifically focusing on the first person and impersonal voices. Nielson argues that the "I" of a narrative is not necessarily the narrator, and that an impersonal voice should be assumed. Beongcheon Yu argues against the idea that Ishmael gradually becomes less involved and relevant as the novel continues on, but instead argues that Ishmael should be seen as following Romantic techniques in which the "I" is dynamic enough to transcend the conventional parameters he is situated in as a first-person narrator. Similar to the necessity to overlay two separate narrators in the novel, the many cetological chapters occur in tandem with the action in the chapters that follow. In "The Function of the Cetological Chapters in *Moby-Dick*," J.A. Ward argues that the cetological chapters are necessary because they prelude the more active chapters. Because of this, the cetological chapters and those that follow deal with plot work as a unit to lend significance to each other within the novel. Mark Lloyd Taylor, on the other hand, provides a close reading of Chapter 86 in the novel which he utilizes to argue for gender and theological issues regarding God as a masculine power, the feminine negativity of the Son of God, and *Moby-Dick* as a sexual-

political text. These topics are not taken up in full here, but are touched upon for the sake of arguing theological representations found in the text.

The beginning of *Moby-Dick* introduces Ishmael in an unconventional way that brings attention to his unreliability, forcing us to question any information that follows that we may have otherwise taken as fact. By imploring readers to “Call [him] Ishmael,” he not only establishes his place in the novel as the primary narrator, but he also fashions his own sense of self and identity, creating an image of himself which may or may not be true (16). In the first line, he portrays himself as an outcast through his apparent naming of himself, with a strong Biblical allusion to Abraham’s eldest son by Hagar, his barren wife’s servant. In this respect, he chooses where he believes he stands in relation to society and gives us no reason to think otherwise. However, although he positions himself as an outcast, he still allows us access to his most personal thoughts. With this access, he attempts to draw readers in with his emotional vulnerability by inviting us to sympathize with his depressive state when he makes it clear that he “get[s] to seas as soon as [he] can” as a “substitute for pistol and ball” (Melville 16). Ishmael attempts to establish intimacy with the reader early in the novel to make himself seem more approachable and trustworthy, despite ultimately straying away from the inclusion of personal details as he becomes increasingly aware of and obsessed with Captain Ahab and his fascination with Moby Dick. In this way, “Ishmael” builds the picture of himself that he wants the reader to see, allowing him to manipulate and control our view of not only himself, but also the rest of the narrative as it continues. This relates to Olson’s idea that “readers attribute internal inconsistency and self-contradiction to narrators they judge to be lacking in trustworthiness” (Olson 104). With his own attribution and admittance of his internal inconsistency through his mental instability, Ishmael establishes his unreliability without the readers having to. Ishmael’s unreliability and untrustworthiness is not a gradual incline, but rather a characterization that is brought to the reader’s attention from the very beginning of the novel, building upon itself as it continues. The introduction immediately evokes suspicion for our supposed narrator as we are now meant to question Ishmael’s authority over the text.

Throughout the novel, Ishmael positions himself as a storyteller, purposely exaggerating details to sell the story to the readers and therefore obscuring the truth of the events. In his focus on the creation of the narrative, he becomes a storyteller, rather than a conveyor of facts. In his “rehears[al]” (Melville 191) of the Town-Ho’s story, a story that involves another ship’s encounter with Moby Dick, Ishmael begins by stating, “for my humor’s sake, I shall preserve the style in which I once narrated [the story] at Lima” (Melville 190). With this preface to his portrayal of the story, he emphasizes that the following story is actually a retelling of another time when he told the story, twice removing himself from the actual events. The use of the word “rehearsing” implies a recitation, or practice

Watermark

of a presentation for a later public performance. With this in mind, it seems as though Ishmael had memorized this story to a certain extent, with an intention to entertain. This idea of entertainment is supported by his conscious decision to emulate a specific “style” for his narration. He also admits to telling this story for his humor’s sake, not for the communication of the message itself. He does not provide it for any particular reason other than for his own amusement in this instance at Lima, specifically. However, this same line of thinking can also correspond to the narrative of *Moby-Dick* as a whole. If he enjoys telling stories such as the one he relates here, it would follow that the novel itself is a larger rehearsal of his storytelling techniques, as opposed to a more factually sound relation of the actual story of events while on the Pequod. This is similar to the story telling of *Moby-Dick* as a whole in that Ishmael already knows the outcome of the story, yet takes his time in telling it. He starts at the very beginning of it, opening with an emphasis on himself, and takes care to not spare any details, no matter how unnecessary they are to the novel’s larger quest while aboard the Pequod. Ishmael understands that he is in a position of power as the sole survivor with the foreknowledge of the occurrences while on the Pequod. In this way, Ishmael allows himself to play God as he not only holds total knowledge of the events, but he is also granted power with that knowledge in his authorship.

On the other hand, Ishmael, or rather the separate narrator, also calls attention to the shortcomings in narration, particularly in terms of the whale itself. During his contemplation of the tail, the narrator states, “the more I consider this mighty tail, the more do I deplore my inability to express it” (Melville 283). Although it appears this inability is solely in reference to the anatomical features of the whale’s tail, it could also be read as a pun for the “tale” of *Moby-Dick*. In this reading, it further discredits the narrator, possibly Ishmael, or possibly Melville himself, not because they claim to know it all, but instead because they admit they cannot. According to Olson, this would position them as being fallible in that they fall short, not necessarily with their comprehension of this story, but rather in the expression of it to the reader. This positions the narrator as still being unreliable for reasons other than the aforementioned, but there is at least a recognition of the limitations.

Throughout the novel, Ishmael and the crew often refer to the whale in a mythological driven context which positions it as a God, positioning Ishmael closer to the whale and knowledge through his own representation of himself as all-knowing, all-powerful author. In Chapter 41, aptly titled “Moby Dick,” the crew “declar[ed] Moby Dick not only ubiquitous, but immortal (for immortality is but ubiquity in time); that though groves of spears should be planted in his flanks, he would still swim away unharmed” (147). The whale is also omnipotent and unable to be killed, despite being speared. The narrator states, “if indeed he should ever be made to spout thick blood, such a sight would be but a ghastly deception; for again in unensanguined billows hundreds of leagues away, his unsullied jet

would once more be seen” (Melville 147). This passage implies that despite being harpooned, the whale can continue living, an idea that carries on until the end of the novel with the ambiguity surrounding Moby Dick’s death. Furthermore, in Taylor’s journal article “Ishmael’s (m)Other: Gender, Jesus, and God in Melville’s ‘Moby-Dick’” that deals with the theological aspect of *Moby-Dick*, Taylor argues that this portrayal of the whale as a God in the eyes of the crew is emphasized in Chapter 86, “The Tail.” Taylor states, “Ishmael grants the tail an attribute traditionally reserved for God: ‘Could annihilation occur to matter, this were the thing to do it’” (Taylor 326). Since Ishmael is representative of a godlike entity as the author of the narrative and he determines how we understand him, Ahab, the rest of the crew, and even the details of the quest, he is positioned as being similar to the white whale through the omniscient, omnipotent representation of God.

With this chapter, the reader is also given an instance in which Ishmael, or the narrator, exposes the fact that he does not know everything as the omniscience of the separate, unidentified narrator has perhaps led the reader to believe. The whale serves as a physical limitation of comprehension as the first person “I” in the novel states, “I but go skin deep; I know him not, and never will. But if I know not even the tail of this whale, how understand his head? much more, how comprehend his face, when face he has none?” (Melville 283). With this description, the whale is elevated above the narrator as the description echoes Exodus 33 and its notion that to see God is to die. This corresponds to the end of the novel as Captain Ahab does ultimately come face to face with Moby Dick, and as expected according to the prophecy, Ahab obtains absolute knowledge in his death by the whale. This is because in his death, Ahab now may see the face of God, and can therefore ultimately understand what cannot be known on earth, in heaven.

Ishmael’s motive for telling the Town-Ho story relates to the larger quest for truth in the novel as Ishmael possesses the freedom to fashion the events in whichever way he sees fit. As the sole survivor of this great quest, Ishmael assumes the authority to tell details and facts of the story that he may like, and we as readers are left no choice but to accept it as fact. In some ways, Ishmael is representative of a godlike entity as he is the author of the narrative and he determines how we understand him, Ahab, the rest of the crew, and even the details of the quest. This positions Ishmael as being similar to the white whale in the aforementioned representation of the leviathan as a godlike creature. If this is the case, Ishmael is closer still to the true knowledge that Ahab, and consequently the rest of the crew, are desperately trying to obtain. Understanding his power as an unreliable narrator, Ishmael is then allowed to withhold the truth that the readers seek, purposely or not. After his rehearsal of the Town-Ho story, the following chapter deals with the various representations of the whale. In this, Ishmael once again asserts his confidence in his truth as he mentions “it is time to set the world right in this matter, by proving such pictures of the whale all wrong”

Watermark

(Melville 205). In stating this, it is implied that he is the one with the answers and he alone has enough knowledge allowing him to speak accurately on the matter. As the narrator and the only one to survive the events on the Pequod, Ishmael is in a position in which he holds the truth; however, in his unreliability, the reader is not given access to that truth. This begs the question of what good it is to have access to the truth if it cannot be expressed.

Ishmael must be the one to survive not only because he is the one to tell the story, but also because he is the one who is consistently and outwardly trying to learn. Yu reminds us that this is not Ahab's story, but Ishmael's (Yu 115). Ishmael appears contemplative throughout the novel and provides the philosophical narrative thread. If readers are to understand the cetological chapters as coming from Ishmael and not Melville or another, they serve as an apt example of his willingness to fully commit to garnering the most complete comprehension of whaling as possible. He not only signs on to the Pequod without any prior experience aboard a whaling ship, or even having any knowledge of whaling in general (Melville 66), but then he continues to attempt to provide a collection of facts to the reader across multiple chapters. Aside from whales, he also explores topics of brotherhood and love as he contemplates his relationships aboard the Pequod. Ishmael must remain in the narrative not only to tell the story, despite his unreliability, but because he is the one who fully and faithfully plunged into the abyss of the unknown expecting to fulfill the quest for knowledge.

Because of Ishmael's unreliability, readers must understand the events of the novel in the same way that a whale understands what it sees with its two eyes on either side of its head. It must essentially overlay the image on its left side with the image on its right side to obtain a clear vision of its surroundings. With Ishmael, we are given only one aspect of the larger narrative. Due to this fact, readers must take this into account and compare Ishmael's understanding of the events that pass with the information provided by the separate narrator who possesses full access to other characters, such as Ahab, Starbuck, and Stubb in chapters 37, 38, and 39, respectively. With these chapters, the narrator, one that could be assumed to be separate from Ishmael, offers private admission to their inner thoughts. While this may not be possible for Ishmael, it does also correspond to the aforementioned notion of Ishmael as a primary source of knowledge within the text. If we do indeed consider that there are two narrators, it can also be that the information that is taken from Ishmael, and the information from the all-knowing "I" are to be set atop one another. This makes the source of knowledge in the text more fully rounded so readers can assess the truth, but only as represented as palimpsest. As Nielson points out, immediately following these chapters and the drama that plays out in Chapter 40, Ishmael reasserts himself as the narrator (138) with the first line of Chapter 41 in which he states, "I, Ishmael, was one of that crew" (Melville 144). This serves as a signal to the reader that we have returned to the original position of Ishmael as the primary narrator.

However, this idea is complicated by the end of the chapter as it transitions into the point of view of the omniscient narrator who is separate from Ishmael. In the contemplation of the crew's participation of Ahab's monomaniacism regarding the white whale, we are reminded of the all-knowing narrator who notes that "all this to explain, would be to dive deeper than Ishmael can go" (150). In this instance, Ishmael's knowledge is limited by another omniscient narrator, and Ishmael is stripped of his own knowledge and power, positioning him as a first-person narrator with limited access to total truth. This further expands upon Nielson's use of *Moby-Dick* as an example of the "narrating-I" that exists at odds with the voice that does not belong to any character and is one of an assumed omniscient narrator. He argues that with *Moby-Dick*, the first-person narrator is not only Ishmael, as its focalization allows it to move to other characters-providing an understanding of the chapters in which we are given information that Ishmael could not have known, as well as the shift back to Ishmael in the following chapter. Although this occurrence of Ishmael referring to himself in the third person is not unusual, as it occurs multiple times throughout the novel particularly in the beginning chapters, this instance is striking as it is one example in which Ishmael does not also refer to himself as "I" in the same sentence, or even paragraph. In earlier chapters, when he refers to himself in the third person, he does so in a way that shows he is talking to himself. Chapter 2, for example, contains multiple occurrences in which he talks to himself by saying, "So wherever you go, Ishmael, said I to myself" and, "but go on, Ishmael, said I at last" (Melville 21). This serves as a vast difference between Ishmael thinking out loud or talking to himself, as compared to a third person perspective judging his inabilities.

Throughout *Moby-Dick*, the unfailing trust in facts demonstrated in the cetological chapters in the novel parallels that of Ahab's and the crew's quest for knowledge, and provides a visual guide to the philosophical ideas that Melville presents. In Chapter 55, the narrating "I," whether Ishmael or the unknown narrator, includes various representations of whales, dealing with religious, scientific, and artistic images. The narrator then makes the distinction that "the mere skeleton of the whale bears the same relation to the fully invested and padded animal as the insect does to the chrysalis so roundly envelopes it. This peculiarity is strikingly evinced in the head" (208). With this note, we understand that the internal skeleton of the whale does not provide an accurate representation of its outward appearance. This is similar to the way in which this novel must be read with consideration to the discrepancies in narration. In the same way that a whale is visually padded around an unseen skeleton that is much different in appearance. The novel of *Moby-Dick* is only given to the reader through Ishmael's eyes, and the reader therefore does not get the chance to see the internal "skeleton," or the truth of the novel itself. With this "peculiarity" further related to the head of the whale, it corresponds with the eye placement as being on either side of its head. Although in the context of Chapter 85 the "equal eye" (Melville

Watermark

280) refers to being skeptical about earthly things and having intuitions about heavenly things, as previously mentioned, it also connects to the eye placement of a whale, and therefore links the philosophical idea of a heavenly knowledge to the physical manifestation of the whale. In accordance to these cetological sections, Ward points out that “there is a careful interrelation between exposition and narrative, so that the material dealt with in a cetological chapter frequently serves as the concrete basis for an adjacent dramatic scene” (Ward 169). His argument is based on the idea that there is a relationship between the cetological chapters and those that follow where the cetological chapter provides a material foundation for a following dramatic scene. With these anatomical and fact based chapters and selections, Ishmael asserts his insistence on facts throughout the novel, and seems to assume that we will question the credibility of the story that he presents. In this assumption, he therefore arouses suspicion by his own accord that other aspects of the novel may not be complete. In his persistent inclusion of indisputable facts, he attempts to overcompensate for his own fallibility.

The novel’s structure is similar to that of the whale’s anatomy, and it is therefore important to pay close attention to the lengthy cetological chapters, along with other various excerpts as they demonstrate a self-awareness of the novel relating content to action. Ward analyzes the function of the cetological chapters in the novel as having both philosophical and psychoanalytical importance, since the chapters have a role in introducing the narrative that follows. As an example, Ward includes the incident in which Tashtego falls into the sperm whale’s head while tapping the case for its sperm. This chapter follows after the in-depth classification of the sperm whale’s head, just four chapters prior. However, Ward fails to mention that the narrator implies this relationship between the chapters when he addresses the readers and states that “this peculiarity of the whale’s eyes is a thing always to be borne in mind in the fishery; and to be remembered by the reader in some subsequent scenes” (Melville 251). While these subsequent scenes would no doubt refer to the incident that Ward brings up, it can also be extended to include the balance that must be achieved by the end of Chapter 85 in which the equal eye is brought up. This extension connects the significance of the necessity to overlay these images in order to strike a balance between the differences in narration, as well as the darkness of not knowing and the unending chase for comprehension.

Throughout the cetological chapters, this narrator, whether Ishmael, the separate unknown, yet all-knowing narrator, or even Melville himself, confidently speculates that “the whale, therefore, must see one distinct picture on this side, and another distinct picture on that side; while all between must be profound darkness and nothingness to him” (Melville 251). Taking into account this physical representation of the whale in terms of the overall quest for knowledge throughout the novel, the reader is given these two pictures, but is left in “darkness and nothingness” in the in-between. Although it is not possible to understand the

way a whale sees with its eyes on either side of its head and whether the narrator is correct in his assumption (does it unify two images by overlaying them? Do the images remain separate and the whale must make sense of both separately, but at the same time?), researcher Leo Peichl of Max Planck Institute for Brain Research speculates:

Usually in the [human] brain... there is a high connectivity that connects the two hemispheres and makes that into a perceptual unity of just one continuous visual field. Something like that probably also exists in whales because they have to have some kind of perceptive unit of their environment, a unitary percept of their environment.

Despite not having a complete comprehension of how a whale functions anatomically, it is still possible to postulate based on what we can learn from studying human beings and what we already know. However, just as it is impossible for humans to know what a whale sees with their eyes on either side of their heads, it is also impossible for readers to know if Ishmael's account is truly accurate. In the same way that researchers can only speculate about a whale's sight based on what they know about human brains to gain information that will get them closer to total knowledge, readers are also left speculate about the novel as a whole. This further corresponds to the ideas of two distinct, yet united narrators, as well as the idea of "equal eye" which must compile two separate perspectives in order to develop one comprehensive image for the reader.

Although Ishmael is clearly an unreliable source for information, he is also the only source, and therefore understood as being the holder of truth. However, since he is the one who portrays himself as having the answers, at least to a certain extent, our understanding of the truth is then further destabilized. This is because the facts we are given about Ishmael and other aspects of the novel are still given to us by Ishmael, a fallible narrator. The idea that he is not one who can be perfectly understood coincides with the notion that neither nature nor human life can be understood in full, a theme that carries on throughout the novel and the quest for the white whale. In the same way that readers cannot fully comprehend all of what Ishmael truly is, and the events he relates, the crew of the Pequod cannot obtain true and complete knowledge, regarding the whale or life in general. Ishmael and his untrustworthiness prove to be barriers for anyone attempting to grasp the knowledge that the white whale represents, and there is a constant tension between Ishmael as all-knowing, unknowing, and another third person point of view. Whether the illumination of truth can be acquired without Ishmael and the other narrative voice getting in the way is an unanswerable question in itself. If proper understanding of nature is possible within this novel, we are obstructed by the show of it. However, the closest to understanding that can be obtained must be acquired by means of connecting the duplicity of heavenly and earthly ideas using an "equal eye," the philosophical and the physical, and the unreliable and the information at hand.

Works Cited

- Madrigal, Alexis C. "You're Eye-to-Eye With a Whale in the Ocean-What Does It See?" *The Atlantic*, Atlantic Media, 28 Mar. 2013,
- Melville, Herman. *Moby-Dick: An Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism*. Edited by Hershel Parker, 3rd ed., W.W. Norton & Company, 2018.
- Nielsen, Henrik Skov. "The Impersonal Voice in First-Person Narrative Fiction." *Narrative*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2004, pp. 133–150.
- Olson, Greta. "Reconsidering Unreliability: Fallible and Untrustworthy Narrators." *Narrative*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2003, pp. 93–109.
- Taylor, Mark Lloyd. "Ishmael's (m)Other: Gender, Jesus, and God in Melville's *Moby-Dick*." *The Journal of Religion*, vol. 72, no. 3, 1992, pp. 325–350.
- Ward, J. A. "The Function of the Cetological Chapters in *Moby-Dick*." *American Literature*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1956, pp. 164–183.
- Yu, Beongcheon. "Ishmael's Equal Eye: The Source of Balance in *Moby-Dick*." *ELH*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1965, pp. 110–125.

Inherited Memory, Absent History, Fragmented Identity: The Palestinian Experience in Mahmoud Darwish's *Memory for Forgetfulness*

The Palestinian experience examined in this essay is markedly different from the present-day state of affairs. *Memory for Forgetfulness*, the text studied here, was written in 1982. The State of Palestine declared its independence in 1988. The United Nations acknowledged this declaration and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and sovereignty in the same year, yet Palestine was not recognized as a sovereign state until the UN General Assembly voted to grant it a non-member observer state status in 2012. This *conditional* admission into the UN *implicitly* changed Palestine's status from a *de jure* to a *de facto* state. However, the Palestinian nation today still struggles to gain control over its borders, continues to face hardship in reclaiming territories occupied by Israel, and remains unacknowledged by many in the international community. While history is often seen as the stylobate of nationhood, in Palestine's case it is destabilized and eradicated by the Zionist project—Palestine never enjoyed the independence its fellow Arab nations gained after the termination of the British and French mandates in the late 1940s. Yet memory proved to be an equally unreliable basis for national identity since the occupation and the diaspora of the Palestinian people were factors that threatened its survival. Furthermore, all these circumstances produced an 'ironic existence' wherein those who lived in Palestine experienced an internal exile because they were considered legally absent, and those who lived outside the homeland chased an absent meaning in their exilic reality. This essay focuses on how the lack of a conventional nation-building process defined Palestinian identity through a dialectics of presence and absence, memory and history. Specifically, I will examine a key moment in Palestine's struggle for recognition in 1982, as portrayed by its national poet, Mahmoud Darwish.

Watermark

Darwish was born in 1941 in a small village in Galilee. He was six years old when the war of 1948 began, establishing an Israeli state in Palestine. His family fled to the south of Lebanon where they stayed in refugee camps for a year, after which they returned (illegally) to their homeland only to find their village destroyed. The Israeli government did not issue residency cards to those Palestinians who returned after the war had ended, so the Darwish family, like many other returnees, was placed in a paradoxical position of “present absentees”—albeit physically present in Palestine, legally they did not exist. They were exiles in their own homeland. Darwish became politically involved during his youth, and his dissident writings frequently called for an independent and free Palestine. After four years of living under house arrest, Darwish left Palestine in 1970, initiating a long period of geographical exile that lasted until he died in Texas in 2008. *Memory for Forgetfulness* was written during his exile in Beirut, which was at the time the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), of which Darwish was a prominent member until his resignation in 1993. His poetry and prose were heavily influenced by his exile and his profound sense of alienation both inside and outside Palestine.

Memory for Forgetfulness is about a day in the poet's life during the siege of Beirut in August 1982. To understand the intricacies of Darwish's narrative, it is important to examine the historical moment in which he (re)writes his exilic experience. In the aftermath of the 1948 war and the formation of the state of Israel, large numbers of refugees fled to the south of Lebanon where they settled in camps that grew larger over the years creating a noticeable population imbalance—there were more Palestinians than Lebanese people in Lebanon. The PLO moved their base to Beirut in the early 1970s and their armed forces repeatedly engaged the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) in warfare on the Lebanese borders. On June 6th, 1982, the Israeli forces invaded the southern regions with the intention of driving the PLO out of Lebanon. Despite the PLO's agreement to leave, the Israeli troops moved towards Beirut and held the city under siege by sea, land, and air on June 13th. The siege cut off water, food supplies, and electricity, and the city was heavily shelled. It finally ended on August 21st with the arrival of European peacekeeper troops who oversaw the forced dismissal of all PLO members from Beirut.

The structure of *Memory for Forgetfulness* is fragmented and chaotic. Written primarily in the style of a journal, the text was first published in a literary journal in 1986 under the title *The Time: Beirut/ The Place: August*. Its present title was conceived when it was later published as a singular work. The ironic twist in the two titles—the reversal of time and place in the former, and the paradoxical play on memory and forgetfulness in the latter—foreshadows the incongruities that permeate the text and represents the tragic absurdity of the Palestinian experience since 1948. The text begins with the poet waking from a dream to the sound of bombs and the sight of sky and sea on fire and ends

with the poet seeking refuge in sleep at the end of this long day of death and destruction. The reader follows the poet as he navigates ordinary events (making coffee, visiting friends, having a drink at a bar) on this extraordinary day, which is periodically interrupted by narrative ghosts from the poet's past: his brief stay in Lebanon as a child, his experience in Israeli prisons, and his former Jewish lover. This destabilizes the linearity of time in the narrative, lending the text a sense of nervous and frenzied urgency that mirrored the traumatic moment for Palestinians in Beirut. Furthermore, the text itself was written after-the-fact and recounts Darwish's individual *memory* of this particular day, which reinforced for him the importance of personal narrative in preserving lost collective histories.

Mahmoud Darwish once declared: "Time has taught me wisdom, and history has taught me irony" (qtd. in Muhawi 32). Indeed, Palestinian existence since 1948 has been laced with irony. In his essay *Irony and the Poetics of Palestinian Exile* Ibrahim Muhawi notes that "the very structure of irony resembles the condition of exile in that it embodies a rhetoric of presence and absence," wherein the individual is perpetually haunted by the feeling of being "out of place" (31-32). History has rendered the Palestinians' existence ironic in two ways: they are exiles on their own ancestral soil because of their political status as "present absentees" and exiles outside Palestine because, by its very nature, their diaspora points to the absent homeland. This absurd presence/absence element is further underlined by the erasure of Palestine from Western writings related to the Zionist project since the 19th century where accounts either fail to refer to the indigenous population of the land or marks them by negation as "non-Jews" (Muhawi 34). Betrayed by historiography, Palestinians have had to define their identity by other means; that is, through memory. -

In *Memory for Forgetfulness*, Darwish is preoccupied with the failures of history and the importance of memory in the construction of his personal and national self as a Palestinian in exile. In *Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire*, Pierre Nora differentiates between what he calls 'real memory' and history by claiming that the former is "social and unviolated," while the latter is nothing more than a "sifted and sorted" organization of the past (7). According to Nora, memory and history are fundamentally opposite because memory "remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer" (8-9). For Darwish, however, history can also be manipulated, usurped, distorted, and brought back from a state of dormancy—"Is history not bribable?" (14) he asks. Nora also contends that "[m]emory is a perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past" (8-9). Yet in Darwish's text, memory for a people with no history is both their connection to the past

Watermark

and their insurance for survival in the future. While his view of history is ironic, his treatment of memory is equally so because, in the Palestinian experience, memory is also implicated in this dilemma of presence and absence.

In one of the text's most powerful segments, Darwish celebrates the bravery of the Palestinian youth who fought Israeli forces in the south of Lebanon and in Beirut. Darwish describes them as

[A]rmed to the teeth with a creative ignorance of the balance of forces and with the opening words of old songs, with hand grenades and burning beer bottles, with the desires of girls in air-raid shelters and pieces of torn identities, with a clear wish to take vengeance on prudent parents and with what they do not know of the sport of active death; armed with a rage for release from the senility of the Idea. (11)

They carried their broken identity with them, wishing to undo the mistakes of their parents who chose to flee rather than fight for the homeland. The "Idea" here is Palestine itself, or rather the memory of it, and these young men and women "rage for release" from this memory—they wish to turn it into a concrete reality. Nora argues that "[m]emory attaches itself to sites, whereas history attaches itself to events" (22). Palestine, for those fighting in Lebanon, possessed neither—the site was no longer called Palestine and the event had been, in Darwish's interpretation, bribed out of history. The brave Palestinian youth carried this irony within them. They had no memories of the site because they were born in Lebanese refugee camps. They defended, in Darwish' words, "the *scent* of the distant homeland—that fragrance they've never smelled because they weren't born on her soil" (13) [emphasis added]. Furthermore, history to them was only the traumatic narratives of war and exodus recounted by their parents; history books omitted the narrative of their people. By fighting, they wished to realize non-existent memories of Palestine and raged against a deficient history that was closer to a myth—their identity was based on absence; absent memory, absent history. Why, then, are they fighting and what are they fighting for?

Darwish proclaims that even though those young men and women never knew Palestine, they "studied her constantly, without fatigue or boredom; and from *overpowering memory* and constant pursuit, they learned what it means to belong to her" (13) [emphasis added]. But if the youth are removed from Palestine historically (they were born after the event) and in memory (they possess none of the place), what is this "overpowering memory" to which Darwish refers? I argue that this is a memory of absence, of non-belonging—a memory of *exile*.

Darwish identifies the acute sense of alienation these Palestinian refugees were subjected to from the moment they were born; "'You're aliens here,' they say to them *there*. 'You're aliens here,' they say to them *here*" (13) [emphasis in original]. The youths' parents had the privilege of memories—they belonged

somewhere but were forced into exile—whereas the children of refugees were denied even that. Darwish equates their birth with negation since they were born “without a cradle, [...] with no joy or feasting, no birth certificate or name registration” (14). Memories of exile determined their identity and their inherited memory of the lost homeland fueled their fighting spirit.

Although this *memory of exile* forged an intense connection between the Palestinian youth and their absent homeland, Darwish is aware of its power to oppress. Palestinian refugees in Lebanon were often discriminated against, denied integration, work, and equal rights. They were forced to live in hostility and deprivation and denied the privilege of settling down so that they wouldn't forget their homeland. Darwish insists that “[t]hese forgotten ones, disconnected from the social fabric, these outcasts [...] are at the same time expected to applaud their oppression because it provides them with the blessings of memory” (16). The Palestinian, burdened with memories and denied forgetfulness, must remain “the ‘Other’ to his Arab brothers because he is pledged to liberation” (16). Loss keeps memory alive, and so this loss must be sustained through exile. By definition, Palestinian identity was forced to become one of exile.

Darwish plays with various levels of irony in order to fully communicate the difficulty of exile in Beirut and the ways in which Palestinian history, memory, and identity were problematized in its context. Memory, though only inherited, drove the youth to take up arms for a homeland they never knew, while simultaneously oppressing and alienating them from their surroundings in order to ensure its survival. History, on the other hand, was a dictator that banished Palestine from its books and sentenced her to forgetfulness. In 1982, national identity for a Palestinian was defined by otherness, loss, and displacement—cursed to unendingly chase the fragrance of a lost homeland.

Evidently, those Palestinians who never had a physical connection to the homeland faced a strange and complex relationship with history and memory. Darwish argues that legitimizing the Palestinian cause by fighting against forgetfulness is a natural instinct—an instinct exemplified by the way in which conquerors named the places they conquered after themselves. Yet, doesn't that same argument for survival apply to the Jewish quest for a homeland? History proved equally hostile to the Jewish population in Europe who were persecuted and their existence threatened by the Holocaust in Germany. The Zionist project, regardless of the veracity of its historical claims, was also a result of that same natural instinct to attach its memory and history to a place in order to guarantee its survival for posterity. Darwish does not address the similarity of the basis for existence in both Jewish and Palestinian rhetoric, or the uncanny way in which history and memory are so closely implicated in both experiences. The reader's awareness of this resemblance adds an extra layer of irony to his text that is most likely unintended, further destabilizing the perceived uniqueness and uniformity of memory and history among exiled peoples.

Watermark

In conclusion, *Memory for Forgetfulness* is a work that expresses the paradoxes of the Palestinian exile. Absence has defined their experience and identity since the 1948 war. In Beirut, where their leadership sought a new meaning, a promise of survival, and a possible return, Palestinian hopes were crushed by rejection and betrayal. Palestinian children born in exile embodied the paradoxical role of (absent) memory as catalyst for action and a tool for oppression. Mahmoud Darwish attempts to capture the difficulties of living under siege in a city not his own, yet his discourse also tries to universalize his experience as a voice for all Palestinian refugees living and fighting in exile. The disconnected text becomes, in itself, a metaphor for the memory of Palestine—fractured, disorderedly, anxious, and confused. Searching for meaning in poetry, prose, myth, scripture, and attempting to interpret a dream with another dream, the text merges the ordinary and the extraordinary to produce an individual and collective *memory* that refuses to be silenced even in its despair. Driven by the forces of fate, the day unfolds with all its aesthetic pleasures, madness, desires, and pain. Mahmoud Darwish writes a memory *for* and *against* forgetfulness that echoes a Palestinian identity that, to this day, is *defined by* and *struggles against* annihilation.

Works Cited

- Darwish, Mahmoud. *Memory for Forgetfulness*. Trans. Ibrahim Muhawi. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1995.
- Muhawi, Ibrahim. "Irony and the Poetics of Palestinian Exile." *Literature and Nation in the Middle East*. Eds. Yasir Suleiman and Ibrahim Muhawi. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-24.

Contributors

Stacia Arnold

Stacia Arnold is teacher of English at the secondary level and a first-year graduate student. Her primary interest is in multicultural literature and exposing students to diverse authors from an early age to create a more balanced and inclusive foundation of education.

Jessica Banner

Jessica Banner is a second year Ph.D. student at the University of Ottawa in the Department of English. Her current research focuses on materiality and identity formation on the eighteenth-century English stage.

Elsbeth Beardsley

Elsbeth Beardsley is a fourth-year undergraduate student at the University of California Merced studying Spanish. She enjoys studying U.S. Latin American writers, especially female writers and has a passion for language (and corgis).

Melissa Berland

Melissa Berland graduated from CSULB with my Bachelor of Arts in English Literature in 2018 and will graduate with her Master of Arts in English Literature in 2020. Her studies focus on post-1900 American Literature, with an interest in science fiction, metafiction, and psychological horror.

Miranda Gámez

After receiving her BA in English and Comparative World Literature at CSULB, Miranda Gámez began the MA English program at the same institution this Fall 2018 semester. Her main academic interests are in 19th and 20th century American Literature.

Adriana Giacoletti-Crandall

Adriana Giacoletti-Crandall is a graduate student of English at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, where she teaches first year students about rhetorical practices and the recursive nature of the writing process. A common theme throughout her research is issues relating to, and depictions of gender.

Salisa Grant

Salisa Grant is a second year doctoral student at Howard University in Washington DC. Her research focuses is in African American Literature, and she is originally from Duluth, Minnesota.

Gage Greenspan

Gage Greenspan is a graduate student in the English program at California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo. He is currently an instructor of a freshman writing and rhetoric course, a tutor at the university's Writing Center, and a Co-Managing Editor of Cal Poly SLO's Sprinkle, an international journal of undergraduate research in feminist and queer studies.

Carolina Hernandez Munoz

Carolina Hernandez Munoz is a graduate student at California State University Long Beach. Her research interests include analyzing topics such as the politics of the border, race, gender, and the body in America.

Rachel Narozniak

Rachel Narozniak is a second-year English Master of Arts student at The George Washington University in Washington, DC. She intends to pursue her English Ph.D. in Victorian Literature.

Zara Raheem

Zara Raheem is a Master of Fine Arts student in Creative Writing at California State University Long Beach. She is the recipient of the James I. Murashige Jr. Memorial award in fiction and was selected as one of 2019's Harriet Williams Emerging Writers. Her work has been published in many online and print publications, and her debut novel, *The Marriage Clock*, will be published this summer by William Morrow/HarperCollins

Allison Reames

Allison Reames graduated with her Bachelor of Arts from the University of California, Irvine and is interested in pre-1900 American literature.

Nina Youkhanna

Nina Youkhanna holds a Bachelor of Arts in Comparative Literature from Western University and a Master of Arts from the Centre for Comparative Literature at the University of Toronto. She is an independent scholar with varied interests including translation, satire, and dark comedy in Syrian theatre, depictions of the homeland in Arabic poetry, and memory and trauma in Arabic texts.