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Preface

The following three papers were prepared in lieu of one thesis. The three papers are part of an alternate English Department program for completion of the Master of Arts degree in English. This plan, entitled "Plan B," includes rewriting three graduate seminar papers and taking one additional graduate class.

When I decided to follow "Plan B," I had completed only two seminars. Hence I took an additional seminar in Ben Jonson. Consequently, the Ben Jonson paper was written with the thesis plan in mind. The Hawthorne paper was rewritten, but the Faulkner paper is more of a new paper since it was written to conform to new opinions I had on Faulkner's writing.

All three papers reveal my interest in characterization. In each paper I attempt to refute a common misunderstanding about an author's characterizations--Jonson's ineffective women, Hawthorne's stereotyped fair maidens, and Faulkner's predominately evil characters.

"Plan B," no doubt, creates a less portentous document than a common thesis, but it requires as much scholarship as the thesis. Consequently, I ask each reader to judge the papers on an individual basis.
Table of Contents

The Women of Ben Jonson in *Epicoene* and *Bartholomew Fair*  
Hawthorne's Fair Maidens  
Responsibility and Character in Faulkner's Fiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Women of Ben Jonson in <em>Epicoene</em> and <em>Bartholomew Fair</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne's Fair Maidens</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility and Character in Faulkner's Fiction</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bartholomew Fair and Epicoene, considered to be two of Ben Jonson's greatest plays, are the basis for this study of the effectiveness of Jonson's characterizations of women. Both plays have strong marriage themes and, therefore, more women characters than many of Jonson's plays. Yet, within Epicoene and Bartholomew Fair, the effectiveness of the women characters varies a great deal. Consequently these two plays supply excellent material for comparison and contrast between successful and unsuccessful techniques of characterizations in the women. This variation is particularly important to the understanding of Ben Jonson's writing since Jonson's ability to characterize women has been highly criticized, and study of the variations can give some insight into the reasons why some of Jonson's characterizations are more successful than others.

Throughout his plays, Jonson's characterizations of women were strongly defamatory. Because of these negative characterizations of women, he has been called a misogynist. George B. Johnston explains that Jonson, whom he calls "the scourger of female foibles," was expressing the misogyny of the Renaissance and not any personal hatred of women. ¹ C. G. Thayer calls Epicoene "Johnson's presentation of the

'monstrous regiment of women,'"² while Robert Brustein explains that phrase in terms of misogyny and scathing condemnation of women.³ Algernon C. Swinburne calls Jonson's views of womanhood "radically cynical."⁴

Unfortunately, the critics' belief in Jonson's misogyny has often affected their own studies. They have often lumped his women characters together, judged them as ineffective characterizations and passed them by for more complete examinations of the male characters. Aurelia Henry says that Epicoene does not "exhibit among the four women characters and the man masquerading as a woman a single redeeming feminine attribute." She continues with more general criticism, "But in which of his greater comedies has Jonson ever created a woman actuated by virtuous motives ... ? The qualities with which he endows his women ... show his usual attitude towards women to be supercilious and unsympathetic, and to be marked by an inherent love of detraction and exaggeration worthy the elder satirist [Juvenal].⁵ Gamaliel Bradford plainly states, "Jonson was not the dramatist of women ... Of pure, modest and charming women Jonson has few ... The women of more dubious virtue are hardly more interesting. The broad and simple vices of men, ambition and avarice, were enough for Jonson's scorn and satire:


he left the finer and more delicate passions of the other sex to ... anyone who would condescend to meddle with them."

Of course, even the highly critical Bradford sees some exceptions in the characters. He excuses from typicality Lady Would-Be of Volpone and Ursula of Bartholomew Fair (p. 101). William Gifford calls Grace in Bartholomew Fair "one of Jonson's few estimable females." Yet, while some women are singled out for commendation, very seldom do the critics reveal in detail what sets these women apart from the rest.

In this paper I plan to show what methods caused the variations in effectiveness of Jonson's characterizations, by contrasting and comparing the static, stereotyped women of Epicoene with the more interesting women of Bartholomew Fair, where Jonson uses the satire of the humours to particularize and individualize his women characters.

Madeleine Doran describes each of the characterization methods involved in my study, "The Theophrastan method reveals a class of moral behavior through the behavior of an imaginary individual; the humours technique, on the contrary, starts with the person and makes an individual excess, sometimes a vice or passion, but more commonly a mere eccentricity the essence of the character." Doran explains that for its particularizing, the humour technique of the Renaissance was based quite heavily on the use of the rhetorical "places" (p. 229). Jonson


used both the methods, sometimes combining them by using the humour to enliven the type. Therefore, before we can examine Jonson’s method of characterizing women, we must review the rhetorical places, the Renaissance meaning of humours, and the Theophrastan character-type.

One of the first men to begin the study of character was Aristotle. Of course, Aristotle’s focus was the oration, but his comments on the ethical element in Book II of his *Rhetoric* served as the basis for much further character development.

Aristotle believed that in order to present a convincing image of himself and to elicit the correct response from his audience, one thing the orator had to understand was the emotions in regard to the mental disposition required for each emotion and the kind of people and occasions which elicited the specific response. He mentioned such opposite reactions as love and hate, pity and indignation, and envy and emulation.⁹

In his desire to contemplate what emotional responses to expect from people, he also began the rhetorical device of placing people in specific categories—places. Aristotle divided the "nature of the characters of men" into the basic categories of the young man, the old man, the man in the prime of life; as well as men of noble birth, wealth and power. Each description was a characterization of several adequate paragraphs as seen by the third person. In them he revealed the propensities of each type of character to both virtue and vice.¹⁰


By the time of the Roman rhetorician Cicero (B.C. 106-43), the list of things to be considered in influencing a person had been enlarged. Aristotle's social places of age and fortune had been enlarged and called "nature" (including such things as race, inborn physical, emotional and intellectual endowments) and "fortuna" (circumstances of slavery or freedom, wealth or poverty, common citizenship or official life). But, as Doran explains, to these two places had been added victus (manner of life); habitus (a stable constitution of life); affectio (an unstable condition); studium (assiduous interests); consilium (reasons for actions); casus (things befallen) and orationes (things said). About the same time, Quintilian's interest in the places of mankind produced a list similar to Cicero's but including more explanation. He included descriptio (descriptions of the characteristic conduct of moral types); ethopocia and prosopopoeia (impersonation); and ethologia (theme delineating character) (p. 219).

The lists of places kept getting longer and more particular, until, in the Renaissance the rhetorical "places" were incorporated into the drama as a scientific basis to the theory of humours. William Thrall and Addison Hibbard explain this change: "In the old theory of physiology the four chief liquids of the human body . . . were known as humours . . . . An individual's personal characteristics, physical, mental, and moral, were explained by his 'temperment' or the state of his humours . . . . In Elizabethan times humours came to mean 'disposition,' then 'mood,' or 'characteristic peculiarity,' later specialized to 'folly' or 'affectation.' By 1600 it was common to use
humour as a means of classifying characters."^{11} The theory of humours was, therefore, blurred by such particularizing elements as the use of places.

And yet, as the Roman rhetoricians elongated the list of things to consider, they decreased the specific character description. Benjamin Boyce states that the only character descriptions of the period were "mechanically organized portraits."^{12}

Since Aristotle, the character description had died out in the rhetorical study in favor of a longer list of more complex places. However, the character description had risen from the writings of a student of Aristotle's and become a new form that influenced the writers of the Renaissance.

Boyce explains that Theophrastus, using the foundation of Aristotle's theories on characters, wrote the first book of characters about 319 B. C. (p. 3). His characters were both more numerous and complex than Aristotle's because, instead of categorizing by age and fortune, Theophrastus described the characters according to the moral attributes such as the propensity to slander or flatter.

The types were quite basic and simple, however. They were shorter than Aristotle's and neither obviously didactic nor particularly subtle. At this stage the character book was to teach about mankind by definition and example only. All the characters described by Theophrastus are evil, but point to virtue by means of opposing extremes.


As Boyce records, after Theophrastus the character book languished for centuries until the Renaissance interest in the nature of mankind caused renewed interest in the variety of character types (p. 122). The new character-book was, of course, more representative of the new ideas of the Renaissance.

Joseph Hall, the first new major character-book writer in the period, was more subjective and didactic than Theophrastus; there is no unbiased definition in his work. Also unTheophrastan was his habit of describing the internal thoughts and desires of the specific type, as in the example from the "hypocrite": "all other sinnes he reckons up with detestation, while he loves and hides his darling in his bosome." 13

To the basic character types, Hall made one major change. He added a great deal to the characters by creating descriptions of virtuous individuals as well as evil ones. He added such descriptions as the wise, honest, faithful, humble, valiant and patient.

As Boyce notes, in the new list of virtues of mankind, Hall obviously combines the moral and social aspects of man only once—in the sketch of the "Good Magistrate." However, the next major character-book writer, Sir Thomas Overbury, combined those two variables in about half of his types (p. 166). Overbury's work shows us how particular the character had come from Aristotle's divisions of age and fortune. Overbury names some 80 characters, twelve of these women. He includes the external places of age in characters like "The Olde Man," with the

specific professional place of characters like "An Almanacke-maker," and the moral characters like "A Flatterer."

Boyce believes that many consider John Earle to be the best English character-book writer because of his ability to reveal character more subtly than others. (p. 167). Earle's subtlety had to come, at least in part, from his concern with the cause for evil. Note his understanding in this view of the "Young Man": "He sees yet but the outside of the world and men, and conceives them according to their appearing glitter, and out of his ignorance believes them." 14

To the number of places or types of character studied, Earle added about 30 moral types, along with four from social institutions, seven from university life, five ecclesiastics, two rural types, three age-related characters and many business, professional and city people. In all, Earle mentioned 54 types.

Thus, both the rhetorical places and the character-types were becoming more and more specific. Yet, where the rhetorical places combined with the humours to reveal multifaceted individuals, the basic theory of the character-type still limited individuals according to one facet of their personality while broadening the number of those types.

Doran explains the limitations of the type:

To make a character with the signs of some class to which he belongs (miserly old men, prudent old fathers, jealous husbands, young men afflicted with love melancholy, and so on) is a simple way to give him consistency and propriety and a certain kind of verisimilitude. Such emphasis on

type makes for quick recognition on the part of reader or spectator, arouses expectations that can easily be satisfied, gives a coherent total impression. But of course even a consistent and appropriate and verisimilar character, to be interesting, must also seem alive, and to do that he needs identity as an individual, not merely as a member of a class (p. 232).

In Epicoene we are to meet women members of a class, a College to be exact.
The Women of Epicoene

The women of Epicoene are all associated with the College. Joined in the group is the independent wife not living with her husband, the overbearing wife living at home, and the young man impersonating both an unmarried female and a domineering wife. While these may seem like several different types at first glance, in reality they are all the same type--the masculine woman.

Renaissance society was well acquainted with this type of woman. The masculine woman had long put fear, hatred or, at least, discomfort into the lives of males. Even Aristotle mentioned the problem. In his short, but well-known paragraph on the requirements for characters, he says, "There is a type of manly valor, but manliness in a woman, or unscrupulous cleverness is inappropriate."\footnote{Aristotle, On Man, p. 433.}

Renaissance society was better acquainted with the type than many other social eras because of the reign of Elizabeth and the many changes of the period. Robert Brustein explains, "The example of this great queen, and the reverence in which she was held, undoubtedly affected women throughout the realm. Whether as a direct result of this or not, the Elizabethan woman was certainly assuming a more active position in her household. No longer confined exclusively to the kitchen and child-bed, she now enjoyed--in her relation with her husband, her freedom of
movement throughout the city, and her access to the latest fashions and cosmetics--a liberty unparalleled in former times . . ." (pp. 37-38).

Because of these circumstances, the writers of the Elizabethan era often satirized the basic and general characteristics of the marital relations, new usurped freedoms and fashion-conscious looks of the "new" woman. Jonson was no different when he wrote Epicoene. L. A. Beaurline, editor of one edition of Epicoene, describes the kind of woman the audience will see in the play as women "who sought independence of their husbands, who learned foreign tongues, who wore leather jerkins and painted with cosmetics." 16

One of the main characteristics of the masculine woman is boldness. She is an audacious pursuer of men. She tries to appear a bold intellectual. She attempts to be a daring model of the current fashions. Jonson, of course, exaggerated these characteristics for the sake of humor. And through these three main rhetorical "places" he attempted to individualize the real masculine-type woman and to satirize her.

The characterizations of the real women--the Collegiates and Mrs. Otter--however, are entirely different from that of Epicoene. In the characterization of Epicoene it is important to note that while the audience does not know it until the end, Epicoene is a boy pretending to be a young, ambitious, domineering woman using trickery to get what she wants. Prosopopia or impersonation is one of the rhetorical places. Such impersonation of a type of woman considerably complicates the characterization. While the greatest irony of the play may seem to come from the fact that everyone was fooled about Epicoene's sex, a

greater irony comes from the actuality that Epicoene is a man's view of the masculine woman, within a play written by a man on that subject.

Of Epicoene's characterization there is not much to study in the first scenes where "she" is apart from the other women, because she does not say much. First in the meeting with Clerimont and Dauphine and then in the meeting with Morose, Epicoene remains very quiet. By her quiet phrases of subservience, Morose is lead to believe that she will allow him to choose everything for her. Also adding to her mysteriousness is the lack of information given the audience on her basic attributes. Morose does tell that she is a gentlewoman, fair, and poor.17

After the wedding ceremony, Epicoene changes from meek to boldly domineering. Her change apparently comes from her attempt to convince Morose that she is extremely modest and contrite when she is not. Actually even her personality change is planned as part of the impersonation. At the time of her change her real moral characteristics are supposedly exposed. Nothing is ever said about her cosmetics, but like the "real" women in the play, the changed Epicoene is characterized as bold with men (her husband in particular) and ostentatiously intellectual. Truewit describes the new Epicoene as "a woman of an excellent assurance, and an extraordinarie happy wit and tongue" (V, 215).

As the plot works out both these characteristics are revealed. Epicoene corrects her husband's manners, diagnoses his problems and declares her governorship of their home. The Collegiates judge her intellect sufficient for their society and invite her attendance in

their chambers. Actually Epicoene proves their superior. She is able to amend their views on men, question their way of life and see through Morose's plea of impotence. She never does talk as much as they do.

It is difficult to believe that this superiority to the Collegiates comes from man's view of what the real masculine woman was; it is much more likely that the superiority was intrinsic to the boy's behavior, knowledge of the situation and desire not to be discovered too soon.

But enough about the impersonation of a masculine woman. What are the real women of Epicoene like?

The first specific view of feminine vice in Epicoene is woman's bold forwardness as revealed in Lady Haughty, the most talkative Collegiate. Clerimont's page reveals, "Shee kisses me with her oil'd face; and puts a perruke o' my head; and askes me an' I will weare her gowne; and I say, no: and then she hits me a blow o' the ear.e, and calls me innocent, and lets me goe." Clerimont replies, "No maruell, if the dore bee kept shut against your master, when the entrance is so easie to you--well sir, you shall goe there no more, lest I bee faine to seeke your voyce in my ladies rushes a fortnight hence" (V, 165). Certainly this description of Lady Haughty is supposed to be ugly, disgusting and bitingly satirical, as well as comical.

In Elizabethan times a married woman was to be obedient to her husband and to "carry herself as inferior." At the very introduction to them at the beginning of the play, the Collegiates are breaking this important rule. Says Brustein, "Woman demonstrated their masculinity, sometimes, by taking an active part in the love relationship; the pursued

became the pursuer. This reversal of roles was perhaps the most distaste­ful of all female vices to the satirists, for they found such seducing women to constitute a genuine threat to masculine vigorousness" (p. 48). From the beginning of the play to the end, the Collegiates' predominant characteristic seems to be their desire to pursue men.

The page's introduction to the Collegiates' forwardness "arouses expectations that can easily be satisfied" as Doran explained that the type-character would do. The audience would easily anticipate some of the coming action. True to type, when the women arrive at the wedding they begin by demanding that Morose kiss them. Their audacious pursuits are most emphasized, however, in their one scene apart from Mrs. Otter and Epicoene. To reveal their tactics, Jonson shows Haughty, Centaure and Mavis working against each other for the charms of Morose's nephew, Dauphine. The fact that they work against friends reveals their top priority--capture of the man.

In the scene with Dauphine, the three Amazons reveal their disloyalty to their society of friends. First Haughty admits that she may suffer if Dauphine judges her equal in rank or society with the other women. After Dauphine agrees, she also explains, "They are not apprehensive of an eminent perfection, but love flat and dully" (V, 254). She attempts to lead Dauphine's remarks but finally openly invites him to her chambers. Next Centaure approaches Dauphine. Her attacks on the others are not even as veiled as Haughty's; she does not even wait for Dauphine to speak. She simply warns him that Haughty is unloving, fifty and ugly. Centaure says that Morose is even uglier. Then she invites Dauphine to her chambers to talk more about the situation (V, 255). The third Collegiate, Mavis, is the most pretentious. She tells everyone that she is writing
Dauphine an Italian riddle. The "Italian riddle" turns out to be a very plain English invitation for Dauphine to be her lover. Says Clerimont, "By my faith, a subtle one! Call you this a riddle? What's their plaine dealing trow? (V, 255-256).

Consequently, it is the Collegiates' bold sexual activity that receives most outward rebuff. In the last words of the play, after the men have been proved liars and perjurers of women's reputations, the women are admonished to reform. They are told, "Madames, you are mute, vpon this new metamorphosis! but here stands shee, that has vindicated your names. Take heed of such insecte hereafter" (V, 270).

After the basic characteristic of pursuit of men, perhaps the next most identifying feature of the type was cosmetic adornment. Though Jonson used this rhetorical place as an individualizing feature, it was a common trait of many women of the time. As Brustein points out, cosmetics were very popular in the Renaissance. Jonson did not like make-up at all because it was unnatural and often unhealthy. George Johnston says that Jonson could be called the "poet par excellence of cosmetics with the same justice that he was called the poet par excellence of alchemy" (p. 83).

In Epicoene Truewit and Clerimont spend much of "Scene One" discussing Madam Haughty's "oiled face." While Jonson was, of course, using effictio to comment on the women's external image, the physical appearance of women was also a moral issue. Madeleine Doran says that one of the most popular themes of the Renaissance was the controversy over the relative importance of nature and art, with one variation on the subject being women's beauty (p. 55). Clerimont's poem at the beginning of the
Still to be neat, still to be drest,
As, you were going to a feast;
Still to be pou'dred, still perfum'd:
Lady, it is to be presum'd,
Though arts hid causes are not found,
All is not sweet, all is not sound.

Give me a looke, give me a face,
That makes simplicitie a grace;
Robes loosely flowing, haire as free:
Such sweet neglect more taketh me,
Then all th' adulteries of art.

They strike mine eyes, but not my heart (V, 167).

The first stanza reveals the unnatural art in the lady's beauty. The question such adornment brought up is "What is being covered up?"

The second stanza describes the beauty of the natural look. Though Clerimont admits the make-up pleases his eye, he most appreciates simplicity and naturalness. At this time in the play, Truewit is not convinced that cosmetic adornment is a vice in women. He later remarks that cosmetics are time-consuming (V, 197). Clerimont even is convinced that Lady Haughty looks nice (V, 219). It is not until Mr. Otter has described his wife that Clerimont and Truewit are thoroughly educated on the facts of cosmetic adornment in women.

The third place Jonson attempted to use to individualize the Collegiates was their ostentatious and fake intellectualism. As their society's name reveals, their main purpose was supposed to be educational. Actually, according to Camden, education was considered a desirable part
of an Elizabethan woman's skills (p. 46). As many of Jonson's poems reveal, he appreciated intelligent women. Intelligence, in Jonson's mind was not necessarily masculine. He wrote many poems praising the intellect of particular women of his age. But ostentatious authoritarian intellectualism in women was not considered a virtue. The Collegiates' education had become an assiduous deviation from nature.

This situation is described by Truewit, who says the women "give entertainment to all the Wits, and Braueries o' the time, as they call 'hem: crie downe, or vp, what they like, or dislike in a braine, or a fashion, with most masculine, or rather hermaphroditicall authoritie: and every day, gaine to their colledge some new probationer" (V, 167). The Collegiates are considered to be very dangerous because of their ability to convert other women to their school.

Thus, when the women reach the wedding, they take the bride apart from the crowd and try to judge her suitability for their precious society. When they believe she will pass their examination, they proceed to instruct Epicoene how to act, what to do and buy and where to go. What Truewit had called their "hermaphroditicall authoritie" could nowhere be more apparent than in that instruction period with Epicoene.

Daw. Faith mistris, you must doe so too. Learne to chastise. Mistris Otter corrects her husband so, hee dares not speake but vnder correction . . .

Hav. In sadnesse 'tis good, and mature counsell: practise it, Morose. I'll call you Morose still now, as I call Cantavre and Mavis: we foure will be all one.

Cen. And you'll come to the colledge, and liue with vs?
Mav. Looke how you manage him at first, you shall haue him euer after.

Cen. Let him allow you your coach, and foure horses, your woman, your chamber-maid, your page, your gentleman-vsher, your french cooke, and foure groomes.

Hav. And goe with vs, to Bed'lem, to the China houses, and to the Exchange.

Cen. It will open the gate to your fame.

Hav. Here's Centavre has immortaliz'd her selfe, with taming of her wilde male . . . .

Epi. But ladies, doe you count it lawfull to haue such pluralities of seruants, and doe 'hem all graces?

Hav. Why not? why should women denie their favours to men? Are they the poorer, or the worse? (V, 227-228).

If the audience for the play is surprised by this conversation, it is not because the introduction to the Collegiates by Truewit and Clerimont had misled, but because the verbal actuality of the conversation is much like the previous descriptions. But revealing the women's authoritarianism is not enough; Jonson wants to show that their opinions were not based in common sense. He shows the women incapable of thinking well in two scences, one with Dauphine and one at the end of the play.

The Collegiates' stupidity is partially revealed in their pursuit of Dauphine. In that segment they are tricked, or convinced by Epicoene into disliking the men they have liked and liking Dauphine, whom they have not cared for previously. Dauphine does not really suit their tastes, but they are convinced that he does. Truewit exclaims, "Did not I tell thee, Davphine? Why all their actions are gouverned by crude
opinions, without reason or cause; they know not why they doe any thing: but as they are inform'd, beleue, iudge, praise, condemne, loue, hate, and in emulation one of another, doe all these things alike" (V, 247).

In the final scene, there are no surprises about the real women, but that scene does reveal their inability to cope with problems, despite their previous assurance in their own wisdom. When they see Epicoene's marriage being dissolved, they become indignant, because they believe Epicoene is one of them. They offer to have the man blanketed or cudgelled. But such action would, of course, have no lasting effect in such a problem. It seems there is really nothing the women can think of to do if the men want to help Morose be divorced. But when they hear knights proclaim Epicoene as their partner in adultery, the problem is compounded. The Collegiates are dumbfounded. They are guilty of adultery, too, and suddenly learn their own vulnerability. Even Haughty can only try to soothe Epicoene's feelings. Haughty says, "I would except against 'hem as beaten Knights, wench, and not good witnesses in law" (V, 267). The advice is not even considered. Haughty continues, "Be comforted, Morose, I loue you the better for't" (V, 267).

In the introduction to the Collegiates, they are described as intellectually abrasive and heavily made up (V, 166). Their conversations and actions have revealed them to be true to type throughout the play. This consistency is caused, at least in part, by Jonson's limitations to the three main rhetorical places and to the fact that these places are very appropriate to the masculine type. This same consistency, therefore, emphasizes the type rather than the individual. The only source for individuality, then, among the Collegiate women comes from
the contrasts with Epicoene, as previously mentioned, and the Collegiates' associate, Mrs. Otter.

Whereas the Collegiates were the "free" masculine women, Mrs. Otter represents the married masculine female. Besides the basic contrast of marital position, there are two other contrasts Mrs. Otter contributes to the characterization of women in Epicoene. She is less refined than the Collegiates, and, though she is wealthy, she is a business woman rather than a society lady.

Her inferior sophistication is revealed in her overwhelming desire to cater to the Collegiate society. When she is with the other women, Mrs. Otter is always a minor echo of the Collegiate ideal because she wants to be part of their "high society." She is quick to mention to Clerimont that she has been visited by Lady Haughty and been to Lady Centaure's chambers. She even proclaims herself a Collegiate. After the Collegiates arrive at the wedding celebration, Mrs. Otter remains with the Collegiates, inserting short statements reiterating and agreeing and sympathizing with what the Collegiates say.

Mrs. Otter's professionalism and business propriety could be considered more debasing than it seems at first reading. When La Foole introduces her, he specifically describes her as "the rich China-woman, that the courtiers visited so often, that gave the rare entertainment" (V, 175). In a note in their edition of Epicoene, Gifford and Cunningham explain that China houses were often really bagnioes (p. 411). If the Renaissance audience did believe Mrs. Otter ran a house of prostitution, it might put her moral and social standing considerably below the Collegiates'.

Yet, even with these contrasts, Mrs. Otter is still the same type—the masculine woman. The contrasts are still related to the type, and
in her characterization, the main characteristics are still the same three—boldness with men, cosmetic adornment and ostentatious and fake intellectualism.

Mrs. Otter's boldness in pursuit of men is channeled into the torment of the captured, so to speak. Mrs. Otter, like the Collegiates, is financially secure. This helped her to catch her husband and then to rule over him. The problem of a poor man marrying a rich woman was one the Renaissance audience was well acquainted with. Camden comments on the opinion of Renaissance writers on the subject, "This insistence on wealth, think many writers, is the cause for the failure of many marriages, since the wife who brings wealth to the union will be full of pride and will feel that the husband must give her first place" (pp. 62-63).

The problem was common enough to the audience so that once they heard she was rich and commanded all at home (as La Foole observed), they understood why, and knew approximately what she would be like. When Mrs. Otter is angry at her husband, she rails on and on at him, saying such things as, "Is this according to the instrument, when I married you? That I would bee Princesse, and raigne in mine owne house: and you would be my subject, and obay me? What did you bring me, should make you thus peremptory? Do I allow you your halfe-crowne a day, to spend where you will, among your gamsters, to vexe and torment me, at such times as these? Who giues you your maintenance, I pray you? (V, 200).

So Jonson shows what living with a sexually bold woman could be like. It seems as though Jonson was trying to teach the men who might be interested in them, just how bad living with a masculine type woman could be. In the description of the Collegiates, Jonson had mentioned
their cosmetics, but the men involved are never really convinced of the horror of it all. It took the same characteristic in Mrs. Otter to reveal the complete problem.

Truewit and his friends had the ability to stay away from their ladies before they were married. Living with the same type created more problems. In the case of cosmetics, the husband, in this play Mrs. Otter, had to pay for all the expensive cosmetics and see the woman without make-up on in the morning. Their home must be ignored while she spent hours primping.

Otter's speech alone should be enough to scare men away from the woman who used cosmetics. He exclaims, "A most vile face! and yet she spends me fortie pound a yeere in mercury, and hogs-bones. All her teeth were made i' the Blacke-Friers: both her eye'browes i' the strand, and her haire in Siluer-street. Euery part o' the towne ownes a piece of her . . . . She takes her selfe asunder still when she goes to bed, into some twentie boxes; and about next day noone is put together againe, like a great Germane clocke: and so comes forth and rings a tedious larum to the whole house, and then is quiet againe for an houre, but for her quarters" (V, 225-226).

Although not mentioned or shown so much, the third trait of Mrs. Otter is her Collegiate-like attempt to seem intellectual. This is shown in her echo of Collegiate ideals, but it is most noticeable in her euphuistic language. When her language begins to get showy, Truewit declares her "the onely authenticaull courtier, that is not naturally bred one, in the citie" (V, 201). She takes this stab at her femininity as a compliment. Then, to show how external her intellectualism really is, Jonson has her tell about her superstitious fright at a dream in
which some of her precious clothes and personal things were ruined while she was in London. Because of the dream, she has been worried and has even gone to see her doctor.

So we see that Mrs. Otter shares the same traits with the Collegiates, boldness with men, cosmetic adornment, and a certain amount of Collegiate intellectual ostentatiousness. She is a close copy of their ideals, a good enough copy to be used as an example for Epicoene to follow. The women of the College are really so much alike that there is not even a need to view them separately except when they separate themselves to pursue Dauphine. Consequently, the total impression of the women in Epicoene is coherent, as Doran's description of type characters suggests it will be.

As for development of character, the women are introduced before their appearances on stage, a typical method of Jonson, and they remain true to that description throughout the play. The only change is the unnatural, planned one in Epicoene's behavior. So the women are quite consistent to the type. Jonson began with a class of moral behavior--bold masculine women--revealed few rhetorical places (no unusual, untypical ones for the type), developed no change in the characters, and therefore created women characters that seem quite static, unimaginative, and uninteresting. The only effectiveness in the characterizations is created by Jonson's well-known method of humor through exaggeration.

The Women of Bartholomew Fair

Says John Enck of Bartholomew Fair, "The accommodating noises and cries of the fair triumph unequivocally, and so does marriage. The
vendors fill the stage with hawking, and the concluding events point up the marriage theme directly, more richly voiced than it could have been in *Epicoene*. ... *Bartholomew Fair* celebrates its tatters and ragged characters who not only win forgiveness, but, slightly modified, live happily ever after in what will be, presumably, their family circles.\(^{19}\)

Mr. Enck has pointed out that the marriage theme is more richly voiced than it could have been in *Epicoene*. One major reason for the increased richness is the characterization of the women in the play. *Bartholomew Fair* has much more variation in its female character types. Where *Epicoene*’s women were all the masculine type, *Bartholomew Fair*’s women are each a different type. The play revolves around two more courtships--of the single gentlewoman Grace and the common widow Purecraft. For examples of married couples there are the commoners Mr. and Mrs. Littlewit and the authority figures Mr. and Mrs. Overdo. And as the major unmarried bawd there is the unforgettable Ursula. Note the variations between a single gentlewoman, a common widow, a dumb proctor’s wife, a justice of the peace’s wife, and an English bawd. Such great variations create more contrasts and more individuality in characters than the stereotyped women in *Epicoene*.

But more than variations in type, there are also contrasts of moral qualities with the more subtle difference of motivation for action. As a genesis Jonson used some basic types, then put them under various stresses and within the environment of the fair. Unlike *Epicoene*, in the fair the women do not draw together but move separately. Each woman,

therefore, goes through different and varied situations. One major contrast which must be observed is the one between the community's women and the fair's leading woman. It is important to understand the real conflict of the play; John Potter states, "In this play the conflict is between moral hypocrisy and moral realism. The characters are divided into two groups: the people of the fair who represent a moral realism . . . and the visitors to the fair . . . who represent moral self-deception." 20

The moral hypocrisy of the community members can be seen most clearly in Purecraft, because her revelation of character is most sudden and thoroughly shown. Also of particular interest in the characterization of Purecraft is her relationship to Grace. In Purecraft and Grace are the opposites in the "unmarried woman" spectrum. While the Dame is the wealthy old common widow, Grace is the young virgin girl of good background, under contract for her land. Brustein reveals, "Women . . . were assumed [in the Renaissance] to be in constant danger of losing their chastity, but the inconstancy of widows was thought to be almost inevitable" (p. 41).

In Purecraft, Jonson uses the strong type character again, as he did in *Epicoene*, but not so rigidly. Purecraft is not strictly limited to one specific type. Jonson gives Purecraft's character more versatility through revelation of several interwoven rhetorical places. Therefore, while Purecraft is easily identified as a widow-type, she is also a Puritan-type and a hypocrite-type. The three types are quite appropriate to each other. Overbury mentions all three. The chief pride of the

---

"ordinary widdow" is "in the multitude of her suitors; and by them she
gaines: for one serues to draw another . . . . " And "her seruants, or
kinsfolke, are the Trumpeters that summon any to this combat: by them
she gaines much credit."21 Of the "Puritane," Overbury says he "is a
diseas'd peec of Apocripha: bind him to the Bible and he corrupts the
whole text . . . ." Overbury continues, "Honest hee dare not be, for
that loues order" (pp. 109-112). And then, about the clergy "hypocrite,"
Overbury reveals, "If he be a Cleargy Hypocrite, then all manner of vice
is for the most part so proper to him, as he will grudge any man the
practise of it but himselfe . . . . Hence are his so austere reprehen-
sions of drinking healths, lasciuous talke, vsury and vnconscionable
dealing; when as himself hating the profane mixture of malt and water, will
by his good will let nothing come within him, but the purity of the Grape,
when he can get it of another cost: But this must not bee done neither,
without a preface of seeming lothnesse . . . ." (pp. 132-133).

All three of these types fit Purecraft's rhetorical places. However,
in the plot, we learn earlier about the widowhood and Puritanism than
about hypocrisy. The introductory description of Purecraft is an in-
teresting combination. After her suitor calls her "sober" (VI, 21), his
friend Quarlous breaks into an extended description of life with an old
Puritan widow. After a month with Purecraft, Quarlous swears that
Winwife will "look like the quartan ague and the black jaundice met in
the face" (VI, 25). While neither of the men seems to know Purecraft for
the hypocrite her daughter and son-in-law say she is, they do know that
she is superstitious. Superstitiousness does not seem to agree with her

21 Sir Thomas Overbury, The "Conceited News" of Sir Thomas Overbury
and His Friends, ed. James E. Savage (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars'
sobriety. Her fortune of wealth and widowhood are mentioned early, as is the fact that she is Win-the-fight's mother. But of her moral character all the audience knows at first is that she is a legalistic Puritan whom her daughter believes is a hypocrite.

At first Purecraft's moral character seems quite conservative. She tries to convince her daughter not to be tempted by the fair. Then, when she sees that Win really wants to go, Purecraft promises Win that she will be able to attend. With Busy's help she figures out a way to legalize it. Purecraft's moral legalizing lasts throughout the pig eating and Busy's arrest, with no noticeable changes. But besides her legalism, Purecraft reveals loyalty and friendship when she chooses to attempt to help Busy and stay with him.

Purecraft's sudden revelation of true character is more dramatic than any other of the women's changes in Bartholomew Fair. Like Epicoene, Purecraft's real character is not revealed until close to the end of the play. Unlike Epicoene's change, it is not planned. Through the ethologica, Purecraft undergoes a change. Her superstitiousness makes her vulnerable. The fortunetellers tell her to marry a madman. When she believes the disguised Quarlous is a madman, she feels she has to reveal to him what she has actually been doing while she has pretended to be godly.

Then she reveals,

These seuen yeeres, I haue beene a wilfull holy widdow, onely to draw feasts, and gifts from my intangled suitors:
I am also by office, an assisting sister of the Deacons, and a deouerer, in stead of a distributer of the alms.
I am a speciall maker of marriages for our decayed Bretheren, with our rich widdowes; for a third part of
their wealth, when they are marryed, for the reliefe of
the poore elect: as also our poore handsome yong Virgins,
with our wealthy Batchelors, or Widdowers; to make them
steale from their husbands, when I haue confirmed them
in the faith, and got all put into their custodies"
(VI, 114-115).

Of these vices, except for the stealing from the church, Purecraft's
craft has been related to the courtship theme of Bartholomew Fair. She
has, in reality, stolen from her own suitors, stolen from widows and
their future husbands, taught young girls to steal from their husbands.
The revelation of Purecraft's moral character is particularly poignant
because of the relationship to Grace's situation. People such as Purecraft
put poor girls like Grace into horrible situations.

Looking at the characterization of Purecraft in its entirety, one
sees some similarity of characterization between Purecraft and the women
in Epicoene, especially in the use of a strong type and the sudden
revelation of character as in Epicoene's characterization. However,
Jonson's use of the three types in one woman makes Purecraft more of an
individual. Also emphasizing her individuality is her separation from
the other women. Half of her scenes are with Win. In the others she is
apart from other women. One other particularizing device making
Purecraft's characterization more effective than the women in Epicoene is
her relationship to Grace--another type of woman, also looking for a
husband.

Gamaliel Bradford has said that "of pure, modest and charming women,
Jonson has few." Certainly there were not any in Epicoene. Grace has
more of the aspects desired by the Renaissance man than any of the other
women in either play. She fits the type of the good young gentlewoman quite well. Note the variety of places included in her description by Quarlous and Winwife; there is effictio, nature, fortuna and many aspects of her notatio. One of the first introductions we have to Grace is the compliments by Quarlous and Winwife of Grace's discreet, sober characteristics and her good looks. She is a gentlewoman. Grace is not happy with the company she is made to keep because she looks with "restrained scorn" on Cokes' behavior and speeches (VI, 32).

Early in the play Grace helps prove her own soberness and good judgment by her attitude toward the fair. She is the only person in the play who really does not want to go there. Grace had to attend the fair anyway. And it is there that the audience is to view her demise.

The first characteristic to change noticeably is Grace's discreet nature. While before the fair Grace looks on Cokes with "restrained scorn," at the fair she becomes more outspoken. While Cokes is not paying attention she makes derogatory remarks about Cokes' family to Quarlous and Winwife. First she describes Justice Overdo as quite like Mrs. Overdo and Cokes (though she admits he is more serious). Later, when Quarlous refers to Numps as a "serious asse," Grace remarks that Justice Overdo "is answerable to that description in every haire of him" (VI, 80). Finally, after Grace, Quarlous, and Winwife are able to slip away from Cokes, she reveals the remainder of her opinions on the subject of her marriage, and therefore totally loses her discreetness. There are two major reasons for Grace's change, her poverty and a previously unnoticeable trait of conceit.

Jonson, perhaps, was trying to make a social comment on arranged marriages by using Grace as an example. Grace is really quite naive
in her idealism. She does not have much chance, socially, to do as she would like to do and marry whom she loves, because young girls did not usually have that advantage in the Renaissance.

Grace describes a common bad fortune when she tells of her fortune. "Faith, through a common calamity, he Justice Overdo bought me, Sir; and now he will marry me to his wive's brother, this wise Gentleman, that you see, or else I must pay value o' my land" (VI, 80). Bradshford believes that such a situation was a common subject in Restoration comedy because the authors were critical of the outcome (p. 101). Grace and Cokes are badly suited. She knows that, and she wants out of the marriage arrangements very much.

But besides being worried about her marriage, Grace is also conceited. She is consistently pictured as just a little too sure of herself and too naive about her actual situation. While she swears she must marry for love (VI, 93), she later says she has no fear that if she gets an understanding husband, her own manners will make him a good one (VI, 93).

Grace surely desires to "put it her ability to choose a husband to no danger of protestation" (VI, 114). But by Act V when she makes this statement, she has already put her future in jeopardy by the promise to pay the loser of her affections the value of her land (VI, 111). Even her future husband, Winifred, sees Grace's fall into foolishness, as we can observe in his statement that he will try to make her think she has made the decision to marry him with both her eyes open (VI, 114).

But because of her bad fortune of poverty and because of her moral sin of pride, Grace undergoes a change at the fair. She loses her sober
Grace calls her actions modest and reasonable (VI, 93). She says since both the men seem alike to her she will devise a plan to make a choice between them. Instructing them both to write a name on a tablet, she then chooses another stranger to pick the name he likes best. The irony comes from the stranger she chooses to judge—Troubleall, the madman Purecraft thinks she wants to marry. For all Grace's own high opinion of herself and her idealistic aims, Jonson shows her picking her husband by a manman's preference for a name (VI, 95). Purecraft may choose to marry the madman, but Grace lets him choose whom she will marry!

Since Grace starts out to be one of Jonson's better women characters morally and socially, and allows herself to act so foolishly, she is a very dynamic character. Consequently the audience is able to see her fitting into more of the places: sober and foolish, discreet and indiscreet, ladylike and conceited. She is very much the particularized, dynamic, individualized character.

Until the fair, Grace was both young and sober. But sobriety is unusual in the young. Mrs. Littlewit is also young, but she seems to fit the type of youth more than Grace. Earle's description of the "Young Man" fits Mrs. Littlewit's youthful actions quite well. The young man "is now out of nature's protection, though not yet able to guide himself; but left loose to the world and fortune, from which the weakness of his childhood preserved him; and now his strength exposes him . . . . He sees yet but the outside of the world and men, and conceives them according to their appearing glister, and out of this ignorance believes them. He pursues all vanities for happiness, and enjoys them best in this fancy. His reason serves not to curb." (pp. 39-40).
In regard to other places, several are mentioned early in her characterization. Many lines reveal that Win is pretty. She is the wife of an ordinary proctor and the daughter of a Puritan widow. Her father has been dead for several years. But Jonson went beyond these basic points.

In Mrs. Littlewit, Jonson revealed more of the reasons behind her actions than most of the other women in the two plays. First of all, Mrs. Littlewit is the natural daughter of hypocrite Purecraft. She is also married to one of the silliest men in any play. Jonson goes to great detail to reveal the Littlewits' relationship.

As usual, Jonson's introduction to the Littlewits' relationship is typical of the whole marriage. P. F. Vernon says, "It is a cardinal principle of Restoration comedy that cuckolds make themselves." And truly, much of Win's moral demise may be explained according to this principle. As the play opens Mr. Littlewit is so taken with his wife's cap, he says he could kiss it forever. Even young, silly Mrs. Littlewit sees the foolishness of her husband's affection for clothes and calls him a fool (VI, 20). Then Mr. Littlewit wants every man around to kiss his wife to see what a lucky man he is. Mrs. Littlewit lets them kiss her, but with misgivings. She calls her husband a fool again, and we must agree with her (VI, 20-21). It is Mr. Littlewit who tells his wife to lie and play hypocrite. Mrs. Littlewit has a fairly good sense of propriety, but her husband constantly leads her in the wrong direction. She is true to the Renaissance ideal of the obedient wife; she tried to do what she is told.

When John and Win are alone, he suggests a device to convince Purecraft to allow them to go to the fair. Then Win reveals the effects of her nature. She says of her "she is not a wise wilfull widdow for nothing, nor a sanctified sister for a song" (VI, 36). Then Win continues, "And let me alone too, I ha' somewhat o' the mother in me, you shall see ..." (VI, 36). It is an ironic statement considering what happens later in the play when he does leave her alone.

But when they get to the fair, Mrs. Littlewit follows her husband's leading. It is at the fair that Mr. Littlewit mentions the possibility of Win's interest in other men (VI, 30). She has not been guilty, at least in this particular case, but the idea, accompanied with John's desire for her "not to be asham'd" has been expressed.

But Littlewit can not be blamed totally for his wife's demise. A third rhetorical place is mentioned to clarify the situation. Mrs. Littlewit's wisdom falls short of Comden's description of the Elizabethan ideal (48). Mr. Littlewit laughs jokingly about his wife's lack of wisdom and describes her as having as little wit as he does (VI, 30). And her actions prove her to be less than wise. Completely relying on her husband's word, the gullible woman obeys all that he tells her to do. Consequently, when he leaves his silly wife with two strange men and tells her "they'll vse you very ciuilly, Win," she believes him totally (VI, 104).

Once Mr. Littlewit puts the gullible Win into the hands of the two men, she is led astray by her ignorance and her hypocritical nature. Note her two first responses to the men. She controls her passions as well as Waspe's.

Whi. Yes, by my fait, and trot, it is, Captaine:

de honesht womans life is a scuruy dull life, indeed, la.
Win. How, Sir? is an honest womans life a scuruy life?

Whi. Yes fait, shweet heart, beleue him, de leefe of a Bond-woman: but if dou vilt harken to me, I vill make tee a free-woman, and a Lady: dou shalt liue like a Lady, as te Captaine saish . . .

Win. What, and be honest still, that were fine sport (VI, 104-105).

This conversation partially reveals a fourth place Mrs. Littlewit fits into. Like Mrs. Otter in Epicoene, Win also wants social position. In the seduction of Mrs. Littlewit, Knockem and Whit constantly appeal to her desires for quality and manners. Allen Dessen says that this reveals that "the institution of marriage is being undermined by an appeal to false 'fashion' and a false concept of ladyship." Thus Mrs. Littlewit is overcome, in part, by her desire to become a lady. In the play's climax at the puppet show, the commoner, Mrs. Littlewit, shares the same compromising situation with a "real" lady, Mrs. Overdo.

Mrs. Overdo has been introduced to the audience by Waspe who told four things about her: her fortune (she is the wife of a justice of the peace), her nature (she is a gentlewoman--and sister to the crazy Cokes) and her victus (she is in charge of Cokes) (VI, 30). It takes a little longer to find Mrs. Overdo's moral character and to understand the reasons for her actions. Basically they are: thoughtlessness, ineffective bossiness and passivity.

When she enters the Littlewits' house at the beginning of the play, Waspe is very rude to her, questioning her authority to care for Cokes.

and calling her derogatory names in reference to her social position. She reacts very well. She controls her passions as well as Waspe's. And peace is maintained.

But that is her first and last moment of obvious intelligence. Mrs. Littlewit was ignorant and gullible, but at least she tried to understand her own situation. Mrs. Overdo does not even try. She goes to the fair as governor of her group, without even a second thought. One of the major characteristics of Mrs. Overdo, then, is thoughtlessness.

When she arrives at the fair, she seems little else but a child having fun. She makes no strong comments and just lets Cokes have fun. She decides the only person who wouldn't like the fair is Waspe. When Cokes looses his purse, she lightly chastises him by saying, "I pray you, have a better care of that, brother" (VI, 59). Then, after the second robbery, as Dessen describes it, "Mrs. Overdo is no help to Cokes against the threat of the cutpurse, but rather identifies herself with his 'vanity of the eye' and joins him in his denunciation of the 'preaching fellow' whom she describes as 'a lewd, and pernicious enormity'" (p. 177). Of course the lewd fellow is her husband in disguise.

It is only after she has been separated from Cokes that Waspe gets into a fight, and she gets so drunk that she becomes bossy. She tries to take on a masculine authority like the truly masculine types of Epicoene, but she fails because she is no authority figure.

To stop the fight she calls on her own authority, the king's name, her husband's name, a threat to commit them herself, her womanhood, and her justicehood. To these ineffectual pleas Waspe replies, "Spoke like a true Justice of peace's wife, indeed, and a fine female Lawyer!" (VI, 101). He has no respect for Mrs. Overdo.
Dessen comments on Mrs. Overdo's position saying, "Besides placing her in the social scale by means of emblematic costume, Jonson is also providing . . . an ever-present symbol of the ideal role such a ranking member of society should be playing toward the social disorder and anarchy of the fair . . . . Rather than helping to restore social order, Mrs. Overdo's pretensions to rank and authority only serve to make her husband appear even more ridiculous while establishing her kinship with her hopelessly foolish brother" (p. 177). Mrs. Overdo has only the affectation of social importance.

After the fight is stopped and Waspe is taken away, Mrs. Overdo becomes very passive. She admits to Captain Whit that, "Though I am Justice of peace's wife, I doe loue Men of warre, and the Sonnes of the sword, when they come before my husband" (VI, 103). Then after Alice attacks her, pulling Mrs. Overdo's hood over her ears and beating her, Mrs. Overdo quietly and drunkenly goes off with Mrs. Littlewit to change into the costume of a harlot.

As opposed to Mrs. Littlewit whose main problem is taking care of herself, Mrs. Overdo is emblematic of the person in a position to help others. Throughout the play we never really see Mrs. Overdo in the role of a private woman-wife as much as we see her as the public representative of her husband and his position. She is constantly referred to as "good she-justice," "Mistress French-hood" and other socially descriptive phrases.

She is not characterized so fully as some of the other women, but she is an accurate representation of her husband, the "silly asse." Mrs. Overdo also serves as a good contrast to Mrs. Littlewit, not just in the area of intelligence, but also in regard to social position. Mrs.
Littlewit wants ladyship and falls, in part, because of it. Mrs. Overdo has ladyship and falls, in part, because she has it but can't control herself within the position.

Both Mrs. Overdo and Mrs. Littlewit show sorrow for their previous actions more than the other community women, Madame Purecraft and Grace. Both Mrs. Littlewit and Mrs. Overdo want to go back to their husbands. Mrs. Overdo specifically asks, "Will not my Adam come at mee? shall I see him no more then? (VI, 138). But by the time Adam learns his wife is involved in the mess, he and Quarlous are ready to discuss the whole situation, and the community people go home, relatively happy, to discuss the problems.

So for the community women, but what of the fair's main lady? As Purecraft had been the personification of the "moral hypocrisy" of the community people, and Grace, Mrs. Overdo and Mrs. Littlewit had represented that same double standard, so Ursula represents the "moral realism" of the fair's people. Like Purecraft she is more of a character-type than the other women. She fits Overbury's description of a bawd with amazing similarity: "A Maquerela, in plaine English a Bawd is an old Char-cole, that hath beene burnt her selfe, and therefore is able to kindle a whole greene Coppice. The burden of her song is like that of Frier Bacons Head; Time is, Time was, and Time is past: in repeating which, she makes a wicked brazen face, and weepes in the cuppe, to allay the heate of her Aquavitad' (pp. 197-198). Consequently the basics of her victus, fortuna, charactera and effictio are revealed early in her characterization. She is a fat, ugly, old woman who makes her money selling pigs and promoting prostitution.
But Jonson has, once again, taken a strong type-character and enlarged the picture. Throughout the play, when others speak of Ursula, it is in very symbolic terms. Others call her "Piller of the Fayre" (VI, 47), "Body o' the Fayre," "mother o' the Bawds," "mother o' the Pigs," "mother o' the Furics," "walking Sow of tallow," and "an inspir'd vessel of Kitchin-stuffe" (VI, 52). Good hypocrite Busy sees Ursula the most symbolically. He says, "But the fleshly woman, (which you call Vrsla) is above all to be auoyded, hauing the marks vpon her, of the three enemies of Man, the World, as being in the Faire; the Deuill, as being in the fire; and the Flesh, as being her selfe" (VI, 82).

Even Ursula seems to see herself in more than natural symbolic terms. She introduces herself complaining, "Fye vpon't: who would weare out their youth, and prime thus, in roasting of pigges, that had any cooler vocation? Hell's a kind of cold cellar to it, a very fine vault, o' my conscience . . . I shall e'en melt away to the first woman, a ribbe againe . . . (VI, 42).

One rhetorical figure Jonson uses for Ursula is orationes. At the same time that Ursula is pictured as symbolic, her language could not be more earthy. When the men start insulting her obesity she answers in one of her calmer statements, "I, I, Gamesters, mocke a plaine plumpe soft wench o' the Suburbs, doe, because she's juicy and wholesome: you must he' your thinne pinch'd ware, pent vp i' the compass of a dogge-collar, (or 'twill not do) that lookes like a long lac'd Conger, set vpright, and a greene feather, like fennel, i' the Ioll on't" (VI, 52). Such language is a great contrast to any other in either the women of Epicoene or Bartholomew Fair.
James E. Robinson describes Ursula this way, "Ursula presents herself as a creature of total animalism, like the pigs she roasts . . . . She is all bilious humors and vapors conjured in the one dimension of the lower level of human nature—a pitiful, lovable creature." Robinson's description of Ursula as "total animalism" and "of the lower level of human nature" may be easy to agree with, but why "lovable, and pitiful"?

Contrasts with the other women as well as use of the particular rhetorical place of *casus* (things befallen) help Ursula gain our sympathy. In contrast to the hypocrisy of Purecraft, the conceit of Grace, the stupidity of Mrs. Littlewit, and in ineffectiveness of Mrs. Overdo, even Ursula's life style seems honest and fresh. Says Doran, "We should be sorry to see Ursula carted for helping to corrupt women whose silliness asks for a fall . . . (p. 330).

By the end of the play, we can't help feeling that Ursula is probably very happy to see her customers, those pillars of the community, leave her fair. She has been insulted and burned. She has had her pan stolen. She has had to help the people use her jordan, and then keep the women from being attacked by rightfully angry prostitutes who disliked territorial infringements by the society ladies. When, at the end of the play, she comes in crying for help and pleading, "I am in no fault," many find it easy to agree with her (VI, 138).

Like Ursula, all the women of *Bartholomew Fair* (with perhaps the exception of Purecraft) are dealt with more sympathetically than those in *Epicoene*. In *Bartholomew Fair* Jonson tried to emphasize the *consilium*, or reason behind many of the women's actions. Thus he gives the audience

a chance to understand social problems involved with individual people. In leaving the "why" out of *Epicoene* Jonson succeeded in creating humorous characters, but ones not easily sympathized with.

Though the women in *Bartholomew Fair* fit into certain type-character roles, the types are not enforced so strictly as those in *Epicoene*. Jonson also created more versatility in the characters, at least the women characters, at the fair by including more rhetorical places for each character. The multiplied places, plus the changes in the community women while they were at the fair, plus the looser roles as evidenced in the types of women, created more diversions in characters.

All the women of the community changed during their trip to the fair: Purecraft revealed her hypocrisy; through worry and pride, Grace lost her good sense and the little freedom she had; Mrs. Littlewit and Mrs. Overdo were almost started on a life of prostitution because they couldn't take care of themselves.

It is incorrect and unfair to Jonson to lump all his women characters together and call them ineffective. As we have seen, the women of *Bartholomew Fair* are good and interesting. Likewise it is probably wrong to call Jonson a misogynist. He deals harshly with all types of people, including women. It is far more correct to say that in some plays, like *Epicoene*, Jonson did not develop the women characters as thoroughly as in other plays. G. Gregory Smith is generalizing when he says that, "It is not so much that Jonson's women are unpleasing as that they are indifferently drawn. They are puppets rather than humans."25

The women in *Epicoene* are drawn much like puppets, but in *Bartholomew Fair*, the women are very much part of the human audience attending the puppet play.
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Hawthorne's Fair Maidens

Of all Nathaniel Hawthorne's characters, the ones declared by critics to be his personifications of the ideal are the fair maidens. Grouped together in this category are maidens of the major novels--Phoebe and Alice Pyncheon of The House of the Seven Gables, Priscilla of The Blithedale Romance and Hilda of The Marble Faun--as well as girls of more minor works--Ellen of Fanshawe and Susan of "The Village Uncle."

Critics have called these women Hawthorne's examples of the "ideal woman,"1 representatives of "the redeeming power of love,"2 propagators of the "ideal life."3 They are described as "the blonde maidens who flit through the novels like sunbeams in a dark world."4 Virginia Birdsall believes Hawthorne's ideal woman could help a man "find his place in the chain of humanity" through her redemptive love, and "through the medium of her soul the world might be seen and comprehended more clearly" (p. 250). Hyatt Waggoner believes the latter duty includes warming men's hearts and giving them hope" (p. 27).

1Hugo McPherson, Hawthorne as Myth Maker (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1919), p. 228.


Probably the main reason the maidens are called ideal by some critics is that they share many good qualities with Sophia Hawthorne, whom Hawthorne considered the ideal woman. Of his wife Hawthorne wrote, "Methinks a woman . . . who should combine the characteristics of Sophie Hawthorne and my Dove [his synonym for her spirit] would be the very perfection of her race. The heart would find all it yearns for, in such a woman, and so would the mind and the fancy;--when her husband was lightsome of spirit, her merry fantasies would dance hand in hand with his; and when he was overburthened with cares he would rest them all upon her bosom."  

While the fair maidens have many good qualities common to their group and to Sophia, problems arise in lumping these women together, particularly as redeemers or ideal women, because of the possibility that the fair maidens will be stereotyped as Hawthorne's view of the ideal woman. What many critics fail to realize is that many of the qualities the girls share are surface traits. Hawthorne's main interest in the girls' characters is in their power of love. In reality each of the maidens plays a different part, and each reacts differently to her responsibilities of love. It is the object of this paper to reveal many of the seemingly ideal qualities the maidens share with Sophia, and to then use the characters of the major fair maidens--Phoebe, Priscilla and Hilda--to show how Hawthorne both individualized and humanized these maidens to bring them out of the realm of the stereotyped ideal and into the world of humanity.

The appearance of the fair maidens is the most common characteristic of their group. Most of Hawthorne's fair maidens look enough like each other and Sophia Hawthorne to be sisters. The influence of Sophia's appearance on Nathaniel at their first meeting is described by her sister, Elizabeth, "She came down, in her simple white wrapper, and sat on the sofa. As I said 'My sister, Sophia,' he rose and looked at her intently,--he did not realize how intently." Elizabeth was so struck by Hawthorne's intense stares she wondered at the time, "What if he should fall in love with her."

The Hawthornes' son Julian described his mother, "In person she was small, graceful, active and translucent with lovely expressions . . . Her eyes [were] gray, soft, and full of gentle light" (p. 49). Sophia was a brown-haired girl from New England. She had been ill and consequently was quite pale most of her life. In his love letters Hawthorne described her as pale. He called her his Dove and thought white clothing suited her best (p. 52).

In Ellen of Fanshawe Hawthorne revealed his interest in the fair maidens' type even before he met Sophia. After Ellen's encounter with evil Hawthorne says, "Her illness . . . had wrought a considerable, but not a disadvantageous, change in her appearance. She was paler and thinner; her countenance was more intellectual, more spiritual . . . There was a quick vibration of the delicate blood in her cheek, yet never brightening to the glow of perfect health . . . ."

In The Marble Faun, Hawthorne describes Hilda as "a slender brown-haired, New England girl who . . ."


7 Nathaniel Hawthorne, The Complete Writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Old Manse Edition (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900), IX, 5. All succeeding references to Hawthorne's works except The American Notebooks will be from this edition, and the references will appear in text by volume and page number.
Still later in the book he pictures her as "a fair young girl, dressed in white" (IX, 68). Of Phoebe in The House of the Seven Gables, Hawthorne says: "Neither did her face . . . with the brown ringlets on either side, and the slightly piquant nose, and the wholesome bloom, and the clear shade of tan, and the half a dozen freckles . . . precisely give us a right to call her beautiful. But there was both lustre and depth in her eyes" (VII, 114). Susan, of "The Village Uncle," is portrayed as a slim girl with "the slimmest of all waists, brown hair curling on her neck, and a complexion rather pale, except when the seabreeze flushed it" (II, 109-110). At the beginning of The Blithedale Romance Priscilla looks different from these girls. While she has slightly waved brown hair, her coloring is a wan shade which Hawthorne describes as coming from her "habitual seclusion from the sun" (VII, 34). After she had been at the farm for awhile, however, "her coloring begins to bloom" (VIII, 101). Alice Pyncheon is another of Hawthorne's fair-haired maids. Throughout The House of the Seven Gables she is continually called fair, and like Hilda she is pictured in white (VII, 305).

Hawthorne greatly adored his wife, as his love letters to her reveal. In these letters, partially recorded in Stewart's edition of The American Notebooks, Hawthorne discloses Sophia's talent for housewifely duties by relating her transformation of "The Old Manse" into a "comfortable modern residence." He testified to her charisma by saying she brings "bright sunshine" into a room with her presence (p. 164).

---

He lauds her femininity by describing her as "birdlike in many things" (p. 182). These specific characteristics may easily be found in Hawthorne's fair-haired maidens.

One of Sophia's specific characteristics that Hawthorne bestows on all his fair maids is the gift for some housewifely duties. Phoebe is "one of those persons who possess . . . the gift of practical arrangement" (VII, 101). She is capable of cooking and taking care of that great seven gabled house. In The Marble Faun Miriam jealously admits that even the artististic Hilda has "certain little housewifely ways of accuracy and order" (IX, 89). Ellen Langdon of Fanshawe is a good enough cook to please even cranky, old Mr. Melmoth (XVI, 12). In "The Village Uncle" Susan is constantly associated with domestic life. "She kindled a domestic fire within the man's heart" says Hawthorne of her influence over the Uncle (II, 110). On Sabbath, Susan sits surrounded "with household things and made others feel the poetry of the home" (II, 111). Priscilla of The Blithedale Romance would not have made a perfect farmer's wife, however. "She met with terrible mishaps in her efforts to milk a cow; she let the poultry into the garden; she generally spoilt whatever part of dinner she took in charge; she broke crockery . . ." (VIII, 104). But even Priscilla could do one thing well --she could sew (VIII, 104).

At least three of the maidens share Sophia's birdlikeness. Priscilla, in her healthful state at Blithedale can run with "an air between that of a bird and a young colt" (VIII, 103). Hawthorne says that Phoebe can sing with a "natural tunefulness . . . like a bird in a shadowy tree" (VII, 180). She is also as "graceful as a bird" (VII, 114). Holgrave tells her that she is lucky to make friends with the
Pyncheon hens so soon after her arrival. But Phoebe reveals the secret when she says, "I have learned how to talk with hens and chickens" (VII, 129). Phoebe can even talk with the birds! However, Hilda's bird-like qualities are emphasized even more strongly than Phoebe's. Living in her tower, Hilda becomes close to the doves who come to her window for food. "They [the doves] soon became as familiar with the . . . girl as if she were a born sister of the brood" (IX, 73). Because of her customary white "plumage" her artist friends even called Hilda the "Dove" (IX, 73). Throughout the book Hilda is compared to and associated with the doves. Her tower is even called the Dove-cote (IX, 73).

Sophia's sunniness is found in most of the fair maids as varying forms of light. In Fanshawe Ellen makes the sunny days brighter for Dr. Melmoth (if not for Mrs. Melmoth) (XVI, 13). Phoebe is closely associated with the sun. She brightens life for Hepzibah, Holgrave and Clifford. She is "as pleasant about the house as a gleam of sunshine falling on the floor through a shadow of twinkling leaves . . . ." (VII, 114). Even Phoebe's name is highly symbolic. Waggoner tells us that in Greek Phoebe's name means "shining" (p. 170). Susan has such a sunny disposition that even the gloomy spirits can feel it (II, 110). Hilda has a glow, but usually it is from a fire instead of the sun. She is usually associated with the glow of sacred flame in the Virgin's shrine (IX, 70). After marrying Kenyon she is to be worshiped "in the light of her husband's fireside" (X, 351). Priscilla is also described in comparison with sunshine, but to a different degree. "She seemed to me [Coverdale] like a butterfly at play in a flickering bit of sunshine
and mistaking it for a broad and eternal summer" (VIII, 104-105). She is happy with just a little sunshine because she does not have much of her own. On first seeing her, Coverdale says that "she reminded me of plants that . . . vegetate among the bricks of an enclosed court where there is scanty soil and never any sunshine (VIII, 68).

The characteristics of housewifely abilities, sunniness, birdlike-ness and appearance are only surface qualities; but they are not the only attributes the maidens share. One important aspect they do share is optimistic and naive philosophies. Julian Hawthorne describes his mother's philosophical influence over his father. He says, "Her lofty and assured ideals kept him to the belief in the reality and veracity of his own. In the warmth and light of such companionship as hers, he could not fall into the coldness and gloom of a selfish intellectual habit . . . . Before her unshakeable hopefulness and serenity his constitutional tendency to ill-foreboding and discouragement vanished away" (p. 40).

Hawthorne often contrasts the maidens' optimistic views with the views of intellectual men. When Phoebe thinks Holgrave's observations of Hepzibah and Clifford are too cold and distant, she states: "I wish you would speak more plainly . . . and above all, that you would feel more like a Christian, and a human being!" (VII, 258-259). When Coverdale asks Priscilla what she thinks about the world, she naively answers: "I never think about it at all . . . . But this I am sure of, that it is a world where everybody is kind to me . . . and all the foolish things which you see me do are only the motions of my heart" (VIII, 105-106). It is an ironic answer if we consider some of the
unkindnesses inflicted upon the girl. Likewise Hilda's hopeful and happy nature will not allow her to accept Kenyon's theories that lead to the thought that man had to fall to understand evil.

Some Hawthorne critics see this naivete as an important aspect of Hawthorne's ideal. Waggoner, a critic who places the girls in the "ideal" category, believes Hawthorne does not want his fair maids to discover that right and wrong are not distinct and are often intermingled, whereas, Hawthorne requires his young men to be educated in the indistinctness of right and wrong (p. 222). Frederic Carpenter believes that Hawthorne picked an effective and traditional symbol for purity when he picked the virgin, or the fair young maidens. He says that this symbol "may be defined as the preservation of a pure, or virginal state of mind with regard to the experiences of life . . . . It involves a denial of the value or significance of these experiences to the spiritual or ideal life" (p. 27).

This theory by critics such as Carpenter and Waggoner that the maidens' purity comes from a denial of experiences of life and understanding of right and wrong is not based on a thorough study of the characterizations. Each of Hawthorne's women does have problems, and consequently participates in life. None of Hawthorne's maidens is constantly sure of her actions and beliefs. In particular Hilda and Ellen question their own actions. Jae Tharpe compares Ellen's and Hilda's self-inventory when he says that Hawthorne "spends a good deal of time in recording Ellen's indecision and her impressions, as he does in Hilda's case much later."9 Most of Chapter VIII of Fanshawe is

dedicated to the reasons for Ellen's actions (XVI, 135-158). In *The Marble Faun* Hilda is unsure exactly what her link to sin really is. At one time she asks, "Am I, too, stained with guilt?" (X, 284). She is unsure what her religion is (X, 221). After her discussion with Kenyon about mercy toward Miriam, Hilda begins to worry whether she has committed a wrong against Miriam (X, 245). Hawthorne shows both Ellen and Hilda trying to understand what they should do. Birdsall believes the girls are not uniformly orthodox. She points out that Phoebe stayed within the "limits of the law," while "Priscilla's lawfulness amounts to little more than a feeble, instinctive protest" against the unorthodox, and Hilda seems "painfully unsure" what her philosophy of life should be (p. 252).

Another important characteristic the maidens share, in varying degrees is a redemptive power of love which enables the man involved to find, as Birdsall phrases it, "his place in the chain of humanity" (p. 250). Nathaniel believed Sophia had this quality. In a love letter to her he says, "So human am I . . . that I would not give up the hope of living and cherishing you by a fireside of our own . . . . Your influence shall purify me and fit me for a better world--but it shall be by means of our happiness here below" (p. 45).

When Ellen Langdon and Edward Walcott were married, "Ellen's gentle almost imperceptible, but powerful influence drew her husband away from the passions and pursuits that would have interfered with domestic felicity . . . (XVI, 184). Millicent Bell explains that "Susan convinces her husband to leave his obsession with solitary achievement."10

Instead he chose "chaste and warm affections, humble wishes, and honest toil for some useful end . . . " (II, 120). When Holgrave announces his love to Phoebe he tells her that "it will be my lot to set out trees, to make fences . . . to conform to laws, and the peaceful practice of society. Your poise will be more powerful than any oscillating tendency of mine" (VII, 448). After Hilda and Kenyon decide to marry they also resolve to go back to America and stop their Roman wanderings (X, 351). Even Priscilla becomes "guardian of Hollingsworth and . . . agent of his conversion from a man of passion, if monomanical, conviction, to a mellowed but defeated nonentity," state Allan and Barbara Lefcowitz.11

Morton Cronin believes that Hawthorne finds the fair girls more congenial than the dark women in his works.12 And this would seem probable since he patterned them after the wife he called "the perfection of her race." Certainly Hawthorne's maidens do have winning ways. At very least we may say that in Hawthorne's stories, the fair maids do win the men. Allen married Edward; Phoebe and Holgrave unite their families; Priscilla wins Hollingsworth, and Hilda and Kenyon head for a future filled with marital bliss.

But not all the characteristics the girls share come from the pattern of Sophia. Some characteristics are completely different. Sophia read a great deal and was interested in intellectual pursuits. Unlike Sophia, Phoebe, Ellen and Susan share a lack of intellectualism and bookishness. In Susan's house there is no other literature than the Bible and an almanac (II, 112). Phoebe admits to Hepzibah that she is


not as good at her books as she is at housewifely duties (VII, 110). And Ellen, despite Dr. Melmoth's good influence, prefers to read romances instead of language books (XVI, 13).

Likewise, many of the characteristics of the later heroines are contributed by the earlier fictitious maidens rather than by Sophia. Stewart, editor of The American Notebooks, believes that Priscilla derives fragility from heroines of the early tales, a certain fantastic grace from the snow image, the powers of a medium from Alice Pyncheon and an occupation and a tendency to playfulness from the seamstress at Brook Farm (LIX).

However, while the girls are patterned after Sophia and each other, each one is a unique character. To all of the maidens Hawthorne gives certain responsibilities. As more careful examination will reveal, one of the most important variations in the pattern—the cutting edge of the fair maidens' characters—concerns their ability to be responsible to the people around them and to unburden those heavy hearts. The variations are particularly evident in the three most prominent fair maidens—Phoebe, Priscilla, and Hilda.

When we first meet Phoebe in The House of the Seven Gables, we see that she is a strong, attractive girl. She is fresh and unconventional but orderly (VII, 97). And her appearance is not her only positive feature. Her interior is true to her exterior assets. Like Sophia Hawthorne, Phoebe can lighten the burdens and accent the joys of those around her. She amuses Hepzibah from the first (VII, 108). And Clifford cannot stand to be parted from her for long. She becomes "absolutely essential to the daily comfort, if not the daily life, of her two forlorn companions" (VII, 196). Holgrave needs her to give him something more
stable than a bird's nest for a home (VII, 461). Waggoner explains Phoebe's relationship to the people: "Clifford finds in her the principle of life, Holgrave the correction of his ingenious speculations. Her arrival is the coming of grace after sin and suffering. In her marriage with Holgrave we see both the end of the male Pyncheon line and of the name, and the promise of renewal. She carries the redemptive theme of the romance" (p. 176).

Phoebe's influence is strong. She warms the hearts of the other three characters. In the scene where Phoebe and Holgrave express their love for one another and Clifford and Hepzibah return, Phoebe's influence is particularly evident. For Phoebe and Holgrave "there is no death; for immortality is revealed anew . . . ." (VII, 449). The listlessness, fear, and unhappiness of Hepzibah and Clifford end as they discover Phoebe at home (VII, 451).

Waggoner believes that the marriage of Phoebe and Holgrave is particularly important in Hawthorne's view of history because it says that the wheel of history is going somewhere, not just in circles (p. 178). The marriage gives hope of the future to both families.

Though some people think Phoebe appears perfect, Hawthorne did not attempt to characterize a woman without blemish. At one point in the book Phoebe has lost control of her will through mesmerism. Hawthorne particularly disliked any type of mesmerism. While he was at Brook Farm he advised Sophia to take no part in "magnetic miracles" for her health. "Supposing that the power arises from the transfusion of one spirit into another, it seems to me that the sacredness of an individual is violated by it; there would be an intruder into the holy of holies" (XVIII, 308).
After Holgrave tells Phoebe the story of Alice Pyncheon, he realizes that he has almost put her in a trance. Holgrave saw that "a veil was beginning to be muffled about her, in which she could behold only him, and live only in his thoughts and emotions . . . . It was evident, that with but one wave of his hand and a corresponding effort of his will, he would complete his mastery of Phoebe's yet free and virgin spirit . . . ." (VII, 307-308). In this one event Phoebe had lost control of herself. With someone less kind than Holgrave, Phoebe might never have regained control of her life and the good influence she had over others.

Phoebe's temporary weakness could have let the intruder into her soul. Hawthorne may well have included this scene to reinforce Phoebe's human frailty. He wanted us to know that even this very good maid could make a mistake, weaken for a moment and lose control of herself. Yet, while Phoebe is human and weak, she is able to keep her strong ability to give love and share joy more than either Priscilla or Hilda.

According to Richard H. Fogle, "Priscilla is allegorically the heart miraculously untouched by sin. She is at once powerful and vulnerable, a paradox which epitomized in the shimmering garment of the Veiled Lady." She can be considered powerful because she knew she wanted Hollingsworth and she got him. There was not even as much difficulty for her to turn from Zenobia as Coverdale thought there would be (VIII, 315).

But Hawthorne does not try to make this fair maiden a saint, even though Coverdale does call her a shadowy snow-maiden that might melt

---

away in an instant (VIII, 43). In fact, Priscilla is less like Sophia and Hawthorne's ideal than most of the fair women. She is not very good at housewifely duties and her sunniness is flickering and dim. When she first comes to Blithedale she is physically and psychologically weak. Her physical condition improves, but her psychological debilitation remains. Her mind is too open to mesmerism to easily allow her independence. Fogle explains this mental impairment as "romantic imagination, marvellously sensitive and penetrating, but in this instance unsupported by judgment and experience and therefore insecure and dangerously exposed to evil" (p. 188). A. N. Kaul goes so far as to liken Priscilla to Ester, whose soul was overcome by a psychological experiment in "Ethan Brand."14 According to Coverdale, Priscilla is imprecible as wax" (VIII, 109). She can be too easily formed by those who wish to form her.

Others must help Priscilla because she is incapable of helping herself. Roy R. Male states that Priscilla's importance lies in her relationship to others.15 But because Priscilla is so weak, the relationships are worthwhile only if the others make them that way. Kaul relates Blithedale's success to Priscilla when he says, "The great test of the experiment's human worth is of course Priscilla. Unless the visionaries can save this daughter of poverty from her bondage, their enterprise will be a mockery of their principles" (p. 162). Priscilla has very little effect on the outcome of Blithedale.


To be Hawthorne's ideal, Priscilla needs to have a strong love that can unburden hearts. She tries to be loving toward Zenobia, but time after time Zenobia spurns her love and affection. Zenobia calls Priscilla's love "a little more love than one can conveniently dispose of . . . " (VIII, 44-45). But it is not strong enough to be indispensable. In fact, when Zenobia and Priscilla part for the last time, Zenobia gives Priscilla a loveless kiss (VIII, 314). Evidently Priscilla's love is not enough to help poor Coverdale either, since he has to end his story with a confession which includes his attempt to admit he loves her (VIII, 350-354). Her engrossing love is not even enough for Hollingsworth. Before Zenobia commits suicide, Zenobia accuses Hollingsworth of previously being interested in her money (VIII, 309). And Coverdale says, "After all the evil that he did, are we to leave him thus, blest with the entire devotion of his own true heart [Priscilla], and with wealth at his disposal to execute the long-contemplated project that had led him so far astray?" (VIII, 346). Both Coverdale and Zenobia believe that one of the reasons Hollingsworth says he loves Priscilla is an evil desire for Priscilla's new-found wealth.

No, her love is not strong enough to help those around her. Nor does it unburden a heavy heart as Hawthorne said the perfect woman's love would. Zenobia commits suicide. Coverdale's life is only "tolerable" (VIII, 351). Hollingsworth turns into a depressed, melancholy, weak, insecure man (VIII, 346). The Lefcowitzes say: "Thus Priscilla's charismatic potentialities are severely restricted; though she can 'save' the chastened Hollingsworth, she can do nothing to save Zenobia from complete physical and spiritual annihilation, and Coverdale from a life of Prufrockian aridity" (p. 275).
Most of the fair maids are to some extent patterned after Sophia. However, in The American Notebooks Stewart points out that it appears that the character of Hilda incorporates even more of Sophia than in the portrait of Phoebe or any of the other fair maidens. Stewart concludes, "The character of Hilda becomes little more than an ideal portrait of the author's wife" (LVII). Besides all the other similarities Hilda and Sophia share, Sophia, like Hilda, was considered an excellent copyist. And, according to Julian, Sophia's copies were more highly regarded than her original paintings (pp. 64-65). Cronin believes Hilda's perfection can be seen in her application of art, because it comes from the heart (p. 622). Certainly Hawthorne appreciates Hilda's abilities. He says: "It strikes us that there is something far higher and nobler in all this [her copying], in her thus sacrificing herself to the devout recognition of the highest excellence in art, than there would have been in cultivating her not inconsiderable share of talent for the production of works from her own ideas" (IX, 79). Paul Brodtkorb agrees that her personal qualities are parallel to the highest attributes of art. He includes close observation of change, realization of resemblances of the moment and knowledge of the essential in these qualities. 16

Hilda and Sophia also have the same moral attitudes. Elizabeth, Sophia's sister, makes this statement in Julian Hawthorne's book:
"There was one kind of thing she could not bear, and that was, moral evil" (248). These same strong moral convictions can be seen in Hilda. When she speaks to Miriam after she viewed the murder, Hilda admits

that the knowledge of Miriam's and Donatello's guilt seems to be crushing her. She does not seem able to stand the knowledge (X, 292).

Whatever her Sophia-like qualities may be, however, Hilda has been one of the most controversial fair maids that Hawthorne created. Most of the controversy centers around her moral convictions and her rejection of Miriam. Readers are often repulsed by Hilda's "purity" when she refuses to help Miriam. Phoebe has seen this characteristic of coolness toward friends in Holgrave and hated it (VII, 258-259). Sidney Moss reveals that "according to the doctrine of the Priesthood of all beliefs, each Protestant is his brother's confessor." Hilda, like Sophia, is a New England Protestant. She refuses Miriam's confession but goes to the confessor herself. This irresponsibility toward her friend is not attractive in Hilda.

Hilda's purity can seem false when she rejects Miriam, but it is both a weakness and a strength. There is strength in knowing one's limitations. Sacran Bercovitch believes the rejection shows Hilda's strength. He says: "She refuses Miriam, not out of hard heartedness but in the conviction that she is impotent to 'save' her, that her foolish friend must find her own way . . . ." Hilda recognized her frailty and her limitation; Hilda realizes that only God can save Miriam. Unlike Phoebe who witlessly would have let herself be overtaken by Holgrave, and Priscilla who was overcome twice by Westervelt,


Hilda does not let her spirit be taken. She explains to Miriam:
"Your powerful magnetism would be too much for me. The pure, white atmosphere, in which I try to discern what things are good and true, would be discolored" (X, 289).

Does her love redeem, bring warmth or hope for anyone? Hilda is not really close enough to Donatello to have any significant influence on him. Of her responsibility to Miriam, Hilda admits, "Miriam loved me well . . . and I failed her at her sorest need" (X, 246). Hilda does no more for Miriam than deliver a package. It is not much to do for a friend. On the contrary, instead of the pure, fair Hilda helping Miriam, it is Miriam who tries to help Hilda. When Hilda asks for advice, "Miriam at once responded to the girl's cry for help" (X, 259).

Sheldon W. Liebman feels that Hilda never changes.19 But Marjorie Elder believes that Hilda does change. Elder says that "as a young girl . . . she needs the sturdier quality, the deeper insight, that she gains from her great sorrow; and she shows the soul's growth through knowledge of the evil in the world."20 Hilda does recognize evil after her discovery of Miriam's and Donatello's crime. She even realizes that some of her hallowed painters might have had weakness in their souls (X, 180).

She also comes down from her virginal tower and marries Kenyon. It is with Kenyon that Hilda's love seems to have some effect. He


needs her to redeem his mind from unorthodox thoughts and bring his body home to America. Their love gave his life "human promise," and since Hilda had a hopeful soul, and saw sunlight on the mountain-tops, we can say she probably gives Kenyon a warm heart and a hope for the future (X, 353). In returning to America, Hilda brings Kenyon back to the "reality of life" and the "truth of the world." Hawthorne explains that in foreign countries "we defer the reality of life . . . . It is wise, therefore, to come back betimes . . . (X, 351-352). Thus Hilda is true to the ideal in regards to her relationship to Kenyon. She brings him redemption from his foreign ways.

Thus, the three major fair maids, while coming from the same basic pattern, react quite differently to the responsibilities of love. Phoebe has an overwhelming love, able to bring joy and relief to overburdened hearts. Her only weakness in the story is her temporary loss of control to mesmerism. On the other hand, Priscilla's love is very weak. She helps no one. She is the person needing help instead of giving love. The man she marries remains evil. Hilda changes during her tale, from a girl too pure to help a friend, to a wife able to bring back her husband to the "reality of life."

Hawthorne, while developing a personality type for his novels and short stories, was able to make each member of the group of fair maidens an individual character, capable of different reactions to her responsibilities. Despite their obvious positive similarities to Sophia and despite the opinions of many critics, each maiden has her own personal tendency to evil or psychological weakness. To stereotype the fair maidens as Hawthorne's ideal negates their individuality and human frailty. Stereotyping the maiden's characters underestimates both Hawthorne's view of life as well as his ability to reveal it.
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Responsibility and Character in Faulkner's Fiction

Since William Faulkner won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1950, many people have examined the characters in his works. Since the majority of his characters are considered to be evil, some readers have questioned whether Faulkner's writing demonstrated how to "endure and prevail." But Faulkner did not equate teaching endurance with writing happy tales of pretty, noble people. Instead, Faulkner sought to help mankind by revealing mankind's weaknesses and various degrees of evil. Consequently his characterizations often emphasized the negative traits of his characters.

In an interview in Japan, Faulkner discussed how he used negative characteristics to emphasize the positive and to teach man how to endure and prevail.

Never use evil for the sake of the evil--you must use the evil to try to tell some truth which you think is important; there are times when man needs to be reminded of evil, to correct it, to change it; he should not be reminded always only of the good and the beautiful. I think that the writer or the poet or the novelist should not be just a "recorder" of man--he should give man some reason to believe that man can be better than he is. If the writer is to accomplish anything, it is to make the world a little better than he found it, to do what he
can, in whatever way he can, to get rid of the evils like war, injustice—that's his job. And not to do this by describing merely the pleasant things—he must show man the base, the evil things that man can do and still hate himself for doing it, to still prevail and endure and last, to believe always that he can be better than he probably will. ¹

The technique Faulkner used to "tell some truth" was to reveal three different ways man could choose to relate to that evil. "The first says, 'This is rotten, I'll have no part of it.' The second says, 'This is rotten, I don't like it, I can't do anything about it, but at least I will not participate in it myself, I will go off into a cave or climb a pillar to sit on.' The third says, 'This stinks and I'm going to do something about it, I'm going to change it.'"²

Faulkner's characters often fall into one of these three categories; however, many times he created a fourth type of character, so devoid of good that he can't even see beyond his own situation to acknowledge that "This is rotten, I'll have no part of it."

Such varying reactions to evil create contrasts and comparisons between many of Faulkner's characters and thereby emphasize the importance of man's responsibilities. It is the object of this paper to classify and evaluate several of Faulkner's main characters according to the four specific types. Though the most definitive way to


evaluate this classification is through examination of all the char-
acters in several works, because of limitations of time and space, I
have chosen to select a few major characters from various works.
Particularly good examples of these types are Quentin, Dilsey, and Jason
in The Sound and the Fury. In later works: Ike in The Bear, Chuck in
Intruder in the Dust, and Flem, Linda, and Ratliff in the Snopes trilogy
well personify the types.

First of all, let us examine some striking contrasts of these
personality types found in The Sound and the Fury. In the novel there
is Quentin, who refuses to take part in life, Dilsey, who stands up
against evil, and Jason, who is devoid of any good. The story was told
by three members of the Compson family--Benjy, Quinton, and Jason.
Faulkner first chose Benjy, the idiot, to tell the story because of his
natural innocence and, therefore, unbiased approach. It is in Benjy
that Faulkner centered the question of responsibility. One of the main
questions presented in The Sound and the Fury is who would give Benjy
"the tenderness, the help, to shield him in his innocence."³

Since Benjy was unable to cope with the world, he had to rely upon
others to protect and care for him. In their sections, Quinton and Jason
reveal that the rest of the family were not able to cope with Benjy's
problems. Their mother rejected Benjy and considered him a curse upon
her. Their sister Caddy, trapped between her mother's social attitudes
toward marriage and her own promiscuity, was banished from her home and
Benjy. Mr. Compson watched his wife tear the family apart with her false
sense of propriety, and then proceeded to drink his way out of life.

³William Faulkner, Faulkner at Nagano, ed. Robert A. Jelliffe
Consequently the responsibility to love and care for Benjy fell upon the two brothers--Quentin and Jason. Unfortunately neither accepted that responsibility.

In order for a character to fall into one of the first three categories mentioned, he had to acknowledge evil and his responsibility to combat it. Quentin was capable of seeing the world's evil. He realized the injustice of selling Benjy's pasture and sending him, Quentin, to Harvard. He did not agree with his father's completely negative views on life. He realized the hurt his own mother had caused him and Benjy. And along with the capability to see evil, Quentin also knew that he was responsible for fighting evil and keeping Benjy safe. Even as he was planning his suicide he remembered that when Caddy had asked him to care for Benjy he had promised her that he would not let anyone send the helpless Benjy to the Jackson asylum. He knew that by his suicide he was not only rejecting the responsibility of Benjy, but also hurting others. He thought: "What a sinful waste Dilsey would say. Benjy knew it when Damuddy died. He cried. He smelled it. He smelled it" (p. 69).

Not only was Quentin able to recognize evil and his responsibilities to combat it, but he was also capable of combating evil with good. He was tolerant of others and he believed in taking people for what they believed they were (p. 66). Consequently he believed that Blacks had patience, reliability and tolerance (p. 67). He showed understanding toward the Black man Louis. He was thoughtful of the old Black man Deacon, and kind and helpful to the little girl he met at the bakery.

---

4William Faulkner, The Sound and the Fury, in The Faulkner Reader (New York: Random House, 1961) p. 85. All succeeding references to this work will be from The Faulkner Reader, and the references will appear in the text by page number.
But Quentin wanted no part of life or its responsibilities. Outwardly his reason for committing suicide stemmed from Caddy's lost honor. However, Heinrich Straumann suggests that Quentin's strongest reason to kill himself was his excessive sensitivity and inability to overlook the inhumanity and "dual scale of values" he saw in his family and the world. It is true that he often argued with his father over the importance of virginity, but, more than anything else, his suicide was a rejection of responsibility.

Consequently, Quentin believed the best thing to do with people was to leave them alone (p. 66). He chose to believe that he was not important. Shortly before his suicide he related, "I seemed to be lying neither asleep nor awake looking down a long corridor of grey halflight where all stable things had become shadowy paradoxical all I had done shadows all I had felt suffered taking visible form antic and perverse mocking without relevance inherent themselves with the denial of the significance they should have affirmed thinking I was I was not who was not was not who" (p. 128). He told his father that suicide was courageous (p. 133). Quentin chose to believe that he meant nothing. He chose not to endure or prevail or to attempt to change the world. Quentin chose to say, "This is rotten, I'll have no part of it."

Quentin and Jason, though brothers, were nothing alike. Jason's reaction to Benjy revealed his total degredation. He constantly made reference to his helpless brother with degrading, derogatory, cruel terms. He called Benjy the state asylum's "star freshman" (p. 172), "crazy" (p. 174), an "idiot" (p. 183), and "the Great American Gelding"

(p. 196). He thought Benjy looked like a bear (p. 188). Jason had no desire to give Benjy any pleasure or compassion. Consequently he did not want to keep a carriage for Benjy to ride in, even if Benjy did enjoy it (p. 186). Likewise, when the Negro servant, Luster, tried to light a fire because Benjy wanted one, Jason refused to let him (p. 190). Jason also resented caring for Benjy at home. Because his mother would not let Benjy be put in an asylum, he sarcastically told her to move all bedlam in the house with them (p. 168). As quickly as Jason could make arrangements, he had Benjy castrated and sent to the state asylum. He got rid of the responsibility of Benjy just as soon as he felt he could.

Besides his inhuman treatment of Benjy, Jason stole money from his niece and mother and blackmailed his sister. After their father's funeral, when Caddy came back for the service, she paid Jason $100 to see her daughter, Quentin, "for a minute." He took the money and then heartlessly, put the child up to a carriage window and had the carriage driven by so quickly Caddy could not speak to the girl. Both Jason and Caddy knew that Mrs. Compson would not allow Quentin to receive money from Caddy. Consequently, Jason agreed to see that Quentin got the money that Caddy sent to her, if Caddy would stay away for good. He kept most of the money and lied to the child about it.

Jason also hated Negroes. Of them he said, "Like I say the only place for them is in the field, where they'd have to work from sunup to sundown. They can't stand prosperity or an easy job. Let one stay around white people for a while and he's not worth killing" (pp. 186-187). In dealing with the Compson's Negro servant Dilsey, he was very rough. Despite her many years of fruitful service, Jason resented paying wages
to her because she was old and because she tried to help Caddy and Quentin. When Dilsey came to help Quentin, Jason described the situation: "Dilsey came hobbling along. I turned and kicked the door shut in her face. 'You keep out of here,' I says" (p. 138). When Quentin called out, Dilsey came to her aid. Jason recalled, "She held to my arm. Then the belt came out and I jerked loose and flung her away. She stumbled into the table. She was so old she couldn't do any more than move hardly. But that's all right: we need somebody in the kitchen to eat up the grub the young ones can't tote off. She came hobbling between us, trying to hold me again. 'Hit me, den,' she says . . . . 'You think I wont?" (p. 139).

Yet, despite Jason's irresponsible actions toward his family and servants, Jason had his own sense of pride, though it was not very well defined. He ironically told his mother he had as much pride in his family as anybody (p. 166). Later he said that he could not have any pride because of his crazy family (p. 172). To protect the family and himself against gossip he reminded people that his "people owned slaves here when you all were running little shirt tale country farms and farming land no nigger would look at on shares" (p. 178).

In Jason we see a man unwilling to care for his helpless brother, his fatherless niece, or his old loyal servant. He stole from his own family and substituted a false sham of appearing propriety for true responsibility to the welfare of his family. He is a character devoid of good. Faulkner called Jason his most vicious character. ⁶ Truly Jason was too selfish to accept responsibility beyond himself or to

⁶Faulkner at Nagano, p. 104.
think of any other's welfare but his own. He is definitely an example of the fourth type of individual mentioned.

Directly opposite to Jason's irresponsibility was Dilsey's constant loyalty to the Compsons' and her job. She refused to let her children discuss the problems of the white family (p. 221). Dilsey was aware of the rottenness in the world and in the Compson family, but she did her best to help those around her. When Jason refused to let Caddy see Quentin, Dilsey arranged a meeting. When interrogated about the meeting Dilsey emphasized the difference between herself and Jason. "You's a cold man, Jason, if a man you is," she says. "I thank de Lawd I got mo heart dan dat, even ef hit is black" (p. 155).

Melvin Backman pointed out the contrasts in imagery created by Faulkner to emphasize the difference between Jason and Dilsey. These differences may be partly seen by noticing the light and dark images in the section describing Easter day. When Easter day dawned it was bleak and chill, but as Benjy and Dilsey left for church the sun was breaking through the rain clouds. Later, when Dilsey returned to the Compson's house she found the fire had gone out and Mrs. Compson was lying in the semi-darkness. Both literally and figuratively Dilsey brought light to the Compson house. Faulkner also contrasted Dilsey's actions and experience with Jason's. While Dilsey had been at church, Jason had been searching for his niece and the money she had taken. While Dilsey had been receiving the message of a saving Christ, Jason, in his rage, had been daring God to interfere with his pursuit

of Quentin. Jason exclaimed, "'See if You can stop me,' thinking of himself, his file of soldiers with the manacled sheriff in the rear, dragging Omnipotence down from His throne, if necessary; of the embattled legions of both hell and heaven through which he tore his way and put his hands at last on his fleeing niece" (pp. 226-227).

Jean Stein records that Faulkner liked Dilseyay because, as he said, "she is brave, courageous, generous, gentle and honest." It was Dilsey who stood up against Jason for Quentin. She even loaned money to Uncle Maury (p. 248). It was Dilsey who cared for Benjy after Caddy was gone. Michael Millgate said, "Her endurance is tested not in acts of spectacular heroism but in her submission to the tedious, trivial, ... and willfully inconsiderate demands made upon her by the Compson family."

So we see that three of the four main types of characters mentioned earlier are found in The Sound and the Fury. Some may consider Caddy to be the missing example—the person who chooses to walk away from an evil situation. Upon close examination, however, the reader will discover that Caddy does not fit the type well.

Caddy was very sensitive to hurt and evil, and she was always thoughtful of Benjy and Quentin. But she was driven away from home by extremely strong forces. Caddy left home because she felt that society demanded that she must marry because she was pregnant. When she was abandoned by her husband, she could not take care of her daughter because


she had no legitimate way to earn a living. Consequently she lost custody of her daughter to her mother, and Mrs. Compson refused to let her have the child. After a few years, when she got some money, Caddy offered Jason a thousand dollars to let her have the girl. Then Jason reminded her, "You'll get it [the money] the same way you got her. And when she gets big enough--" (p. 156). Jason's remarks hurt Caddy deeply, and when he told her she had nothing at stake, she lost all composure. Jason recorded her emotion: "'No,' she says, then she begun to laugh and to try to hold it back all at the same time. 'No. I have nothing at stake,' she says, making that noise, putting her hands to her mouth, 'Nuh-nuh-nothing,' she says. 'Here,' I says, 'stop that!' 'I'm trying to,' she says, holding her hands over her mouth. 'Oh, God, oh God!'" (p. 157).

Caddy, like Benjy, was unable to make the choice to combat evil. She was put into a position that was unalterable. Consequently, she does not fit well into any of the four types. For an example of the type of person who philosophically chooses to go off into a cave or climb a pillar rather than combat evil, we look to a later work--The Bear. Faulkner wrote The Bear in what Walter Brylowski called his "ethical period," and what Richard Adams called his "moral period." In this period, Faulkner began to make the question of responsibility a more obvious part of his work.

The Bear is a story of hunting, man's conquering and domination of the wilderness, and social inequality and prejudice. Backman believes that there were two main elements of disabuse in this story. Both the


Black man and the wilderness were oppressed. By enclosing this dual focus within the story, Faulkner spread the guilt beyond the South. He chose to merge the two crimes to "blur their moral distinction" (p. 172). Southern White men are accused of dominating the Negro, but all men help dominate the wilderness. In reality all mankind is responsible for combating such disabuses.

The plot of *The Bear* revolves around Issac McCaslin. Two major experiences had special bearing on Issac's life. First, while a child, Ike was taught how to survive in the forest by Sam Fathers, who was part Negro and part Indian. He learned to love Sam Fathers and he learned to hate the destructiveness of man. Then, when Ike was older, he discovered that his grandfather had committed incest with his slaves. Upon learning of this crime and his own family's part in the guilt of the White man against the Black man, Issac decided not to accept the responsibility of the land he had inherited from his grandfather.

Unlike Quentin, Ike did not choose complete rejection of life, but in repudiating his inheritance Ike had repudiated the responsibility of life. He was the type to go into seclusion—"go off into a cave." He tried to repudiate his duty to right the wrongs he was so very much aware existed—the vices of improvidence, intemperance, evasion, promiscuity, violence, hatred. In a debate with Carothers McCaslin Edmonds, he kept trying to tell Edmonds that he (Ike) could repudiate his inheritance because he knew the Negroes in his area (like Dilsey in *The Sound and the Fury*) would and could endure. He said, "They will outlast us because they are ... stronger than we are."12

Faulkner and Edmonds could not agree with Ike's repudiation. In his university lectures Faulkner said that man has got to work at prevailing. "That is the price of peace. He must always work at it vigilantly, never fail in vigilance to be ready to sacrifice" (p. 143). It isn't enough to outlast the enemy, whether it is social prejudice or environmental disaster. As Faulkner said in his Nobel Prize Address, it is not enough to be still talking in a "puny inexhaustible voice" after that "last ding dong of doom has clanged." There is not much hope involved in simply enduring! Adams said that endurance is not enough (p. 152). Man must live, and move, and do something positive. At Nagano Faulkner stated that man's hope is the capacity to believe in man, his hope, his aspiration toward a better human condition (p. 157). It was Ike McCaslin's job to stay and accept the responsibilities of his life. But instead he chose to say, "This is rotten. I can't do anything about it. I will go off in a cave . . . ."

For an example of a white male who accepted his responsibilities, it is necessary to look to yet another novel. Chick Mallison of *Intruder in the Dust* was a young teenager faced with responsibility he did not want. One winter day, while rabbit hunting with his friend Aleck, Chick fell into a creek. Lucus, an old Negro, had helped him and had given him dinner which Chick later realized "had been not just the best Lucus had to offer but all he had to offer." Then Chick made an embarrassing mistake, borne from his traditional upbringing. He tried

---


14William Faulkner, *Intruder in the Dust* (New York: Random House, 1948), p. 17. All succeeding references to this work are from this edition and will appear in the text by page number.
to pay for dinner. The money was rejected. Lucus could have easily considered this gesture to be an insult. However, he handled the situation well, but Chick already realized his own stupidity. "Through his shame the boy comes to question his own attitudes and the values of the society around him." 15

Part of Chick's distress came from Lucus' attitude. Lucus "by accepting both his white and black blood as a matter of course, established a personal identity, independent of race . . ." 16 He ignored the town's traditional ideas, but it could not ignore him. His attitude bothered the citizens because it did not fit into their organization of classes. They proclaimed, "We got to make him be a nigger first. He's got to admit he's a nigger. Then maybe we will accept him as he seems to intend to be accepted" (p. 18).

When Chick first felt indebted to Lucus he agreed with the townfolk. He blamed Lucus for befriending him and thereby making him indebted to a Negro. For four years he tried to repay Lucus, but with every "gift" he gave, Lucus returned another. When Lucus was arrested for murder, Chick first felt relieved of obligation towards him. "But it turns out that Lucus has not discharged him from the obligation to moral growth," states Gold (p. 84).

Lucus had been caught with a fired gun, standing by a murdered White man. Lucus called Chick's uncle, Gavin Stevens the lawyer to represent him. Stevens, in what Vickery believed to be a typical


Southern response, believed Lucus was guilty. Lucus told Chick that he was innocent (p. 139). Chick, realizing his obligation, asked what he could do to help.

With the help of Miss Habersham, an elderly lady from one of Jefferson's oldest families, and Aleck, Chick's Negro friend, Chick proved Lucus was innocent. Each of the three had good reasons not to get involved helping a Negro accused of killing a White man. Chick was a young White boy whose lawyer uncle believed Lucus was guilty. Aleck's race merely stayed out of the way in times like this. As Vickery points out, Miss Habersham helped in spite of "her blood, her class and her sex" (p. 140).

Yet these three unlikely "activists" discovered the truth--Lucus was innocent. When Chick revealed the actual circumstances to his uncle, Gavin was amazed and ashamed, "It took an old woman and two children . . . to believe truth for no other reason than that it was truth, told by an old man in a fix deserving pity and belief, to someone capable of the pity" (p. 126).

The difference between the reactions of Ike and Chick is an important as the difference between the evil and good of Jason and Dilsey. Brylowski contrasted Ike and Chick this way: "In Isaac McCaslin we had the young initiate whose knowledge of the 'mysteries' of his society led him to repudiation and divorcement from that society; in the story of Chick Mallison we have the story of a young boy who learns of his society but takes action within that society and does not repudiate it" (p. 168). Chick, like Dilsey, chose to accept responsibility and combat evil against great difficulty.
Faulkner often wove his main characters into many different books because he was attempting to characterize the city of Jefferson and the county of Yoknapatawpha. Consequently Chuck Mallison appeared in the Snopes' trilogy also. But Chuck's role was more secondary in these stories. He was more of an observer. In the trilogy the more major characters and examples of the types include Flem and Linda Snopes and V. K. Ratliff.

An excellent example of a man who participated wholly in evil and who lived only for his own profit is Flem Snopes. He is a perfect example of the fourth type of man—a man so devoid of good that he made no attempt at responsibility to others. The story of Flem covers three books—The Hamlet, The Town and The Mansion. In The Hamlet Flem had risen from the son of a poor farmer to the best businessman in the hamlet of Frenchman's Bend. The Town is the story of Flem's rise from behind the counter of a small restaurant in a larger town, Jefferson, to behind the president's desk of the largest bank in Jefferson. In The Mansion, while Flem had reached his peak of success, the means he had used to attain his success, festered into violence. The Mansion is the story of his murder.

Throughout Flem's life his strongest motivation was money. He loved nothing more. The only words in his vocabulary were supposedly "no" and "foreclose." He was constantly scheming. He married Eula Varner, pregnant with another man's child, for her dowry. Then he tricked his father-in-law into selling his land cheaply. He used his wife's lover, De Spain, to get him a job as power-plant superintendent.

16William Faulkner, The Mansion (New York: Random House, 1959), p. 17. All succeeding references to this work are from this edition and will appear in the text by abbreviated title and page number.
in Jefferson, then a job as vice-president and finally president of one of Jefferson's two banks. As power-plant superintendent he stripped the water tank of all the brass and planned to sell it on the side. He convinced his daughter to give him her inheritance from her grandfather so that she could go away to school.

But money was not Flem's only motivation. Eventually he realized what he wanted more than wealth. What Gavin Stevens always "missed" when analyzing Flem Snopes was his great need for respectability. Flem had come from a very disreputable family. Montgomery Snopes believed that "every Snopes will make it his private and personal aim to have the whole world recognize him as THE son of a bitch's son of a bitch" (Mansion, p. 87). Truly the members of the Snopes' family were varied but unusually wicked. Flem's father was a bitter man, who burned his landlords' property when he could not get along with them. Most of Flem's other relatives were criminals of some sort--bank robbers, horse stealers, bigamists, pornographers, or murderers. Stevens thought he knew the evil of the family, but at Flem's funeral Stevens understood it much more fully: "They're like wolves come to look at the trap where another bigger wolf, the boss wolf the head wolf, what Ratliff would call the bull wolf, died; if maybe there was not a shred or scrap of hide still snared in it" (Mansion, p. 421).

Consequently, because of Flem's very disreputable background, he constantly tried to buy respectability. When he first went to work in the Varner's store he patterned his shirts and ties after Varner's son's clothes. Later he had to have exactly the right type of furniture for a self-made bank vice-president. Still later when Flem became bank president, he bought the ex-president's mansion and enlarged its facade.
He even became a Baptist deacon. Flem was an expert at giving the proper appearances of a respectable citizen. Ratliff, an avid Snopes-watcher said:

When it's jest money and power a man wants, there is usually some place where he will stop; there's always one thing at least that ever--every man wont do for jest money. But when it's respectability he finds out he wants and has got to have, there aint nothing he wont do to get it and then keep it. And when it's almost too late when he finds out that's what he's got to have, and that even after he gets it he cant jest lock it up and set--sit down on top of it and quit, but instead he has got to keep on working with ever-every breath to keep it, there aint nothing he will stop at, aint nobody or nothing within his scope and reach that may not anguish and grieve and suffer. 17

Flem was responsible to one person, and that one person was Flem Snopes.

Flem would never have accepted the responsibilities love or friendship require. Gavin Stevens, a watchman over the Snopes of Jefferson said, "He had no friends. I mean, he knew he didn't have any friends because he had never (and never would) intended to have them, be cluttered with them, be constantly vulnerable or anyway liable to the creeping sentimental parasitic importunity which his observation had shown him friendship meant" (Town, p. 279). His selfishness would not allow him friends.

17 William Faulkner, The Town (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 259. All succeeding references to this work are from this edition and will appear in the text by abbreviated title and page number.
Ruthless and mean, Flem would let no one get in his way, not even a member of his own family. When Wallstreet, one of his relatives, became successful, Flem tried to buy into Wallstreet's business. Wallstreet refused the offer but later he needed to borrow money from Flem's bank. Even though Wallstreet's credit was good, the loan was refused (Town, pp. 146-147).

But Flem's most horrible evil showed in his relationship to his cousin Mink Snopes. Mink, under a great deal of pressure, murdered Jack Houston. At the time, Mink truly believed that Flem would help him "because of the ancient immutable laws of simple kinship" (Mansion, p. 5). But by the time he was sentenced to life in prison Mink realized that Flem had not helped because of their kinship. Flem did not want to remind people that he was related to a murderer (Mansion, p. 42).

Then later when Mink was scheduled for parole and ready to kill him, Flem worked out a protection plan. When Montgomery Ward Snopes was arrested for selling dirty pictures, Flem had whiskey planted in Montgomery's shop. Then Flem convinced the county attorney and sheriff to make the charges against Montgomery for selling moonshine. The variation in crime changed the location of Montgomery's imprisonment to Parchman, where Mink Snopes was located. Then Flem blackmailed Montgomery into convincing Mink to attempt escape so he would be killed or put away for another twenty years.

Flem, in his total selfishness, was much like Jason Compson. They were both the fourth type of person. Flem and Jason are even compared in The Mansion, where their mutual master is declared to be the Devil (Mansion, p. 326). Flem, like Jason, was not only unkind and irresponsible to acquaintances, he had no scruples in his relationship with his
family. If they threatened either his money or his respectability, he would do whatever he could to get rid of them. However, unlike _The Sound and the Fury_, where Dilsey was the only one who attempted to combat evil, in _The Mansion_, Faulkner supplied two examples of people who tried to fight the evil of the Snope's--Linda Snopes and V.K. Ratliff.

Though Linda Snopes had the family name, her real father was Hoake McCarron. Consequently she had what a true Snopes rarely had--care for people. Linda had always felt responsibility toward others. She wished her mother had had love and happiness (_Town_, p. 346). And she wanted to feel needed--responsible for something. Ratliff believed that the reason Linda tried to will her inheritance to Flem was because of this desire: "It was to be needed: not jist to be loved and wanted, but to be needed too; and maybe this was the first time in her life she ever had anything that anybody not jist wanted but needed too" (_Mansion_, p. 143).

So early in her life Linda had desired to help others. But she did not understand evil nor understand what to fight. Linda's turning point--her discovery of evil--came at her mother's suicide. In _The Town_ Faulkner describes her at the funeral with Flem as "setting there by him, tight and still and her back not even touching the back of the seat, in a kind of dark suit for travelling and a hat and a little veil and her hands in white gloves still and kind of clenched on her knees and not once not never once ever looking at that stone monument . . . ." (_Town_, p. 354). In _The Mansion_ Faulkner reemphasized Linda's tenseness shown by the "white gloves shut into fists on her lap" (_Mansion_, p. 149). Gavin Stevens explained how Eula's suicide had affected her: "Too much
has happened to her since. Too much, too fast, too quick. She outgrew colleges all in about twenty-four hours two weeks ago" (Town, p. 350).

Consequently, when Linda did recognize evil, she began to make very deliberate plans to fight it. She fought against Mussolini in Spain. She was adamant in her reactions to war against injustice and fascism. When others were lamenting a poet killed in war against Mussolini she asked, "What line or paragraph or even page can you compose and write to match giving your life to say 'No' to people like Hitler and Mussolini?" (Mansion, p. 218). Linda was determined to improve the education of the Negro children of Jefferson, in spite of the prejudice of Black and White people. She began by suggesting the exchange of White and Black teachers in segregated schools. She became so insistent "the board of supervisors didn't dare unlock their door while they were in session even to go home at noon to eat . . . . Until suddenly you were thinking how suppose she were docile and amenable . . . ." (Mansion, p. 227). When the supervisors would not help, she did not give up hope. Instead she began personally to help in a Negro Sunday school.

During the Second World War Linda went to work in a factory, building tanks for Russia. Then after the war, when she returned to Jefferson she found social injustice waining and Negroes with better schools than in the White community. Ratliff said, "She has done run out of injustice . . . . So she will have to think of something, even if she has to invent it" (Mansion, p. 361).

Linda thought of something. She knew that Mink Snopes had a grudge against Flem. So Linda arranged for Mink to get out of prison two years early so that he could come back to Jefferson early and rid the community
of the epitomy of evil--Flem Snopes. Helping to get Mink out of prison allowed her to have an active part in the murder of her father.

Such an action makes Linda's true character difficult to evaluate. How could she have fought so hard against evil and then arrange for a killing? Gavin Stevens was terrified at the idea. He had felt very close to her before he found out she had planned her father's murder. Then he felt used and disillusioned, not only with Linda, but with all women. First he called himself an accessory before a murder, later he called himself a murderer because he had helped her with the pardon (Mansion, p. 427).

Stevens tried to convince himself "There aren't any morals (Mansion, p. 429). But Ratliff explained to Stevens that, "She could a waited two more years . . . and saved herself not jest the bother and worry but the moral responsibility too, even if you do say they aint no morals" (Mansion, p. 429). The only excuse Ratliff attempted to make for Linda's actions was that she might have felt a need to revenge her mother's loveless marriage and forthcoming suicide. Linda may have felt that her mother asked her, "Didn't you never have no love of your own to learn you what it is" (Mansion, p. 431).

And therein may have been Linda's weakness. Flem Snopes didn't love her; her mother was occupied with her affair with De Spain; Gavin Stevens refused to marry her. Readers usually assume she loved her husband. We are never given any other hint until just before Ratliff's attempt to excuse her. Then, when Linda and Gavin are alone in the house she insisted, "I have never loved anybody but you" (Mansion, p. 425). If she was being truthful, then her one love affair was neither reciprocal nor full.
Apparently Stevens never understood her. He was so shaken by her plan of murder that his view of her changed rapidly. On the day of the funeral, when he learned what she had done, he thought of her eyes, "They were not secret: intent enough yes, but not secret; someday perhaps he would remember that they had never been really tender even" (Mansion, p. 424). Ratliff had pity for Gavin. First he said, "I decided some time back that maybe the only thing that would make you safe to have around would be for somebody to marry you. That never worked but at least you're all right now. As you jest said, You finally committed a murder. What else is there beyond that for anybody to think up for you to do (Mansion, p. 427). Later Ratliff added, "I don't know if she's already got a daughter stashed out somewhere . . . . But when she does I jest hope for Old Lang Zyne's sake she dont never bring it back to Jefferson. You done already been through two Eula Varners and I dont think you can stand another one" (Mansion, p. 434).

So, in Linda Faulkner had created an example of the third type of individual. She saw evil and attempted to get rid of it. However, in Linda Faulkner also created a subtle variation in that type. She fought evil, but the "how" of her method bothered the morality of several people. Whether Faulkner created the character differences in Linda and Ratliff for comparison and contrast may be debated, but Ratliff does fit the type without the need for violence or the ability to fight evil with evil.

Ratliff was very observant and intelligent. Stevens said, "Between the voice and the face there were always two Ratliffs: the second one offering you a fair and open chance to divine what the first one really meant by what it was saying, provided you were smart enough" (Town, p. 150). But even Ratliff was not always able to see just how evil the Snopes's
really were. At one time even Ratliff was tricked into paying Flem more for some property than it was worth. But after that experience Ratliff was more careful. He kept a close watch over the Snopes family, as well as Flem, because he was alarmed at the evil inherent in them. Consequently he was able to see Flem's strong desire for respectability long before anyone else. He knew the whole town needed to fear Flem because he would do anything for money or respectability. V. K. Ratliff was the first to guess Flem's reasons for sending Montgomery to Parchman and Linda's reasons for getting Mink out early.

Ratliff and Stevens tried to watch over the Snopes family together, but they had different opinions on what their responsibility to the community involved. Stevens just wanted to watch, resist and endure the Snopeses. Ratliff believed they had to "get completely shut of them, abolish them" (Town, p. 102). Likewise Ratliff did not approve of Stevens' decision not to marry Linda, because such a decision was really a rejection of responsibility. Ratliff described Stevens' situation, "So he was free. He had not only got shut of his sireen, he had even got shut of the ward he found out she had heired to him." He continued, "So he was free. And in fact, when you had time to look around a little, he never had nothing no more to do but jest rest in peace and quiet and contentment" (Mansion, p. 151). Stevens believed all other people were a mirror of his own desire not to get too involved. But the middle-aged Ratliff proved him wrong.

Ratliff and Linda were both able to get rid of a Snopes, but in Ratliff's action Faulkner supplied us with a direct contrast to Linda's action. A very strong and evil Snopes, Clarence, decided to run for Congress. Clarence was described as a man who had "used the Ku Klux
Klan while he needed it and then used their innocence to wreck the Klan when he no longer did, who was using the Baptist Church as long as he believed it would serve him; who had used W. P. A. and N. R. A. and A. A. A. and C. C. C. and all the other agencies created in the dream or hope that people should not suffer" (Mansion, p. 306). So Clarence was capable of extreme harm to the community, state and national government if he won the election.

And Stevens was sure Clarence would win the election. He believed that since most of the young men were gone to war, no one left was capable of stopping the man. Stevens told Ratliff, "But it's too late for us now ... Call it just tired, too tired to be afraid any longer of losing. Just to hate evil is not enough. You--somebody--has got to do something about it. Only now it will have to be somebody else ... ." Ratliff would only say, "Maybe" (Mansion, p. 307).

Then, in what Stevens described as an unbelievably simple plan, Ratliff got rid of Clarence (Mansion, p. 318). Just before Clarence was scheduled to speak at a large public picnic, Ratliff worked out a plan with a couple of boys and some proper smelling sticks rubbed across Clarence's pants to convince all the area's dogs to piss on Clarence's pants while he stood ready to speak. Ratliff knew Uncle Billy Varner, political boss of the area, well enough to realize that he would not allow any man to represent Frenchman's Bend that any "dog that happens by cant tell from a fence post" (Mansion, p. 319).

At first reading this story can appear to be nothing more than a humorous anecdote, until we realize that Ratliff had gotten rid of a very real evil in a very simple way, an unevil way. In the voice of the narrator Faulkner explains, "Not that Ratliff shot him or anything like
that: he just simply eliminated Clarence as a factor in what Charles's Uncle Gavin also called their constant Snopes-fear and-dread, or you might say Snopes-dodging" (Mansion, p. 295). The story presents a great contrast between the methods to combat evil. The difference between Ratliff's humorously simple plan and Linda's murder plot can not be ignored. Linda had fought evil with strong evil. Ratliff had fought evil with harmless intelligence. The comparisons between types and the contrasts of the methods of Linda and Ratliff are further examples of Faulkner's intent and method of revealing truth.

While some have questioned Faulkner's ability to teach how to endure and prevail because of the negative characteristics of his characters, many may also disagree. In this study we have seen at least four classes of people and the ways they chose to face responsibility. In evaluating Faulkner's characters we see that he created some subtle and some striking differences in them. While it is true that Faulkner's technique of emphasizing evil often left his works with an abundance of evil characters, yet in the works discussed Faulkner was able to point out the evils that overcome man as well as the alternate choices to those evils. In choosing to deal with evil, Faulkner created characters of various types. In doing this he gave his readers every chance to observe the complexity of life and the decisions possible in regards to responsibility to others.
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Abstracts

THE WOMEN OF BEN JONSON IN EPICOENE AND BARTHOLOMEW FAIR. This paper compares and contrasts the method variations that cause the women of Epicoene to be less interesting and more stereotyped than those of Bartholomew Fair.

Basically, in the women of Epicoene, Jonson used character types exclusively. The women were all "masculine," and remained that type throughout the play. In Bartholomew Fair Jonson created versatility in the characters by including more information on the women through rhetorical "places," particularly the consilium or reason behind their actions. The multiplied places in the women in Bartholomew Fair, the changes in the community women while they were at the fair, plus the looser roles as evidenced in the types of women, created more diversity in characters.

HAWTHORNE'S FAIR MAIDENS. It is the object of this paper to reveal many of the seemingly ideal qualities the maidens share with Sophia Hawthorne, Nathaniel's much beloved wife, and then to use the characters of the major fair maidens--Phoebe, Priscilla and Hilda--to show how Hawthorne both individualized and humanized these maidens to bring them out of the realm of the stereotyped ideal into the world of humanity.

Some of the characteristics the girls share are looks, sunniness, housewifeliness, birdlikeness, optimistic and naive philosophies, and the redemptive power of love.
Hawthorne individualizes the maidens by varying their reactions to the responsibilities to love. Phoebe has an overwhelming love, able to bring joy and relief to overburdened hearts. Her only weakness in the story is her temporary loss of control to mesmerism. On the other hand, Priscilla's love is very weak. She helps no one. Hilda changes during her tale, from a girl too pure to help a friend to a wife able to bring back her husband to the "reality of life."

RESPONSIBILITY AND CHARACTER IN FAULKNER'S FICTION. This paper classifies and evaluates several of Faulkner's main characters according to four specific types. "The first says, 'This is rotten, I'll have no part of it.' The second says, 'This is rotten, I don't like it, I can't do anything about it, but at least I will not participate in it myself, I will go off into a cave . . . .' The third says, 'This stinks and I'm going to do something about it, I'm going to change it.'" The fourth type is so devoid of good that he can't even see beyond his own situation to acknowledge evil, or responsibility.

The examples examined are: Quentin, Dilsey, and Jason in The Sound and the Fury; Ike in The Bear, Chuck in Intruder in the Dust; and Flem, Linda, and Ratliff in the Snopes trilogy.

While it is true that Faulkner's technique of emphasizing evil often left his works with an abundance of evil characters, yet in the works discussed, Faulkner was able to point out the evils that overcome man as well as the alternate choices to those evils.