Studies in English

Volume 11

Article 11

1971

Vol. 11 (1970): Full issue

Journal Editors

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ms_studies_eng

Part of the American Literature Commons, and the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation

Editors, Journal (1971) "Vol. 11 (1970): Full issue," *Studies in English*: Vol. 11 , Article 11.
Available at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ms_studies_eng/vol11/iss1/11

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Studies in English at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Studies in English by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Studies in English

1848

The University of Mississippi Department of English

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

1848

Volume Eleven

University, Mississippi

1971

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

EDITOR

John Pilkington

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

John D. Crews

ADVISORY BOARD

James E. Savage James W. Webb

The University of Mississippi Studies in English is published annually by the Department of English of the University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi. The subscription price for each volume is two dollars.

CONTENTS

"The Death of Anointed Kings" 1
Charles Dale Cannon

The Formal Choruses in the Comedies of Ben Jonson 11
James E. Savage

A Study of Lower Class and Middle Class Students'
Sentence Conjoining and Embedding 23
Gerald W. Walton

Mythical Elements of "Pantaloon in Black" 45
Rosemary Stephens

The Case of the Supposititious Prince 53
Mary Ann Connell

Rudyard Kipling in France: French Imperialist
Authors and Literature 69
James J. Cooke

The Year of Jesus's Birth 83
Allen Cabaniss

Author-Title Index to Studies in English
Volumes I-X, 1960-1969 91
Obion W. Feagin

"THE DEATH OF ANOINTED KINGS"

by Charles Dale Cannon

The purpose of this paper is to treat the death of two kings—Richard II and Saul—and the relationships of their successors—Henry IV and David—with the men responsible for the deaths of their predecessors. Killing a king or even participating in his death at the request of the king was considered a crime of such enormity because the "cease of majesty" by violence was an unspeakable affront to law and religion.

The importance of being a king inheres in the fact that a king assumes a position of leadership which may take many forms. His leadership may well be both spiritual and temporal.[1] In the temporal realm he may be the chief judge, military leader, and the first magistrate of the realm. In the spiritual realm he may be a god.[2] Though some kings are gods, not all are. If not a god, he may be a prophet or a priest, even if not the archpriest. Moreover, even when the ruler either in primitive or in modern times, has not combined religious duties with political office, "the credulous public have often treated him as a priest or a god."[3] A king may be said to rule by divine right without making a claim to personal divinity though divinity may be said to "hedge" him. A king may be styled "defender of the faith," "supreme head," or (for a queen) "supreme governor" of an established church.

At any rate, people of all sorts and conditions in all ages have attested to the fact that there is something extraordinary about a king. Whether he be conceived as saint, shaman, magician,[4] general, judge, or "God's deputy," he has been set apart from other men.

---

[1] See A. S. Tritton, "King (Semitic)," in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* where Saul is referred to as "judge, general, and priest," VII, 725.

[2] A. E. Crawley in *Relgion and Ethics* comments on the concept of "divine king or human god" and finds two "psychological tendencies . . . in these elemental ideas about the divine king or human god: a veneration for authority and a belief in magic," VII, 709.

[3] *Ibid.*

Within the Judaeo-Christian tradition one feature of setting apart a king has been the anointing.[5] The anointing of a king which consecrates him to his task seems to derive from the priest-like aspect of his office and the fact that Hebrew kings were anointed.[6] Once a king had been anointed, set apart, and consecrated, there were those who held it sacrilege to lift a hand against the "Lord's anointed," whatever the provocation. Even to consider rebelling against an anointed king was an unspeakable effrontery in the light of the fact that the heavenly bodies as well as all ranks in the Chain of Being observed proper rank, degree, and priority in keeping with a divine plan and order.[7]

To be a spiritual leader, to rule by divine right even though not personally claiming divinity, gave a king another claim for obedience, for rebelling against God's deputy would be sacrilege as well as treason. Though Lily Bess Campbell points out that the king was responsible to the "King of Kings," she adds that this "part of the theory of divine right [was] less popular with reigning monarchs" than the part which insisted on the obedience which a subject owed his sovereign.[8] The sovereign was understandably more likely to emphasize the fact that he was answerable to no one on earth than that he was responsible to anyone else—even to God.

---

[4] Crawley writes that J. G. Frazer "has established by a long array of facts the theory that among primitive peoples it was the medicine man, the shaman, or public magician who laid the foundations, at least in part, of the kingly office"; "Beginning," according to Frazer, "as little more than a simple conjurer, the medicine man or magician tends to blossom out into a full-blown god and king in one," *ibid.*

[5] Morris Jastrow in "Anointing (Semitic)" in *Religion and Ethics* said the act of anointing among the Hebrew people was "meant actually to symbolize the sanctity bound up with such objects and persons and was to be understood as the investiture with such sanctity," I, 556.

[6] A. S. Tritton, for example, does not believe there is a separate line of development for the anointing of a king and the anointing of a priest, *Religion and Ethics,* VII, 726; Morris Jastrow, noting the explicit references in the scriptures to the anointing of Saul, David, Solomon, Joash, and Jehoahaz, concludes that "the rite was a general one from the beginning of Kingship among the Hebrews," *Religion and Ethics,* I, 556.

[7] A. O. Lovejoy in *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936) gives the fullest exposition of the concept of the great chain of being; see also Hardin Craig, *The Enchanted Glass* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936) and E.M.W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944); Ulysses in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (I, iii, 75ff.) speaks at some length on rank, order and degree, observing at one point that discord is a consequence of failing to observe proper rank and degree: "Take but degree away, untune that string,/ And, hark, what discord follows!"

According to the received political doctrine subjects might "under no circumstances rebel against the ruler, for he represents God, and to resist him is to resist God. If God is pleased, he will send a good ruler; if he wishes to try or to punish the people, he may give them a tyrant for a king."[9] Figgis lists the doctrine of passive obedience as one of the fundamental principles of the theory of the divine right of kings: *"Non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined of God.* Under any circumstance resistance to a king is a sin and ensures damnation."[10]

Alfred Hart notes the fact that Shakespeare would have been "in his tenth year when the new homily on *"Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* was read for the first time in Holy Trinity Church." He notes, moreover, that the contents of the sermon "were calculated to impress the memory and mind of an imaginative boy. To forget it or its solemn teachings would be impossible. . . ."[11]

As it appears in the *Second Tome of Homilies* (1577), the "Homilie agaynst disobedience and wylful rebellion" points out that obedience is due that sovereign, whether he is a good one or an evil one. David's exemplary behavior towards King Saul in the face of extreme provocation from King Saul is cited as an instance of a more-than-ordinary subject's correct behavior at the hands of a king who sought his death:

> Kyng Saul . . . rewarded hym [David] not onely with great vnkyndnesse, but also sought his destruction and death by all meanes possible: so that David was faine to save his life, not by rebellion, nor any resistaunce, but by flight and hyding him selfe from the kings sight. Which

---

[8] Lily Bess Campbell (ed.), *The Mirror for Magistrates* (New York: Barnes and Nobles, 1960), p. 53.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] John N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 6.

[11] Alfred Hart, *Shakespeare and the Homilies* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1934), p. 23.

> notwithstanding, when king Saul vpon a time came alone into the caue where David was so yt David myght easyly haue slayne hym, yet would he neyther hurt him, himselfe, neyther suffer any of his men to lay handes vppon hym.[12]

Anointed majesty is conceived of as a closer relationship with God than people may have if they are not kings and have not been anointed. If the divinity that hedges a king does not spare his life, the taking of a king's life is an especially odious deed. Even when a king's death is desired by his successor, the person who kills the king can expect scant thanks if any for killing a king.

When Exton in *Richard II* decided to act on the wish of Bolingbroke and rid Bolingbroke of the "living fear," the deposed Richard II, Exton may not have expected to be made "earl or duke" as Falstaff hoped when he falsely represented himself as killing Hotspur. It is highly likely, however, that he expected some reward and was no more prepared for the kind of reward he received from Bolingbroke, now Henry IV, than Falstaff was when he was curtly rejected by Hal when he was Henry V.

As a good soldier may be enjoined to interpret the wish or desire of his commanding officer as an order, so Exton interpreted the wish of the new king. When Exton repeated to a servant the words of the king—"Have I no friend will rid me of this living fear?"—the servant responded "These were his very words." Both Exton and the servant agreed that the king looked at Exton in a wistful manner as if to say "I would thou wert the man/That would divorce this terror from my heart." At this point Exton affirms that he is the king's friend and "will rid his foe."

Killing Richard II, the "skipping king," was more difficult, however, than may have been anticipated. Richard may justly have been considered a man of thought rather than of action, a man who could use the rhetoric of majesty without being possessed of the virtue to stand to the rhetoric ("We were not born to sue but to command"), but in the final moments of his life Richard acquitted himself more like an Anglo-Saxon king proud of tracing his ancestry directly from the bellicose Woden rather than like a man who was but a scholar of kingship, not a warrior-king in his own right. Moreover, Richard's language showed his resolution. Having killed one man, he said to Exton "Go thou and fill another room in Hell." Mortally wounded by Exton, Richard tells him "That hand shall burn in never-quenching fire that staggers thus my person."

---

[12] *The Second Tome of Homilies* (1577), *STC 3671.*

Richard departed this life like a man, and it was after Richard had killed two men, disarming one man and killing him with his own weapon, that Exton struck Richard down. Having done so, Exton felt no exultation but was remorseful, saying Richard was

> As full of valor as of royal blood.
> Both have I spilled—oh would the deed were good!
> For now the Devil, that told me I did well,
> Says that this deed is chronicled in Hell.[13]
>
> (V.v. 114-117)

Later Exton went into Henry IV's presence bearing Richard's coffin and said:

> Great King, within this coffin I present
> Thy buried fear. Herein all breathless lies
> Richard of Bordeaux, by me hither brought.
>
> (V.vi. 30-33)

Instead, however, of receiving thanks from the king, Exton heard the king say:

> They love not poison that do poison need
> Nor do I thee. Though I did wish him dead,
> I hate the murderer, love him murdered.
>
> (V.vi. 38-40)

Moreover the king told Exton "I thank thee not, for thou hast wrought/A deed of slander with thy fatal hand. . . . " When Exton sought to justify himself, urging that "From your own mouth, my lord, did I this deed," Henry bluntly said "Though I did wish him dead,/I hate the murderer. . . . "

Instead, then, of having the royal favor for the deed Exton had, according to the king, "the guilt of conscience," not "my good word nor princely favor." Henry bade Exton "with Cain go wander through shades of night,/And never show thy head by day or night." As for himself, Henry protested that his soul was "full of woe" and said that he planned to "make a voyage to the Holy Land" to expiate the crime.

---

[13] Citation here and elsewhere to the text of Shakespeare is to G. B. Harrison's *Shakespeare: Major Plays and the Sonnets* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1948).

There is a sense in which the relationship of Bolingbroke and Richard is analogous to that of David and Saul as set forth in the Old Testament in the Book of Samuel. Though Henry does not explicitly invoke the concept of the divine right of kings and does not mention the fact that killing an anointed king is a greater crime than killing anyone else, the play *Richard II* and King Richard himself have been explicit about anointed majesty. "The breath of worldly men cannot depose the deputy elected by the lord," asserted Richard, in the play which Dover Wilson has styled "that gorgeous dramatic essay on the divine right of kings."[14] Though some theorists of the concept of the divine right of kings have questioned the necessity, permanence, and efficacy of the anointing, King Richard did not: "Not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm off from an anointed king." When, therefore, he told Exton, who had mortally wounded him, "That hand shall burn in never-quenching fire which staggers thus my person," he may well have had in mind the extra burden of guilt that afflicts a regicide.

When Henry said, "They love not poison that do poison need," when he desires the death but does not commend the murderer, he is in a situation similar to that of David and Saul as found in the Book of Samuel.

When David once had an opportunity to kill Saul, he did not do so even though "men of David" urged him on against Saul. The men who urged David to kill Saul considered the opportunity provided by circumstances to be a fulfillment of prophecy, for God had said "Beholde, I wil deliuer thine enemie into thine hand, and thou shalt do to him as it shal seme good to thee"[15] (I Samuel 24:5).

David did not kill Saul but "arose and cut of the lappe of Sauls garment priuely." Feeling remorseful later, however, even for having done this, he said

---

[14] John Dover Wilson (ed.), *King Richard II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), xiv.

[15] Citation here and elsewhere to the Book of Samuel is to the Geneva Bible, *STC* 2093.

> The Lord kepe me from doing that thing vnto my master the Lords Anointed, to lay mine hand vpon him: for he is the Anointed of the Lord.
>
> (I Samuel 24:7)

David's resolution not to lay a hand on the Lord's anointed was confirmed later when a man of the Amalekites came to David from the camp of Saul with word that Saul was dead. When David asked about the death of Saul, the man told how he had come upon Saul who was found leaning on a spear. Saul bade the man "I pray thee, come vpon me, and sloye me: for anguish is come vpon me, because my life is yet whole in me." Complying with the king's request, the man said:

> I came vpon him, and slewe him, & because I was sure that he colde not live after that he had fallen, I toke the crowne that was vpon his head, and the bracelet that was on his arme, and broght the hither vnto my lord.
>
> (II Samuel I:9-10)

At this point the Amalekite must have been as hopeful as Exton was when he brought the coffin containing the dead King Richard into the presence of Henry. Instead of thanking the Amalekite, David questioned him: "How wast thou not afraied, to put forthe thine hand to destroy the Anoynted of the Lord?" (II Samuel 1:14)

> Instead of rewarding him, David, having questioned him, forthwith called one of his yong me, & said, Go nere, and fall vpo him. And he smote him that he dyed. The said David vnto him, Thy blood be vpon thine owne head., for thine owne mouth hathe testified against thee, saying, I haue slaine the Lords Anointed.
>
> Then Dauid mourned with this lamentation ouer Saul, and ouer Ionathan his sonne. . . .
>
> (II Samuel 1:15-17).

A comparison of the death of the two kings reveals both parallels and discrepancies. First both men were kings and (in terms of this study) anointed majesty. In both instances a successor was not only readily available but eager to assume the kingship. In Richard's case Bolingbroke was already King Henry IV, but the deposed King Richard II was yet alive constituting the "living fear" which disturbed King Henry IV. In both instances the successor (whether successor in fact or successor-presumptive) had reason to wish the death of the king. Henry IV uttered his wish and Exton acted on it. David clipped a piece from Saul's robe, at least a symbolic act of hostility, notwithstanding the fact that he later repented of the act.

In both instances there is expressed or implied the idea that killing a king or participating in the death of anointed majesty was a heinous act deserving no thanks but occasioning remorse and mourning. In both instances the man who was the efficient cause of the death expected a reward from the dead king's successor. In *Richard II,* Exton, accompanying the coffin of Richard II, told Henry he presented to him "thy buried fear," that "Herein all breathless lies/ The mightiest of thy enemies. . . . " In Samuel, the Amalekite came into the presence of David and explained the circumstances of Saul's death, his assistance in the death of the dying Saul. Moreover, the Amalekite told how he took "the crown . . . and the bracelet" from the dead king "and brought them hither to my lord." Having every reason to expect a reward, the man nevertheless went unrewarded. Instead of breaking into thanksgiving at the news David "toke holde on his clothes, & rent them, and likewise all the men that were with him. And they mourned and wept, and fasted vntil euen, for Saul . . ." (II Samuel 1:11-12).

In both instances the efficient cause of the death not only went unrewarded but was punished—Exton with scorn and banishment, and the Amalekite by death at the bidding of the man from whom he had reason to expect thanks and a reward, not a sentence of death. Finally, in both instances there was lamentation by the successor-king. Killing a king was a deed of such impiousness that though Henry and David may have desired the consequences of the death of Richard and Saul, they could neither reward the efficient causes nor openly rejoice over the death of their predecessor. The future King David "mourned with this lametation ouer Saul. . . . " Henry IV, protesting that "my soul is full of woe" enjoined others to "Come mourn with me for that I do lament,/ And put on sullen black incontinent" (V. vi. 47-48).

Making clear his own personal burden of guilt he said:

> I'll make a voyage to the Holy Land
> To wash this blood off from my guilty hand.

March sadly after, grace my mournings here
In weeping after this untimely bier.

(V. vi. 49-52)

THE FORMAL CHORUSES IN THE COMEDIES OF BEN JONSON

by James E. Savage

Though the cast of characters through which Ben Jonson achieves his massive satirical commentary is large, it divides itself in reality into a few recurring types. Frequently a single figure, larger than life, makes for the author comic assessments and assigns comic fates, whether reformation or cutting-off is proposed. Such figures, looking remarkably like Jonson himself, are Horace of *The Poetaster* and Peniboy Cantor of *The Staple of News.*[1] On other occasions, wits, of the Wellbred or Truewit type, wind up the victims to the revelation of their follies, and give the comic *coup de grace.* A third group, whom Satan of *The Devil is An Ass* designates as members "of our tribe of brokers," provides the bait at which the greedy nibble, whether they be hypocrites or fools. Such are Merecrafte, of *The Devil is An Ass,* and Volpone.

But the therapeutic attentions of all these members of Jonson's comic gallery are focused on his characters of the humorous type—those possessed by greed or hypocrisy, being perhaps utterly foolish at the same time. Their humours are not the object of Jonson's attack, but merely a technique of differentiating them one from another.

These people, wise or foolish, greedy or hypocritical, exemplars of manners or corrupters of manners, are all on Jonson's stage. But they are also in his audience. This he implies frequently in his introductory matter. The point is made much more bitingly, however, in those plays into which he introduces a formal choric group, composed of persons outside the action of the play itself. Such a group may have other functions, also, such as helping the "auditory" through the mazes of the action, or justifying the author's comic procedures. There are three such groups in the comedies, the "Grex" (Mitis and Cordatus) of *Every Man Out of His Humour,* the "Intermeane" (the Gossips, Mirth, Tatle, Expectation, and Censure) of *The Staple of*

---

[1] See my article, "Ben Jonson in Ben Jonson's Plays," *Studies in English,* University of Mississippi, III, (1962), 1-17.

News, and the "Chorus" (Mr. Probee, Mr. Damplay, and A Boy) of *The Magnetic Lady.*

These groups are not in the strict sense "characters," for they are not concerned in the sequence of events. But, as part of the comic apparatus by which Jonson achieves his effects they should be examined, all the more because in many instances they themselves are impaled among Jonson's more prominent victims.

Our friends of the "Grex" of *Every Man Out of His Humour,* though they take no part in moving the members of the *Dramatis Personae* toward their comic fates, are obviously part of the "play." For the artistic entity which is a "play" is composite: a poem, spoken by actors, on a stage, before an audience. Even costume and gesture are a part of the "play." The ultimate effect of a Jonson play on an audience will be, perhaps, scorn—for one cannot countenance a Bobadil; and complacency—for one is not, of course, a Bartholomew Cokes; and self-recognition—for there may be in all of us a little of Fastidius Briske. To help the audience in arriving at the proper comic assessment of action, of motive, of character, and ultimately of itself, a "Grex" is a valuable tool in the hand of the author.

The "Grex" of *Every Man Out of His Humour* is a replica of the audience viewing the play, not in all the manifold humours of the Fungosos and the Deliros, but in the simple category of wise and learned, in contrast with ignorant and foolish. In the final words of the "Grex," Cordatus makes the identification, even though he perhaps flatters the auditory a bit:

> Here are those (round about you)
> of more abilitie in censure than wee, whose iudgements
> can giue it a more satisfying allowance; wee'le refer you to them. (V, xi, 71-74)[2]

In the introductory matter in the printed texts, not a part of the "play," Jonson gives these formal characters for Cordatus and Mitis:

> CORDATVS.
> *THe Authors friend; A man inly acquainted with the scope and drift of his Plot: Of a discreet, and vnderstanding iudgement; and has the place of a Moderator.*

---

[2] The source of all quotation is *Ben Jonson,* Herford and Simpson (11 vols., Oxford, 1925-1952).

MITIS.

IS a person of no action, and therefore we haue reason to affoord him no Character.

One questions, of course, whether Jonson would find many of his auditory to have "a discreet and vnderstanding iudgement." The fiction, though, that there is in the audience a Cordatus to correct the misapprehensions and enlighten the ignorance of a Mitis gives the poet an opportunity to achieve many effects, not only intellectual, but also mechanical.

These functions, in perhaps the ascending order of their importance, require brief examinations. At perhaps the lowest level Cordatus and Mitis provide stage directions: "Behold, the translated gallant"—Fungoso has entered wearing a new suit. Or, they announce the entry of Sir Puntarvolo, "stay, here comes the knight adventurer. I, and his scrivener with him." In a slightly different function, they are of immense help, at least to the reader of *Every Man Out of His Humour,* for they announce changes of scene: "the *Scene* is the country still, remember"; "we must desire you to do presuppose the stage, the middle isle in *Paules";* "O, this is to be imagined the *Counter,* belike?"

Cordatus and Mitis have the responsibility, on a somewhat higher level, of adumbrating character. Though Jonson had, in the introductory material, given a thumb-nail "character" of each of his actors, those descriptions were only for the reader, not for the auditory. It is therefore a help to the play-goer to have Cordatus describe Buffone:

> He is one, the Author calls him CARLO BVFFONE, an impudent common iester, a violent rayler, and an incomprehensible *Epicure;* one, whose company is desir'd of all men, but belou'd of none; hee will sooner lose his soule then a iest, and prophane euen the most holy things, to excite laughter: no honorable or reuerend personage whatsoeuer, can come within the reach of his eye, but is turn'd into all manner of varietie, by his adult'rate *simile's.*
>
> (Prologue, 356-364)

On the appearance of Clove and Orange—"mere strangers to the whole scope of our play"—Cordatus pinpoints both for the audience in what is almost a formal "character":

> I, and they are well met, for 'tis as drie an ORANGE as euer grew: nothing, but *Salutation;* and, *O god, sir;* and, *It pleases you to say so, Sir;* one that can laugh at a iest for company with a most plausible, and extemporall grace; and some houre after, in priuate, aske you what it was: the other, monsieur CLOVE, is a more spic't youth: he will sit you a whole afternoone sometimes, in a bookesellers shop, reading the *Greeke, Italian,* and *Spanish;* when he vnderstands not a word of either: if he had the tongues, to his sutes, he were an excellent linguist.
>
> (III, i, 23-33)

Much more important, however, to both reader and auditory is Cordatus' explication of Macilente's humour of envy:

> COR. . . . Why, you mistake his Humour vtterly then.
>
> MIT. How? doe I mistake it? is't not enuie?
>
> COR. Yes, but you must vnderstand, Signior, he enuies him not as he is a villaine, a wolfe i' the common-wealth, but as he is rich, and fortunate; for the true condition of enuie is, *Dolor alienae Faelicitatis,* to haue our eyes continually fixt vpon another mans prosperitie, that is, his chiefe happinesse, and to grieue at that. Whereas, if we make his monstrous, and abhord actions our object, the griefe (we take then) comes neerer the nature of hate, then enuie, as being bred out of a kinde of contempt and lothing, in our selues.
>
> (I, iii, 159-171)

Mitis, as the uninformed half of the Grex, and of the audience, has an occasional cavil which must be corrected. Scene three of Act II has been of unusual length, but the objection of Mitis is neatly spiked in this passage:

> MIT. Me thinkes, CORDATVS, he dwelt somewhat too long on this Scene; it hung i' the hand.
>
> COR. I see not where he could haue insisted lesse, and t'haue made the humours perspicuous enough.
>
> MIT. True, as his subiect lies; but hee might haue

> altered the shape of his argument, and explicated 'hem better in single *Scenes*.
>
> COR. That had been single indeed: why? be they not the same persons in this, as they would haue beene in those? and is it not an obiect of more state, to behold the *Scene* full, and relieu'd with varietie of speakers to the end, then to see a vast emptie stage, and the actors come in (one by one) as if they were dropt downe with a feather, into the eye of the spectators?
>
> (II, iii, 288-301)

Two other cavils of Mitis are put to even more effective use in the educating of the auditory. After the end of Act II, says Mitis, "Well, I doubt, this last *Scene* will endure some grieuous torture." Cordatus must again put him right. In the process he enunciates the essential theory of satire and offers the standard disclaimer of any personal portraiture:

> COR. No, in good faith: vnlesse mine eyes could light mee beyond sense. I see no reason, why this should be more liable to the racke, then the rest: you'le say, perhaps, the city will not take it well, that the merchant is made here to dote so perfectly vpon his wife; and shee againe, to bee so *Fastidiously* affected, as shee is?
>
> MIT. You haue vtter'd my thought, sir, indeed.
>
> COR. Why (by that proportion) the court might as wel take offense at him we call the courtier, and with much more pretext, by how much the place transcends, and goes before in dignitie and vertue: but can you imagine that any noble, or true spirit in court (whose sinowie, and altogether vn-affected graces, very worthily expresse him a courtier) will make any exception at the opening of such an emptie trunke, as this BRISKE is! or thinke his owne worth empeacht, by beholding his motley inside?
>
> MIT. No sir, I doe not.
>
> COR. No more, assure you, will any graue, wise citizen, or modest matron, take the obiect of this folly in DELIRO, and his wife: but rather apply it as the foile to their owne vertues. For that were to affirme, that a man, writing of NERO, should meane all Emperors: or speaking of MACHIAVEL, comprehend all States-men; or in our

> SORDIDO, all Farmars; and so of the rest: then which, nothing can be vtter'd more malicious, or absurd. Indeed, there are a sort of these narrow-ey'd decypherers, I confesse, that will extort strange, and abstruse meanings out of any subiect, be it neuer so conspicuous and innocently deliuer'd. But to such (where e're they sit conceal'd) let them know, the author defies them, and their writing-tables; and hopes, no sound or safe judgement will infect it selfe with their contagious comments, who (indeed) come here only to peruert, and poison the sense of what they heare, and for nought else.
>
> (II, vi, 146-179)

The unhappy Mitis again at the end of the sixth scene of Act III falls into a trap of Jonson's making, thereby allowing Cordatus to state for Jonson a sort of capsule *Poetics* on the nature of comedy:

> MIT. I trauell with another obiection, signior, which I feare will bee enforc'd against the author, ere I can be deliuer'd of it.
>
> COR. What's that, sir?
>
> MIT. That the argument of his *Comoedie* might haue beene of some other nature, as of a duke to be in loue with a countesse, and that countesse to bee in loue with the dukes sonne, and the sonne to loue the ladies waiting maid: some such crosse wooing, with a clowne to their seruingman, better then to be thus neere, and familiarly allied to the time.
>
> COR. You say well, but I would faine heare one of these *autumne*-judgements define once, *Quid sit Comoedia?* if he cannot, let him content himselfe with CICEROS definition, (till hee haue strength to propose to himselfe a better) who would haue a *Comoedie* to be *Imitatio vitae, Speculum consuetudinis, Imago veritatis;* a thing throughout pleasant, and ridiculous, and accommodated to the correction of manners: if the maker haue fail'd in any particle of this, they may worthily taxe him.
>
> (III, vi, 191-210)

Finally, Cordatus and Mitis serve as a sounding board for the formal statement of the humours concept by Asper-Macilente-Jonson:

As when some one peculiar quality
Doth so possesse a man, that it doth draw
All his affects, his spirits, and his powers,
In their confluctions, all to runne one way,
This may be truly said to be a Humour.
(Prologue, 105-109)

They applaud his statements of his satiric purpose: "And therefore I would giue them pills to purge, And make 'hem fit for faire societies" (Prologue, 175-176). They also concur with his comic method:

To please, but whom? attentiue auditors,
Such as will ioyne their profit with their pleasure,
And come to feed their vnderstanding parts:
For these, Ile prodigally spend my selfe,
And speake away my spirit into ayre;
For these, Ile melt my braine into inuention,
Coine new conceits, and hang my richest words
As polisht jewels in their bounteous eares. (Prologue, 201-208)

When Asper has gone to become the envious Macilente, Cordatus and Mitis remain "as censors to sit here," and explain why Jonson has not in this play, observed the "lawes of *Comoedie.*" Says Mitis:

> MIT. Why, the equall diuision of it into *Acts,* and *Scenes,* according to the *Terentian* manner, his true number of Actors; the furnishing of the Scene with GREX, or CHORVS, and that the whole Argument fall within compasse of a dayes businesse.
> (Prologue, 237-241)

Mitis has been more knowledgeable in this passage than he will be later, but even this degree of knowledge is of little avail against the redoutable Cordatus. After a brief history of comedy, he liberates Jonson from the strict "lawes" established by Mitis:

> I see not then, but we should enjoy the same licence, or free power, to illustrate and heighten our inuention as they did; and not bee tyed to those strict and regular formes, which the nicenesse of a few (who are nothing but forme) would thrust vpon vs. (Prologue, 266-270)

Apparently that "licence" was for this play only; for in prologues to his later plays, Jonson insists on those "lawes," and in general, in his comedies, he conforms strictly to the "unities."

Jonson did not introduce another formal chorus into a comedy for twenty-six years. In *The Staple of News,* 1625, he has the "Intermeane" of the Gossips: Mirth, Tatle, Censure, and Expectation. But their presence is not to instruct reader or auditory in Jonson's poetic dogma; they in no way assist the poet in presenting the action, or the audience in understanding it. Though they are seated on the stage, they speak only as prologue, and between acts.

But they are, I suspect, the audience. If so, however, the audience has degenerated since the days of Cordatus and Mitis. Even Mitis had some knowledge, and Cordatus possessed all the wisdom of Jonson himself. These four Gossips understand nothing. They praise the foolish (Peniboy-Jr. as prodigal) and condemn the wise (Peniboy-Canter as the true chorus).

They constitute, at best, another object of the poet's satire. In part of that satire they have a sort of mirror function, for they are the avid consumers of the ridiculous news collected and disseminated by the Staple. A measure of their discernment, as representatives of the audience, and perhaps of all *London,* is provided in the Third Intermeane:

> MIRTH. . . . *But how like you the newes? you are gone from that.*
>
> CEN. *O, they are monstrous! scuruy! and stale! and too exotick! ill cook'd! and ill dish'd!*
>
> EXP. *They were as good, yet, as butter*[3] *could make them!*
>
> TAT. *In a word, they were beastly buttered! he shall neuer come o' my bread more, nor in my mouth, if I can helpe it. I haue had better newes from the bake-house, by ten thousand parts, in a morning: or the conduicts in* Westminster! *all the newes of* Tutle-*street, and both the* Alm'ries! *the two* Sanctuaries! *long, and round* Wool-staple! *with* Kings-*street, and* Chanon-*row to boot!*
>
> MIRTH. *I, my Gossip* Tatle *knew what fine slips grew in* Gardiners-lane; *who kist the Butchers wife with*

---

[3] A reference to Nathaniel Butter, printer and newsmonger, whose first newspaper, *Newes from most parts of Christendom,* appeared in 1622.

> CEN. *Or the fine* Madrigall-*man, in rime, to haue runne him out o' the Countrey, like an* Irish *rat.*
>
> TAT. *No, I would haue Master* Pyed-mantle, *her* Graces Herald, *to pluck downe his hatchments, reuerse his* coat-armour, *and nullifie him for no* Gentleman.
>
> EXP. *Nay, then let Master* Doctor *dissect him, haue him open'd, and his tripes translated to* Lickfinger, *to make a* probation dish *of.*
>
> CEN. TAT. *Agreed! Agreed!*
>
> MIRTH. *Faith, I would haue him flat disinherited, by a decree of* Court, *bound to make restitution of the* Lady Pecunia, *and the vse of her body to his sonne.*
>
> EXP. *And her traine, to the* Gentlemen.
>
> CEN. *And both the* Poet, *and himselfe, to aske them all forgiuenesse!*
>
> (IV, iv, 40-68)

The third of Jonson's semi-formal comic choruses is in *The Magnetic Lady,* 1632. It consists of Mr. Probee, in an attitude very similar to that of Cordatus in *Every Man Out of His Humour;* of Mr. Damplay, who is both more uninformed and more censorious than Mitis; and a Boy of the House, who "had the dominion of the shop, for this time under him [the poet]," and who speaks for Jonson.

Probee and Damplay, as heretofore, are the audience—but *only* the "Plush and Velvet—outsides." The Boy fears, however, that this description fits only "clothes, not understandings." These three members of the choric group serve, not only for the functions previously suggested in this paper, but in one or two not observed earlier. They provide a sort of "argument" for the play, explaining that the Magnetic Lady herself and her marriageable niece are the poet's "Center attractive," with "persons of different humours to make up his *Peremiter.*" The Boy explains to the auditory the proper procedure for hearing a play:

> A good *Play,* is like a skeene of silke: which, if you take by the right end, you may wind off, at pleasure, on the bottome, or card of your discourse, in a tale, or so; how you will: But if you light on the wrong end, you will pull all into a knot, or elfe-locke; which nothing but the sheers, or a candle will undoe, or separate.
>
> (Induction, 136-141)

> *the Cowes-breath; what matches were made in the* bowling-Alley, *and what bettes wonne and lost; how much griest went to the* Mill, *and what besides: who coniur'd in* Tutle-fields, *and how many? when they neuer came there. And which Boy rode vpon* Doctor Lambe, *in the likenesse of a roaring* Lyon, *that runne away with him in his teeth, and ha's not deuour'd him yet.*
> (III, iv. 12-32)

In a second function they are Jonson's old enemy, the audience which cannot understand a play, but would censure it. Jonson makes that point abuntantly clear in a "To the Readers" appended to the Second Intermeane (this "To the Readers" is, of course, *not* part of the "play"):

> IN this following *Act,* the Office is open'd, and shew'n to the *Prodigall,* and his *Princesse Pecunia,* wherein the *allegory,* and purpose of the *Author* hath hitherto beene wholly mistaken, and so sinister an interpretation beene made, as if the soules of most of the *Spectators* had liu'd in the eyes and eares of these ridiculous Gossips that tattle between the *Acts.*
> (To the Readers, 1-7)

A sample of their censure, taken from the Fourth Intermeane will show the bitterness of Jonson's attack:

> MIR. *I wonder they would suffer it, a foolish old fornicating* Father, *to rauish away his sonnes* Mistresse.
> CEN. *And all her women, at once as hee did!*
> TAT. *I would ha' flyen in his* gypsies *face i' faith.*
> MIRTH. *It was a plaine piece of* politicall *incest, and worthy to be brought afore the* high Commission *of wit. Suppose we were to censure him, you are the youngest voyce,* Gossip Tatle, *beginne.*
> TATLE. *Mary, I would ha' the old* conicatcher *cozen'd of all he has, i' the young heyres defence, by his learn'd Counsell,* Mr. Picklocke!
> CENSVRE. *I would rather the* Courtier *had found out some tricke to begge him, from his estate!*
> EXP. *Or the* Captaine *had courage enough to beat him.*

Probee offers the standard disclaimer of any personal intent in the satire, and mounts a severe attack on all those who undertake the "civil murder" of a play through "the solemne vice of interpretation."

Probee and the Boy enlarge the auditory to include Charles I himself, for on behalf of "an overgrowne, or superannuated Poet," they very neatly beg for Jonson a gratuity:

> PRO. Why doe you maintaine your Poets quarrell so with velvet, and good clothes, *Boy?* Wee have seene him in indifferent good clothes, ere now.
>
> BOY. And may doe in better, if it please the King (his Master) to say Amen to it, and allow it, to whom hee acknowledgeth all. But his clothes shall never be the best thing about him, though; hee will have somewhat beside, either of humane letters, or severe honesty, shall speak him a man though he went naked.
>
> (I, vii, 49-57)

Cordatus and Mitis, then, and Tatle and Expectation, and Probee and Damplay, should, along with the wits, and the individuals with primarily choric functions, and the brokers, and the unfortunate ones possessed of the humours, be admitted to the list of Jonson's comic *Dramatis Personae.* Such is the thrust of the formalized choric groups toward the follies and ignorance of the audience, that one is disposed to feel that, not only in *Every Man Out of His Humour, The Staple of News,* and *The Magnetic Lady,* but perhaps in all the plays, an additional name should be admitted to the cast of characters—"Auditory."

A STUDY OF LOWER CLASS AND MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS' SENTENCE CONJOINING AND EMBEDDING[1]

by Gerald W. Walton

I. Introduction

Long before they had any knowledge of kernel sentences or the formal concept of sentence embedding or transformational rules—indeed, long before Chomsky's important 1957 publication[2]—elementary-school teachers were clearly aware that a pupil who wrote "I see the red ball" was using a more adult, more sophisticated sentence than the person who used "I see the ball and it is red" to express the same idea. This study joins many others that have investigated, in various ways, students' abilities to perform the task of producing the more adult sentences. It seems unnecessary to comment on the other studies because of the excellent summaries provided by such writers as Loban,[3] Hunt,[4] Bateman and Zidonis,[5] O'Donnell, Griffin, and Norris,[6] and Mellon[7] in their recent NCTE Research Reports. (See especially their sections on Related Research, Related Studies, Background Research, etc.)

---

[1] I am grateful to the pupils, the teachers, and the school principals at Elliott School, Randolph School, Whittier Junior High School, and Lefler Junior High School (all in Lincoln, Nebraska) for allowing me to conduct this study. The research was supported by the University of Nebraska segment of Tri-University Project and by the University of Mississippi, which granted me a sabbatical leave during the 1969-70 academic year.

[2] Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1957).

[3] Walter Loban, *The Language of Elementary School Children* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.)

[4] Kellogg W. Hunt, *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965).

[5] Donald R. Bateman and Frank J. Zidonis, *The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Writing of Ninth and Tenth Graders* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966).

[6] Roy C. O'Donnell, William J. Griffin, and Raymond C. Norris, *Syntax of Kindergarten and Elementary School Children: A Transformational Analysis* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967).

[7] John C. Mellon, *Transformational Sentence-Combining: A Method for Enhancing the Development of Syntactic Fluency in English Composition* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1969).

II. The Experiment: the Procedures and Purposes

Although my analysis is a semi-transformational grammar approach, the study itself is quite different from most of those referred to above and most of the ones summarized in them (Menyuk[8] and C. Chomsky[9] should be added to the list also). I had no control groups and no experimental groups; I took no account of the students' intelligence quotients or the education of the students' parents; to my knowledge, none of the students had formally practiced the combining of two kernel sentences. None of the students had any knowledge of transformational-generative grammar; all of them had used English textbooks with a fairly traditional approach. My study was a one-shot examination, with no follow-up of any kind.

It might be said, then, that the present study differs from others mostly in that my purpose was to compare sentences written by lower class children and middle class children (cf., for example, Osser, Wang, and Zaid,[10] and Lawton[11]).

Two elementary schools in Lincoln, Nebraska, were used. Elliott School has over 60 percent disadvantaged youth (poor whites, blacks, American Indians, and Spanish-Americans); Randolph School is an all-white middle-class school. Samples were also taken from two junior high schools: Whittier Junior High School is the neighborhood school to which most of the Elliott children go; Lefler is the neighborhood school attended by most Randolph children.

During the middle of the 1969-70 school year I used subjects from the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades at Elliott School and Randolph School (at least twenty students from each). I then administered the same exercise to one seventh grade English class at Whittier and one at Lefler. Each student was given a list of five groups of sentences, each group containing two kernel sentences with the same NP. The students were told: "Given below are five groups of sentences. Note that in each case there are two sentences about the same thing—for example, a ball and a ball, a man and a man, and so on. What you are to do is read the sentences carefully and then re-write them so that the two sentences are combined or made one sentence. You may leave out words, add words, or change things around, but you should be sure to do two things: (1) make the two sentences into one sentence, and (2) make your new sentence have the same meaning of the two sentences or say about the same thing the two said. Now, try number one and then stop to see some examples before you go on to number two." After the children did their writing for number one, I told them: "There's no right or wrong way to do these, but these are some of the best ways I think you could make these two sentences (I see the ball. The ball has a star on it.) into one sentence." I then showed them these examples:

---

[8] Paula Menyuk, *Sentences Children Use* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1969).

[9] Carol Chomsky, *Acquisition of Syntax in Children from 5 to 10* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1969).

[10] Harry Osser, Marilyn D. Wang, and Farida Zaid, "The Young Child's Ability to Imitate and Comprehend Speech: A Comparison of Two Sub-Cultural Groups," *Child Development,* XL (December, 1969), 1063-1075.

[11] Denis Lawton, *Social Class, Language, and Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968).

I see the ball that has a star on it.
I see the ball which has a star on it.
The ball I see has a star on it.
I see the ball with a star on it.

I continued: "You might keep these examples in mind as you go on to the other exercises and finish them." The example sentences were erased so that they could not be seen during the rest of the examination.

The decision to use subjects from the second through the seventh grades was a somewhat arbitrary one. I experimented with some first graders who were able to handle the exercises quite adequately, but for the most part first graders were not able to read, write, or reason well enough to make me feel that my results would be worth their efforts. I have given the exercises to eighth graders and to some adults, but my reasoning was that I could use seventh-grade writing as a sample of adult writing.

The sentences used were these:

1. I see the ball.
   The ball has a star on it.

2. I know the man.
   The man is a teacher.

3. I see the boy.
   The boy is playing in the street.

4. I see the ball.
   The ball is red.

5. John has a ball.
   I see a ball.

III. A Note on the Appendices

While I hope the appendices will stand alone, some remarks on them and their interpretation may be helpful before specific conclusions are listed. Appendices A through J are analyses of correct responses.

The "clauses connected with *and*" line (G in Appendix A and B) refers to the type of sentence made by the simple coordination of clauses (for example "I see the ball and the ball has a star on it"). *And* was the only coordinating conjunction used by any of the writers. The appendices show a sentence-by-sentence analysis of the usage. A grade-by-grade analysis shows no particularly interesting information except perhaps the seventh-grade decline.

Grade	Number of clauses connected with *and*
2	14
3	17
4	15
5	12
6	18
7	5
	81

The noun-clauses column is for those sentences which show the embedding of a kernel as a direct object—the type of construction Jacobs and Rosenbaum[12] call a clause complementizer and the type Lees[13] refers to as a factive noun clause. Though there is probably a considerable change in meaning when the kernel sentences are combined in an "I see (that) ball is red" manner, I have counted such constructions because of my emphasis on combining in my directions to the students. A grade-by-grade analysis is given here:

---

[12] Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, *English Transformational Grammar* (Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1968).

[13] Robert B. Lees, *The Grammar of English Nominalizations* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, 1960).

Grade	Number of noun clauses
2	6
3	16
4	26
5	28
6	18
7	16
	110

I believe that the various parts of the appendices are self-explanatory. For example, one might follow the line for response A in Appendix A across to see that one student, a boy, gave that response in the second grade, as compared to four boys and five girls the the seventh grade.

Appendix K is another sentence-by-sentence analysis showing the ratios and percentages of correct responses. For example, reading horizontally from left to right, one finds that only one out of the twenty lower class students (5%) correctly combined the clauses for sentence 1, whereas ten out of thirty-three (31%) middle class students performed well on the same exercise.

Appendix L is a sort of grand total or average for the information given in Appendix K. By using this table, one can easily see the comparative percentages for lower class and middle class groups. Note that overall the middle class students out-performed the lower class students on every sentence.

The grades are emphasized in Appendix M. Again an easy comparison can be made between lower class and middle class students. The superior performance of the middle class students can be seen.

Appendix N shows no really significant difference between the performances of girls and boys. The lower class boys were slightly above the lower class girls, the middle class girls above the middle class boys. Overall the girls outperformed the boys slightly.

IV. Conclusions

I believe all of the major conclusions to be drawn from this study are readily apparent if one carefully considers all of the appendices provided. Some summary statements, however, in addition to what has already been said about coordinated clauses, noun clauses, and the performances of girls versus boys, seem to be in order.

First, one can probably assume that the transformational grammarian or the psycholinguist would argue that theoretically the A responses for each sentence would be the most difficult to produce; yet it was the single response given most often for sentence 1, sentence 3, and sentence 4. It might be noted also that second graders and third graders gave this response fairly often.

The assumption seems to be that in order to produce "I see the ball with a star on it" one first embeds to get a sentence with a relative clause—"I see the ball which has a star on it"—and then transforms the relative clause to a with-phrase—"with a star on it." This was the single response given most often by both lower class and middle class students for sentence 1.

The A response for sentence 2 was given only once by a lower class student and six times by middle class students. It seems clear that the A response here (*man teacher*) involves more complicated processes than the production of simple relative clauses. One must delete the WH and BE of the relative clause and place *man* before *teacher* in order to have this compound.

For sentence 3 the single response given most often by far was A. Here again one theoretically embeds the relative clause and then deletes the WH and BE (of course my providing *in the street* as part of one of the kernel sentences made it most unlikely that anyone would then place the present participle *playing* in front of the NP).

Once more, what might be regarded as the most difficult response was the one response given most often by both lower class and middle class students for sentence 4. For response A the transformational grammarian would speak of the prodedures of deleting the WH and BE and obligatorily placing the adjective that was the predicate adjective of the kernel sentence in front of the NP of the main clause.

My conversations with some of the brighter students convinced me that many of the students, both lower class and middle class, felt that "I see John's ball" was a sentence which somehow meant something different from the two sentences "John has a ball" and "I see a ball." The grammarian, however, might argue that the complicated series of transformations necessary for the possessive or genitive is not apparent to the student. The argument seems to be that perhaps one first produces a relative clause ("a ball which John has") which in turn somehow generates the possessive *John's ball.*

Second, it might be noted that students from both groups tended to prefer dropping the relative pronoun when it functioned as an inverted direct object in the relative clause. The pattern for clauses with relative pronouns as direct objects was this:

sentence	relative pronoun deleted	relative pronoun as object
1	18	3
2	34	0
3	26	1
4	39	1
5	47	54

Sentence 5, of course, is a somewhat unusual sentence pattern in this exercise since both of the kernel sentences given to the students had the NP in a direct-object position.

Third, when relative pronouns were used in a subject position in a relative clause (as they could be for the first four sentences), *that* was the pronoun used most often. This chart shows the relative pronoun preferred for subjects of relative clauses (the use of *NA* indicates that the NP to be modified was inanimate and that *who* would thus not have been expected):

sentence	that	which	who
1	32	2	NA
2	31	6	22
3	31	2	12
4	42	8	NA

I am aware that a sentence like "I know a man which is a teacher" is generally considered ungrammatical, but I have counted such responses as correct in this study.

Next, I feel that a few remarks should be made about the incorrect responses. Second and third graders most often simply repeated the two kernel sentences exactly, except that they would place either a comma or no mark of punctuation between the two clauses. Younger children quite often simply did not understand the directions and wrote completely new sentences without the meaning of at least one of the kernel sentences. Older students who missed the questions most often changed one of the NP's to a pronoun and then put only a comma between the clauses—for example, "I see the ball, it has a star on it."

The outperformance of middle class students over lower class students in almost every sentence has already been observed. Last, as might have been expected, there was general increment among both groups as they progressed from grade to grade.

Appendix A

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 1 AS WRITTEN BY LOWER CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the ball with a star		1		3	1	3	2	2	5	2	4	5	12	16	28
B. The ball I see has a star					3	1			1	1		1	4	3	7
C. The ball that I see has a star											1		1		1
D. The ball which I see has a star															
E. I see the ball that has a star						1	1		1		3		5	1	6
F. I see the ball which has a star												1		1	1
G. Clauses connected with *and*			1	1		3			1	2		1	2	7	9
H. Noun clauses								2				1		3	3
I. Miscellaneous sentences				2				1						3	3
Total Correctly Combined		1	1	6	4	8	3	5	8	5	8	9	24	34	58

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix B

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 1 AS WRITTEN BY MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the ball with a star	1	1	1	1	4	3	6	1	5	5	4	4	21	15	36
B The ball I see has a star		1				1	1	1	2	2	2	1	5	6	11
C. The ball that I see has a star		1												1	1
D. The ball which I see has a star											1		1		1
E. I see the ball that has a star	1	1	2	2	2	1	4	2	1	1	4	5	14	12	26
F. I see the ball which has a star				1							1		1	1	2
G. Clauses connected with *and*	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	3			1	8	8	16
H. Noun clauses			1	1	3	1	1	1		1		1	5	5	10
I. Miscellaneous sentences										1				1	1
Total Correctly Combined	4	6	5	7	10	7	13	7	11	10	12	12	55	49	104

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix C

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 2 AS WRITTEN BY LOWER CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I know the man teacher			1										1		1
B. The man I know is a teacher					1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	6	5	11
C. The man who(m) I know is a teacher															
D. The man that I know is a teacher															
E. The man which I know is a teacher															
F. I know a man who is a teacher		1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	2	4	6	10
G. I know a man that is a teacher				2	1	2		2	2		2	1	5	7	12
H. I know a man which is a teacher							1					1	1	1	2
I. Clauses connected with *and*		2	1	1		1			1	1			2	5	7
J. Noun clauses	1			1		1	2	2	1	2		1	4	7	11
K. Miscellaneous sentences		1					1						1	1	2
Total Correctly Combined	1	4	2	5	3	6	6	6	7	5	5	6	24	32	56

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix D

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 2 AS WRITTEN BY MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I know the man teacher	1	1		1	1				1	1			3	3	6
B. The man I know is a teacher						1	3	1	4	4	5	5	12	11	23
C. The man who(m) I know is a teacher															
D. The man that I know is a teacher															
E. The man which I know is a teacher															
F. I know a man who is a teacher	1			1			1	2	1	1	5		8	4	12
G. I know a man that is a teacher		2	1		3	1	2	2	1	3		4	7	12	19
H. I know a man which is a teacher			1	1					1			1	2	2	4
I. Clauses connected with *and*	1	1		1		1	2		1				4	3	7
J. Noun Clauses		1	3	1	5	2	1	1		3	2	3	11	11	22
K. Miscellaneous sentences															
Total Correctly Combined	3	5	5	5	9	5	9	6	9	12	12	13	47	46	93

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix E

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 3 AS WRITTEN BY LOWER CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the boy playing	1	3		4	2	2	3	5	4	4	2	5	12	23	35
B. The boy I see is playing					2	1	1	1	1	1		1	4	4	8
C. The boy who(m) I see is playing															
D. The boy that I see is playing											1		1		1
E. The boy which I see is playing															
F. I see the boy who is playing							2		1		1		4		4
G. I see the boy that is playing					1	1	1	1	2		2		6	2	8
H. I see the boy which is playing												1		1	1
I. Clauses connected with *and*							1			1			1	1	2
J. Noun clauses	2				2		1	1		1		1	5	3	8
K. Miscellaneous sentences															
Total Correctly Combined	3	3		4	7	4	9	8	8	7	6	8	33	34	67

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix F

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 3 AS WRITTEN BY MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the boy playing		1	1	6	4	1	4	3	3	3	5	3	17	17	34
B. The boy I see is playing		1	1				2	1	3	3	3	4	9	9	18
C. The boy who(m) I see is playing															
D. The boy that I see is playing															
E. The boy which I see is playing															
F. I see the boy who is playing			1	1			4	2		1	2	1	7	5	12
G. I see the boy that is playing	1			1	3	5	2	1	3	1	1	5	10	13	23
H. I see the boy which is playing			1										1		1
I. Clauses connected with *and*	1	1		1									1	2	3
J. Noun clauses			2		2	1	2	2		1		1	6	5	11
K. Miscellaneous sentences											1		1		1
Total Correctly Combined	2	3	6	9	9	7	14	9	9	9	12	14	52	51	103

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix G

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 4 AS WRITTEN BY LOWER CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the red ball				1	2	4	4	6	3	3	4	5	13	19	32
B. The ball I see is red		1			2	1		1	1	2	1	2	4	7	11
C. The ball that I see is red															
D. The ball which I see is red															
E. I see the ball that is red		2		2	1	2	2		2		1		6	6	12
F. I see the ball which is red							1				1	1	2	1	3
G. Clauses connected with *and*	1					2			1				2	2	4
H. Noun clauses	1		1		1			1		2			3	3	6
I. Miscellaneous sentences															
Total Correctly Combined	2	3	1	3	6	9	7	8	7	7	7	8	30	38	68

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix H

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 4 AS WRITTEN BY MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see the red ball	2	2		1	1	2	3	3	3	6	6	9	15	23	48
B. The ball I see is red		2	1		1		5	2	5	5	4	3	16	12	28
C. The ball that I see is red										1				1	1
D. The ball which I see is red															
E. I see the ball that is red	1	1	4	2	6	4	4	2	3		1	2	19	11	30
F. I see the ball which is red				1	1				1		1	1	3	2	5
G. Clauses connected with *and*	2			1		1	1						3	2	5
H. Noun clauses		1	1	1	2	1	2	2		1			5	6	11
I. Miscellaneous sentences															
Total Correctly Combined	5	6	6	6	11	8	15	9	12	13	12	15	61	57	118

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix I

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 5 AS WRITTEN BY LOWER CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see John's ball			1										1		1
B. I see a ball of John's															
C. I see John with a ball						1					1		1	1	2
D. I see a ball John has	1			1	1		2	2	2	3			6	6	12
E. I see a ball that John has				1	1		2	2	1		2	2	6	5	11
F. I see a ball which John has															
G. John has a ball I see					1	2	1				2		4	2	6
H. John has a ball that I see						1	1				1	1	2	2	4
I. John has a ball which I see												1		1	1
J. Clauses connected with *and*	1			4		2	1		3	2		1	5	9	14
K. Noun clauses					2	1		2		2	1	1	3	6	9
L. Miscellaneous sentences							1						1		1
Total Correctly Combined	2		1	6	5	7	8	6	6	7	7	6	29	32	61

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix J

ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE NO. 5 AS WRITTEN BY MIDDLE CLASS STUDENTS

Responses	Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Totals		Grand Total
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	
A. I see John's ball				1	1			2				2	1	5	6
B. I see a ball of John's															
C. I see John with a ball								1		1				2	2
D. I see a ball John has		1			1	1	1	2	3	3	4	3	9	10	19
E. I see a ball that John has		1	2	1	1	1	7	1	2	6	5	1	17	11	28
F. I see a ball which John has			1		1				1				3		3
G. John has a ball I see						3	1		3			3	4	6	10
H. John has a ball that I see			1		1			1			1	1	3	2	5
I. John has a ball which I see									1		1		2		2
J. Clauses connected with *and*				3	2	1	3	1	2		1	1	8	6	14
K. Noun clauses			1	3	2		4	1	1	3	1	3	9	10	19
L. Miscellaneous sentences	1	1	1							2			2	3	5
Total Correctly Combined	1	3	6	8	9	6	16	9	13	15	13	14	58	55	113

G=girls; B=boys.

Appendix K

ANALYSIS BY SENTENCES: RATIO AND PERCENTAGE

Grade	Sentence No. 1				Sentence No. 2				Sentence No. 3				Sentence No. 4				Sentence No. 5			
	Lower Class		Middle Class		Lower Class		Middle Class		Lower Class		Middle Class		Lower Class		Middle Class		Lower Class		Middle Class	
	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%	Ratio	%
2	1/20	5	10/33	31	5/20	25	8/33	24	6/20	30	5/33	15	5/20	25	11/33	33	2/20	10	4/33	12
3	7/20	35	12/30	40	7/20	35	10/30	33	4/20	20	15/30	50	4/20	20	12/30	40	7/20	35	14/30	47
4	12/22	55	17/24	71	9/22	41	14/24	58	11/22	50	16/24	67	15/22	68	19/24	79	12/22	55	15/24	63
5	8/20	40	20/29	69	12/20	60	15/29	52	17/20	85	23/29	79	15/20	75	24/29	83	14/20	70	25/29	86
6	13/20	65	21/30	70	12/20	60	21/30	70	15/20	75	18/30	60	14/20	70	25/30	83	13/20	65	28/30	93
7	17/20	85	24/30	80	11/20	55	25/30	83	14/20	70	26/30	87	15/20	75	27/30	90	13/20	65	27/30	90

Appendix L

ANALYSIS BY SENTENCES: OVERALL RATIO AND PERCENTAGE

Sentence No.	Lower Class		Middle Class	
	Ratio	Percent	Ratio	Percent
1	58/122	48	104/176	59
2	56/122	46	93/176	53
3	67/122	55	103/176	59
4	68/122	56	118/176	67
5	61/122	50	113/176	64
Overall Avg.	310/610	51	531/880	60

Appendix M

ANALYSIS BY GRADES: OVERALL RATIO AND PERCENTAGE

Grade	Lower Class		Middle Class	
	Ratio	Percent	Ratio	Percent
2	19/100	19	38/165	23
3	29/100	29	63/150	42
4	59/110	54	81/120	67
5	66/100	66	107/145	74
6	67/100	67	113/150	75
7	70/100	70	129/150	86
Overall Avg.	310/610	51	531/880	60

Appendix N

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE BY GIRLS AND BOYS

	Lower Class		Middle Class		Total	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
Number tested	57	65	86	90	143	155
Number of sentences attempted	285	325	430	450	715	775
Number of sentences correct	140	170	273	258	413	428
Total percent	49	52	63	57	58	55

MYTHICAL ELEMENTS OF "PANTALOON IN BLACK"

by Rosemary Stephens

One of William Faulkner's most neglected short stories, "Pantaloon in Black," emerges under scrutiny as one of his most artistic. The reader may view it as a simple love story containing the dramatic analogy of the hero as pantaloon: inarticulate, dependent upon gestures, desolate because his love has returned to the spirit world.[1] He may consider it a single chapter in the novel *Go Down, Moses,* where it illustrates the book's major theme and contributes an enriching irony through the intensity of Rider's inner turmoil contrasted with the placid ignorance of the white people who misinterpret his emotional outbursts.[2] However, not until he sees it as a part of all literature treating man's lost happiness, his isolation, and his quest for self, does he realize that it contains archetypes and other mythical elements which lift it out of a contemporary and regional context and place it with those stories transcending time and place in revealing man's eternal attempt to understand his world.[3]

---

[1] The traditional Pantaloon of the Italian *Commedia dell' Arte* is a slippered dotard, often in love with the fairy Columbine who returns to the spirit world. The art form's use of pantomime and masks shows the title of Faulkner's story to be effective in emphasizing Rider's inability to express his feelings except in violent gestures—striking the man at the graveside and the moonshiner in the swamp, for example—and his mask, worn as a southern Negro in a community dominated by white people. The dropping of this mask causes the deputy's puzzlement.

[2] *Go, Down, Moses* (New York: Random House, 1942) is a collection of short stories which form a novel about white and Negro members of one family and their relations with other whites and Negroes and with the land. Page numbers in parentheses refer to this edition, which contains "Pantaloon in Black" on pp. 133-159.

[3] C. G. Jung describes archetypes as unconscious and inherited images of instincts, originating in the collective unconscious of mankind and taking form when man attempts to interpret the world he does not understand, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious,* trans. R. F. C. Hull (Bollingen Series XX; New York: Pantheon, 1959). Northrop Frye defines myth as the union of society's ritual and the individual's dream in a form of verbal communication, with the archetype as communicable symbol, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 106.

The rituals civilization has imposed upon the southern rural community in this story reflect the cyclic patterns of life and death, sunrise and sunset, seasonal changes, repetition of daily human needs and rhythmical natural demands upon man.[4] Rider's reaction to these rituals, most of which—in his fragmented condition—conflict with his desires, constitutes the story. Its mythical elements involve archetypes and the search of a naïf person for life's meaning. While the nature of archetypes depends upon man's individuality, their presence indicates a human bond. The story of Rider is thus a story of the reader, of every man's search for understanding, for decision in catastrophe, for peace in the midst of hostility.

"Pantaloon in Black" opens with the ritual of Mannie's funeral on a Sunday evening. Six months ago, as winter ended and spring began, Rider was born into a world of happiness and order. His marriage to Mannie brought him a new name and a new life filled with meaning. Now, in August, as the year approaches winter, he experiences a spiritual death, an end to order and a resumption of personal chaos. The marriage fire has been extinguished.

Refusing the communal supper after the funeral, the hero, isolated by grief from his fellow man and by death from his beloved, returns to the *mandala* of his own house, although it is no longer a paradise and he knows that his wife "be wawkin yit." Religious spokesmen insist that the dead leave this earth "not only without regret but with joy, mounting toward glory," but Mannie has not gone—which is in keeping with a superstition of "the dead who either will not or cannot quit the earth yet although the flesh they once lived in has been returned to it" (p. 136).[5] In the company of his dog, a reminder in its loyalty of the one belonging to Ulysses, Rider sees the ghost of his dead wife and begs her to let him go with her (pp. 140-141).

---

[4] A ritual is a formal observance by members of society repeated ceremoniously and often contains religious or magical connotations. Rites connected with worship, birth, adulthood, marriage, and death are familiar patterns in a community and originate in primitive society. In Faulkner's story the act of eating assumes a ritualistic nature, serving as a timed observance of cyclic phenomena and as acknowledgment of man's physical weakness in the face of supernatural forces. Another ritual is work which, in today's society, has therapeutic value as well as socially beneficial qualities. The "chanted phrases of song tossed back and forth" by the sawmill workers the morning Rider returns to work (p. 144) are modern evidence of primitive attitudes regarding labor and its magical overtones. The act of becoming intoxicated is a ritual which often involves initiation into manhood; in its history it is related to religious rites. Another of the rituals Faulkner uses in this story is gambling. While this act is not instinctual, it follows a communal pattern and has magical and religious implications dating from primitive times.

Mannie is the *anima,* the magical feminine being which is the archetype of life, the soul which offers man something to believe in and a reason for living. Faulkner uses the marriage fire to symbolize this flame of life and its influence upon Rider. Mannie has a secret wisdom which provides Rider's life with meaning. She effects his wholeness, in keeping with the Platonic myth of the creation of man.[6] Her death causes his consciousness to face overwhelming situations as he attempts to adapt to his altered world. While the *anima* brings meaning into man's life, the archetype of the spirit of meaning is the wise old man: in this story, Uncle Alec, who tries to persuade Rider to come to his aunt's house, to give up drinking, and to turn to God for help.

The need for food forces Rider to eat before he sets out on his quest for identity and purpose. "Whut's Ah doin hyar?" is a question which means more than "What am I doing here in this rented house where I used to feel alive with love?" It contains the same cry heard from Lear at the death of Cordelia: "Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life,/And thou no breath at all?"[7] It implies a refusal to accept as normal the world of now and indicates a need for self-knowledge and direction. Rider journeys through the woods with his dog as the moon provides light for the shadow, the archetype of self. Sleep brings no relief but a continuation of the battle within him (p. 142).

Several tasks are imposed between Rider and self-understanding. His first, requiring the lifting of a huge log, occurs when he returns ~~to~~ the mill at dawn to participate in the rituals of eating and of work. He hopes to discover through a superhuman physical feat that he has not changed essentially and that through his own power life still has some meaning. The search for self traditionally leads to water where one might contemplate his mirrored image and find truth. Although Faulkner does not emphasize any reflection in the water, Rider lies face down and drinks from a branch before his uncle comes with an offering of food from his aunt and the magical words: "De Lawd guv, and He tuck away. Put yo faith and trust in Him. And she kin help you" (pp. 143, 144-145). After the first task, Rider resumes his quest, journeying downward and reaching the black river swamp by sundown (p. 146). Descent into a dark water world, symbolizing both the unconscious and the return of man to primordial darkness, is necessary before ascent can be made.

---

[5] Superstitions from regional folklore are discussed in Luetta Upshur Milledge's article "Light Eternal: An Analysis of Some Folkloristic Elements in Faulkner's *Go Down, Moses," Tennessee Folklore Society Bulletin,* XXIX (December, 1963), 86-92.

[6] Plato suggests through Aristophanes in *The Symposium* that from a creature combining the two sexes, Zeus had Apollo create two beings, man and woman. This explains why man contains an inner thirst for that lost part of himself and is continually searching for the completion of his own original nature.

[7] *King Lear,* V, iii, 306-307.

In the swamp Rider encounters another archetype: the half-evil magician with whom he must contend for the magical weapon of a jug of whiskey—a cold, fiery liquid which should enable him to adjust to a changed world. His second task requires courage, demonstrated as he defeats the magician, turning his back "on the man and gun both" (p. 147) and leaving with the *mana* in the liquor. Unable to breathe in the black depths of the watery swamp, Rider climbs a hill and sees the moon again. His uncle finds him on the hill and offers words of wisdom: "Come home, son. Dat ar cant help you" (p. 148).

Rider's third task is to conquer the jug which is not only *mana* but a personified adversary. In primitive fashion, the power of his enemy in defeat becomes his own power, but he realizes that this victory does not contain the answer he seeks. He now follows the sage advice of his uncle and returns to his aunt's house, another *mandala.* His journey carries him back into his past as he sees in the magic circle of the home of his second mother the childhood toys he used to stay loneliness: "empty snuff-tins and rusted harness-buckles and fragments of trace-chains and now and then an actual wheel" (p. 149). This imagery recalls the shards of pottery in the cemetery, invested with meaning and magical powers (p. 135) and implying the childish efforts of adults to prevent imperilment of the soul.

The moon in Jungian terms often symbolizes the mother archetype, in this story a positive figure. Here the moon can be said to represent both the aunt's teachings which hover over Rider, beyond his grasp, and the replacement of the mother image by the maiden, now beyond reach of the man who gropes in the desert of isolation for his lost paradise. The dog—merely a dog on one level of the story—in an archetypal interpretation also has a dual meaning: It symbolizes the mother in its role as guardian of the house, and it becomes a link with the dead after Mannie's burial. The church is also a symbol of Rider's second mother, associated with fertile fields and plenty.

Rider admits to his aunt that the *mana* of whiskey employed in the ritual of getting drunk has failed him, whereupon she urges him to try worship of God to stem the dangers of uncontrolled emotions. Although Rider cannot subscribe to his aunt's religious tenets, in this conversation and in the time immediately following it, he seems to discover an answer to his dilemma. Faulkner does not show us the workings of Rider's mind, but the reader knows that he finds life unbearable without his wife and wants to join her in the spirit world. In his tasks he has shown strength, courage, and endurance, but his efforts to adjust to a world without her have been in vain and his desire to be with her has grown stronger. In talking to his aunt, he realizes that God is not about to swoop down to render the desired service, and this realization spurs him to action. Lacking the strength to live without Mannie, he has—as subsequent events show—the strength to commit murder and to undergo the ritual of punishment because through such action lies hope. A man who benevolently destroys evil and thus causes his own death stands a chance of regaining paradise.[8]

As his aunt calls "Spoot! Spoot!"—the name he bore in his pre-Mannie life—Rider races away under the moon, covering with a *persona* the truth he knows about himself. The new facade—not to be confused with the mask of conformity which he refuses to wear—is evident in the way he shapes the muscles of his face so that he seems to smile at Birdsong (p. 152). Another touch of irony is provided in that Rider is face to face with a man wearing the false face of the hypocritical tempter, another archetype. The white man's very name, contrasted with his character, implies a perversion of nature. His position as the false priest who conducts the gambling ritual further proves his evil. Rider kills this white night-watchman who for fifteen years has robbed Negroes in his crooked crap game (pp. 153-154, 156).

---

[8] That Rider subconsciously considers his act benevolent is obvious in his calm remark to Birdsong: "Ah kin pass even wid miss-outs. But dese hyar yuther boys—" (p. 153). The deed is actually one of self-defense, since Birdsong reaches for his pistol as soon as the second pair of dice falls to the floor, but even a drunken Rider has to know that this will happen. The whole scene indicates that Rider comes to the game prepared to use the razor hanging from his neck inside his shirt. He desires death; he knows the decision to stand up to Birdsong will result in murder and in his own death by law or by lynching.

After the murder, instead of seeking safety in flight, Rider returns to the *mandala*, the cottage where he and his wife found happiness. He sleeps soundly while awaiting the beginning of the death process which will enable him to join Mannie. Civilization demands the chase, the arrest, the punishment for crime; but Rider now regards such rituals as steps to his goal. His reaction to the breathless enclosure of the jail is a physical one: mentally, he accepts the punishment as a means of ultimately attaining his dream. The bars of the prison recall to the reader the imprisoning canestalks of the river swamp (pp. 158, 147), suggesting that this world may be a jail and intimating that Rider's impending death will provide liberation.

The bird's egg imagery used in the deputy's description of Rider (p. 159) is associated with the name of the man he has killed. It also has mythical associations for the reader, reminding him not only of the world-egg of mythology, but also of the innocence of creation, man's innate desire for pleasure, and the enormity of his continual and unnatural crimes against his fellow man.

There is no apotheosis in "Pantaloon in Black," but Rider has seen the ghost of his wife and this promises another world. The peace he gains after his destruction of Birdsong indicates that in death he may join the spiritual community beyond this life and be again with Mannie. The necessity for murder is an indictment of modern southern society. The inclusion of archetypes makes the story also an indictment of any society of any period of time in which authorities have allowed evil to flourish.

Among the stories by Faulkner which have benefitted from a study of mythical elements is "The Bear," the key story in *Go Down, Moses*.[9] But "The Bear," for all the praise critics have justly heaped upon it, is hardly an artistic entity.[10] "Pantaloon in Black," ignored by most critics, is far more artistically written. The author's accomplishment is in keeping with his purpose. The cyclic nature of the plot's completion is evident in the story's beginning with a death and ending with a death, beginning with a separation and ending on the promise of a reunion, beginning with Rider's rejection of the community's code of behavior and ending with his use of its ritual of punishment as the means to escape this world. An examination of the archetypes in "Pantaloon in Black" points to a deliberate use of mythical elements and allows the reader to discern in this story extended and deeper meanings, a universality, and Faulkner's artistry.

---

[9] Critics' explanations of it as a myth have not been wholly satisfactory. For example, John Lydenberg's valuable essay, "Nature Myth in Faulkner's *The Bear,*" *American Literature,* XXIV (March, 1952), 62-72, answers some pertinent questions but not all. Anyone providing an explication of this story should include the presence of the swamp farmers, the fact that in finding and training Lion Sam Fathers contributes to Ben's death, and the description of Boon as *childlike.*

---

[10] Faulkner himself admitted that Part IV does not belong with "The Bear" as a short story and should be skipped by readers who are not interested in *Go Down, Moses* as a novel. See *Faulkner in the University: Class Conferences at the University of Virginia, 1957-1958,* compiled by Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner (Charlottesville, Va.; University of Virginia Press, 1959), pp. 4, 273. In spite of its renown, the story contains some inconsistencies, flaws in Faulkner's craftsmanship. See Rosemary Stephens, "Ike's Gun and Too Many Novembers," *Mississippi Quarterly,* XXIII (Summer, 1970), 279-287.

THE CASE OF THE SUPPOSITITIOUS PRINCE

by Mary Ann Connell

In 1687 a predominantly Protestant England was resigned to endure the reign of Roman Catholic James II. James had no male heir; consequently, his Protestant daughters, Mary and Anne, were destined to inherit his throne. Catholics were hated and feared by all Protestant classes with an unreasoning passion. Any report of Catholic ill-doing would be believed without question. A rumor in 1687 that James, then fifty-two and considered doddering for the time, was to become a father again sent a pall of fear over his anti-Catholic subjects and fostered a legend that today has never been entirely disproved—the legend of James Francis Edward, the supposititious prince.

James was considered by most of his Protestant subjects to be an offensive monarch; he, in tnrn, regarded them as heretics. His marriage to Mary of Modena, an Italian Catholic twenty-five years his junior, had been received with disgust and dismay.[1] During the first ten years of marriage Mary Beatrice had had two miscarriages and had given birth to four children, all of whom died before the age of five. By the time of James's accession to the throne in 1685, it seemed unlikely that Mary Beatrice would ever bear him a son. She had not been pregnant since 1682, and it was generally assumed that either she or James was sterile.[2] Thus, fears of a Catholic heir to James appeared to be groundless, and the future of England seemed secure for a Protestant succession.

Loyal Catholics openly called for a miracle. Mary Beatrice's Mother, the Duchess of Modena, visited the shrine of Our Lady of Loretto in July of 1687 with prayers and rich offerings to the Virgin that, by her intercession, Mary Beatrice might have a son. The Queen had been praying for the same blessing to her favorite saint, Francis

---

[1] F. C. Turner, *James II* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948), pp. 111-113.

[2] J. P. Kenyon, "The Birth of the Old Pretender," *History Today,* XIII (May 1963), 419.

Xavier. These prayers were joined by those of zealous Roman Catholics in other parts of the world and at every shrine in England.[3]

During late summer of 1687 James escorted the Queen to Bath and from there continued on through the west of England, visiting the larger towns in an effort to conciliate his subjects and gain their affection. While on this journey, James made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Winifred's Well in north Wales; there he prayed for a son and drank of the miracle-working waters. On the 6th of September he rejoined Mary Beatrice at Bath where they remained until September 13th. James then returned to Windsor and was met there by the Queen on October 6th.[4]

By the end of October rumors began to circulate that the Queen was pregnant. Mary Beatrice was so astounded over this good fortune that she waited until the end of her second month before she published the news. On December 23, 1687, the Queen's pregnancy was officially announced by royal proclamation. January 15th and 29th were appointed as days of public thanksgiving and prayer throughout the kingdom. A special form and order of worship was drawn up to be used at the Anglican services. The clergy obeyed, but few in the congregations made the proper responses or showed any signs of reverance or enthusiasm. In his *Diary,* Clarendon commented that most spent their time ridiculing the "Queen's Great Belly."[5]

The announcement of the Queen's pregnancy was received at first with incredulity. The medical history of Mary Beatrice, plus the wide-spread assumption that James was diseased, had led the English nation to entertain no fear of a Catholic heir in spite of the fact that the thirty year old Queen was only in the middle of her child-bearing years. Earlier rumors of the pregnancy had not been taken seriously, for, to the Protestants, there was the very realistic hope that the Queen would miscarry as she had done twice before. As the pregnancy progressed, the joy of the Roman Catholics was boundless. They declared that the event was due to the direct intervention of the Diety and was a miracle given in answer to the prayers of the faithful. They likened the Queen to the Biblical Sarah and Hannah, who bore sons in their old age.[6]

---

[3] David Hume, *The History of England* (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1776), V, 388.

[4] Agnes Strickland, ed., *Lives of the Queens of England* (Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea, 1855), IX, 155.

[5] Lord Clarendon's *Diary,* as quoted in Sir John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, from the Dissolution of the Last Parliament of Charles II Until the Sea-Battle of La Hogue* (2nd. ed.; London: W. Strahar and T. Cadell, 1771-1788), III, App. 1, 313-314. Hereafter cited as *Dalrymple's Memoirs.* See also, Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (New York and Chicago: Belford, Clarke, and Co., 1887), II, 285.

There is no doubt that the behavior of James's zealous Jesuit followers was partly responsible for the disbelief with which the news of the pregnancy was received. They dwelt on the tales of the miracle-birth, prophesied with confidence that the baby would be a son, and offered to back their prediction by laying twenty guineas to one. "Heaven, they affirmed, would not have interfered, but for a great end."[7] One devout Catholic predicted that the Queen would give birth to twins—one would be King of England and the other Pope. Mary delighted to hear this prophecy, and her ladies told her of it repeatedly.[8] Though a son was eagerly anticipated and predicted, certain attempts were made by Roman priests to provide for the possibility of a daughter. They advanced the theory that the daughter of the King and Queen—namely, a princess born after James's accession to the throne—should succeed to the throne before his daughters born when he was only a duke.[9]

The Roman Catholics would have been much wiser had they borne their good fortune with moderation and treated the Queen's pregnancy as a natural event. The insolent attitude of the papists aroused widespread indignation, while their confident predictions of the birth of a son compelled many Protestants to suspect that they would use any means to implement these forecasts. Thus, most Protestants, both Whig and Tory, were convinced that the announced pregnancy was an attempt of the papists to foist a supposititious child upon the realm. It seemed clear to them that if the Queen were pregnant, the Catholics would allow her to have nothing but a healthy son. If a Prince of Wales did not appear, they would create one—and, according to Stephen B. Baxter, "here was one miracle that the most sceptical Protestant knew that the Catholics could bring to pass."[10]

---

[6] E. Hale, *The Fall of the Stuarts and Western Europe from 1678 to 1697*, a vol. of *Epochs of Modern History*, ed. Edward E. Morris and J. Surtees Phillpotts (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1876), p. 124.

[7] Macaulay, II, 285

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Walter Scott, ed., *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects: But Chiefly Such As Relate to the History and Constitution of these Kingdoms* (2nd. ed.; New York: A M S Press, 1965), X, 35. Hereafter cited as *Somers Tracts.*

A rumor as improbable as this would hardly have been believed in calmer times; however, so hysterical was the fear of Catholicism in seventeenth-century England that the Protestants almost universally believed James and Mary Beatrice capable of committing any misdoing. A campaign of accusation and slander was well under way by spring of 1688. From the princesses Anne and Mary to porters and laundresses, few alluded to the promised birth without sarcasm. The exultation of the King and the confident predictions of the papists that the child would be a prince were retorted by a myriad of coarse lampoons intended to throw doubts on the alleged condition of the Queen. Wits described the new "miracle" in rhymes not always delicate or genteel, and pamphlets were circulated with titles such as "The Queen's Great Belly."[11] Belloc wrote in his biography, *James II,* that it was good proof of the impotence into which the monarchy of England had fallen that such tales could not be checked or their authors punished.[12]

On the 29th of December it was reported that the Queen had felt her baby move. In those times it was customary for a pregnant woman to invite her friends to place their hands upon her abdomen and feel the stirrings of the child. Being unusually modest, Mary Beatrice had never allowed any of the ladies of her bed-chamber to practice this custom in past pregnancies and refused to do so this time. Her failure to dress and undress with ceremony and her refusal to discuss her condition with others were traits not shared or understood by Englishwomen of her time; therefore, they interpreted her efforts for privacy to be attempts to hide her real condition. In addition to the wits who mocked and ridiculed the Queen was a group of serious observers dedicated to keeping a detailed record of her every movement. Mary Beatrice's modesty only furthered the ends of this group of her enemies who maintained that "there never was, or appeared to be, any reasonable grounds for a belief that her majesty had conceived a child."[13]

---

[10] Stephen B. Baxter, *William III and the Defense of European Liberty, 1650-1702* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966), p. 229.

[11] Rapin de Thoyras, *The History of England,* trans. N. Tindal (5th ed.; London: Knapton, 1962), XII, 82.

[12] Hilaire Belloc, *James the Second* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1928), p. 208.

Also numbered among the sceptics was the Princess Anne. Writing to her sister Mary on March 14, 1688, to express her doubts about the Queen's being with child, Anne wrote:

> I cannot help thinking . . . the Queen's great belly is a little ſuſpicious. It is true indeed, ſhe is very big, but ſhe looks better than ever ſhe did, which is not uſual; for people when they are ſo far gone, for the moſt part, look very ill: beſides, 'tis very odd, that the Bath, that all the beſt Doctors thought would do her a great deal of harm, ſhould have had ſo very good effect ſo ſoon, as that ſhe ſhould prove with child from the firſt minute ſhe and Manſell (James) met, after her coming from thence. Her being ſo poſitive it will be a ſon, and the principles of that religion being ſuch, that they will ſtick at nothing, be it never ſo wicked, if it will promote their intereſt, give ſome cauſe to fear there may be foul play intended. I will do all I can to find it out, if it be ſo; and if I ſhould make any diſcovery, you ſhall be ſure to have an account of it.[14]

Anne again wrote her suspicions to her sister on March 20, 1688. She said that she had no doubt that the child would be a son since there was so much "reaſon to believe it is a falſe belly. For methinks, if it were not, there having been ſo many ſtories and jeſts made about it, ſhe ſhould, to convince the world, make either me, or ſome of my friends feel her belly."[15]

The Queen's pregnancy progressed in a normal manner until Monday in Easter week. On that day the King, who had gone to Rochester to inspect naval preparations, was sent for in haste by the Queen who feared that she was in danger of miscarrying. The Countess of Clarendon came to see Mary Beatrice on that day, not suspecting that she was ill. Being a lady of the bed-chamber to the

---

[13] *Somers Tracts,* X, 50.

[14] Letter of Anne to Mary, March 14, 1688, quoted in *Dalyrymple's Memoirs,* III, 300.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 300-301.

Queen Dowager, the Countess entered Mary Beatrice's bed-chamber without asking admittance and saw the Queen lying on the bed moaning, "Undone, undone." The Countess of Powis entered the room, went to Lady Clarendon, and in a sharp manner told her to leave immediately. As she was going out, one of the ladies in the room followed her and charged her not to speak a word of what she had seen to anyone.[16] The matter was quickly silenced; however, on the 9th of May the Queen apprehended miscarrying again.[17] Besides these two instances, little is known of the Queen's condition during the last few months of her pregnancy. James was in so much trouble at home and abroad that the gossips were too busily occupied with him to concern themselves with the Queen.

From the beginning of her pregnancy, Mary Beatrice had been uncertain as to the due-date of the baby, determining it at times from the King's arrival at Bath in the beginning of September and occasionally from their return to Windsor on October 6th—a point of great significance in the controversy. Thinking the baby to be due around the first week in July, the Princess Anne went to Bath in late May. She later insisted that her father forced her to go knowing that the Queen's confinement was near. James claimed that he begged her to remain in London. The testimony of neither can be termed reliable, but the fact that the Princess Anne was not in London at the time of the Queen's delivery was most unfortunate for all concerned. Anne had consistently doubted the Queen's pregnancy and stated that she would not be convinced that the child was Mary Beatrice's unless " 'I fee the child and fhe parted.' "[18]

The birth of the Prince of Wales was destined to occur at the inauspicious time when James's popularity was at an all-time low. On June 8th, James had committed to the Tower the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops on charges of seditious libel, thus reducing his already weakened esteem in the eyes of his people and diverting attention from the forthcoming delivery. The Queen was at Whitehall awaiting the completion of repairs to St. James's where she was to go for her confinement. On June 9th, thinking that her time was drawing near, Mary Beatrice sent several messages to the workmen to hurry. When told that it would be impossible to have her bed ready that night, the Queen replied, " 'I mean to lie at St. James's tonight, if I lie on the boards.' "[19] Preparations were completed and near eleven o'clock in the evening the Queen was taken to the palace.

---

[16] Bishop Burnet, *History of His Own Time* (Oxford: The University Press, 1933), III, 249.

[17] Statistical information of the Queen as recorded in *Historical Manuscripts Commission* (Portland MSS), II, 53.

[18] Letter of Anne to Mary, March 20, 1688, quoted in *Dalrymple's Memoirs,* III, 301.

At eight o'clock on Sunday morning, June 10th, Mary Beatrice sent for James, told him that her labor had begun, and advised him to summon those whom he wished to witness the birth. Mrs. Judith Wilks, the mid-wife, and Mrs. Margaret Dawson, a woman of the bedchamber, arrived first and found the Queen alone and crying. She complained of being chilly and asked to have the bed warmed. A warming-pan full of hot coals was then brought into the room and placed in her bed.[20] From this circumstance, simple—but unusual in June, came the tale of the spurious child, the "warming-pan baby." A little after eight o'clock the Countess of Sunderland entered the room just as the Queen was getting into the warmed bed. Thus three witnesses testified that they saw Mary Beatrice enter the bed in which the warming-pan had been placed shortly after eight o'clock. Since the baby was not born until ten o'clock, it would have been exceedingly difficult to have kept even a drugged baby still, quiet, and alive for two hours in a small warming-pan. As proof of the fiction of this story, Mrs. Dawson swore under oath that she saw hot coals in the pan when it was brought into the room.[21]

The King, Queen Dowager, ladies of the Court, royal physicians, attendants, and eighteen members of the Privy Council arrived shortly before nine, filling the tiny room to capacity with 67 witnesses. The curtains at the foot of the bed were drawn but those on the sides remained open. The Queen, being embarrassed, asked James to cover her face with his wig. She had earlier requested that the sex of the child not be announced immediately for fear she would be overcome with emotion. The Countess of Sunderland was then asked to feel the Queen's abdomen to dispel Protestants rumors that none had ever felt her "great belly."[22]

---

[19] Strickland, IX, 163.

[20] Deposition of Mrs. Margaret Dawson, quoted in *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: T. C. Hansard, 1812), XII, 130. Hereafter cited as Howell's *State Trials.*

[21] Howell's *State Trials,* XII, 130.

Labor progressed, and near ten o'clock the child was born. Prearranged signs indicating the sex of the child were passed to James, but he, not being satisfied, asked, " 'What is it?' " The mid-wife then replied that it was what he desired. As the infant was being taken into an adjoining room, the King halted the nurse and said to the Privy Council, "'You are witnesses that a child is born.'" Many then entered the next room for closer inspection. The Lord Chancellor Jeffreys stated that when the receiving blanket was opened by the nurse, he saw the male child with all the marks and signs of having just been born.[23]

Immediately after birth the infant was seen by three Protestant ladies who later testified on behalf of its legitimacy. Lady Bellasyse even deposed that she saw the child taken from the bed with the navel string still attached.[24] Another lady of unswerving Protestant loyalty who saw the baby before he was taken out of the bed-chamber was the Lady Isabella Wentworth. She not only verified the child's birth on oath before the Privy Council, but years after the Revolution told Bishop Burnet that " 'she was as sure the Prince of Wales was the queen's son as that any of her own children were hers.' "[25]

The birth of the Prince was proclaimed throughout the nation. In his *Diary,* John Evelyn wrote that about two o'clock "we heard the Toure Ordnance discharge, and the Bells ringing; for the Birth of a Prince of Wales."[26] The King issued a proclamation establishing days of thanksgiving in England for the birth of his son. Similar days for rejoicing were proclaimed in Scotland, Ireland, and all the colonies. Special prayers were written for the services on those days.[27]

---

[22] Deposition of Anne, Countess of Sunderland, quoted in Howell's *State Trials,* XII, 127.

[23] Deposition of Lord Chancellor Jeffreys, quoted in Howell's *State Trials,* XII, 134.

[24] Deposition of Lady Susanna Bellasyse, quoted in Howell's *State Trials,* XII, 129.

[25] Strickland, IX, footnote on p. 166.

[26] E. S. DeBeer, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), IV, 587. Hereafter cited as *Evelyn's Diary.*

[27] *Evelyn's Diary,* IV, 588.

On the night of June 10th, the King and the royal physicians were called from their sleep and summoned to attend the child. Apparently the baby had been over-dosed with medicines and was suffering a reaction. One of the nurses, a Mrs. Rugee, in a state of great agitation over the baby's condition, expressed belief that the infant would not live. Her words were overheard, repeated, and by morning it was widely believed that the child had died. Clarendon noted the rumor in his *Diary* and stated that it arose from the alarm over the Prince's health the night before. He went on to say, however, that after receiving " 'remedies, God be thanked, he grew better.' "[28]

James despatched news to William of Orange that the Queen had been safely delivered of a son. William and Mary received the announcement with polite decorum and had prayers said daily in their chapel for the royal infant. William sent Count Zuylestein to London to extend his best wishes to the new father; however, the five weeks' stay of the Count was more devoted to the gathering of information than to congratulating the King. He talked to the discontented nobility and reported to William that not one in ten believed the child to be the Queen's.[29]

During this period the Princess Anne returned from Bath and began detailed questioning of Mrs. Dawson, Mrs. Wilks, and other witnesses at the birth. In a letter to her sister Mary on June 18, 1688, Anne wrote that, "My dear fifter can't imagine the concern and vexation I have been in, that I fhould be fo unfortunate to be out of town when the Queen was brought to bed, for I fhall never now be fatisfied, whether the child be true or falfe. It may be it is our brother, but God only knows. . . . "[30] Reflecting the views of most English Protestants, Anne went on to say that " 'tis poffible it may be her child; but where one believes it, a thousand do not. For my part . . . I fhall ever be of the number of unbelievers."[31] Mary, much disturbed by this letter, returned to Anne a questionnaire covering all events and facts of the birth. The rumors which reached her from England and the answers of Anne to her questions convinced Mary also that the child was not her brother.[32]

---

[28] Clarendon's *Diary,* as quoted in Howell's *State Trials,* XII, 145.

[29] Nesca A. Robb, *William of Orange: A Personal Portrait* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966), II, 261. See also, Leopold von Ranke, *A History of England Principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1875), IV, 398.

[30] Letter of Anne to Mary, June 18, 1688, quoted in *Dalrymple's Memoirs,* III, 303.

[31] *Ibid.,*

For the next few weeks the child was intensely scrutinized; even normal changes in his appearance were viewed with scepticism and suspicion. When he became ill at the end of June, some, including the Princess Anne, asserted that this was a trick to make him seem as unhealthy as the Queen's other children. Others maintained that the Prince died and another child had been substituted. The fact that the Queen refused to allow visitors to freely view the child in the nursery supported the rumor of a fraudulent swap.[33]

The other children of James and Mary Beatrice had been breast-fed; therefore, it was decided that since they had not survived, this child would be fed by hand. His food was called *watter gruell* and was a mush composed of barley flour, water, sugar, and a few currants. Violent seizures of indigestion and colic, coupled with convulsions, brought the baby dangerously near death. He was taken to Richmond for a change of air, but became so ill there that four physicians were summoned. The doctors examined the child upon their arrival and decided that he was dying.[34]

While the physicians were at dinner, the King and Queen arrived. Mary Beatrice, completely disgusted with the doctors, sent into the village for a wet-nurse. A Mrs. Cooper, the wife of a tile-maker, was brought to the child, and he responded immediately to milk. In a short time the child was calmed and appeared to be completely healthy. When the physicians returned later in the evening, the infant was so changed in appearance that some thought it impossible for him to be the same baby.[35] Thus arose another tale of the child dying and another being substituted.

---

[32] Robb, II, 261. See also, Nellie M. Waterson, *Mary II, Queen of England 1689-1694* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1928), p. 30.

[33] Kenyon, "The Birth of the Old Pretender," p. 423.

[34] Burnet, III, 257.

[35] *Ibid.*

James, seemingly unaware of the malicious speculations, prepared a lavish display of fireworks over the Thames to celebrate the Prince's birth. Whispers spread through the crowd that the fireworks were really intended to bombard the city in revenge for its joyful demonstrations over the acquital of the seven Bishops. So intense was the conviction that the royal birth was a fraud that Poet Laureat John Dryden included a section in his "Britannia Rediviva" repelling the reports of a spurious child:

> Born in broad daylight, that the' ungrateful rout
> May find no room for a remaining doubt;
> Truth, which itself is light, does darkness shun,
> And the true eaglet safely dares the sun.[36]

While James was acclaiming the birth of his son as a mark of Divine favor, his enemies were viciously circulating the rumors of the "warming-pan baby" or the "supposititious prince." In times of high passion, men generally believe what they wish; therefore, these tales of a sinister hoax were greedily received by most dissenting minds even though based upon gross inconsistencies. The predominant theory among the variety of contradictory rumors was that the Queen had never been pregnant, but had, with the cooperation of the King and papists, gone through the procedures of a pregnancy. When time of delivery came, a child was smuggled into her bed in a warming-pan and presented as the Prince of Wales. Another rumor was that the Queen, though originally with child, had miscarried at Easter and had feigned a continued pregnancy which culminated in the "warming-pan baby" episode. Still others maintained that the Queen had been delivered of a child on June 10th who died immediately and was substituted for in the adjoining room. Another group asserted that the child born of the Queen died during the night of June 10th and was substituted for by another child who later died at the age of six weeks at Richmond. They then insisted that the substituted child was replaced by still another infant.[37]

The contradictions in these accounts were questioned by few. Sometimes combinations of several accounts were made to produce widely accepted, though totally illogical, versions of the "suppositititious prince" story. In his *History of My Own Time,* Bishop Burnet first declared that the Queen had never been pregnant, and then a few pages later he maintained that she had miscarried at Easter. In his accounts of the child substitutions, he judged that three swaps were made—[38]a most difficult task to perform while a hostile and suspicious nation looked on! In spite of its inconsistencies, the legend of the "supposititious prince" became enshrined in the hearts of a generation of Englishmen. As Kenyon wrote in *The Stuarts,* "because the warming-pan legend has been so thoroughly discredited by posterity, its influence on the credulous majority in 1688 should not be underestimated. To many it was an excuse, to some a complete justification, for all that followed."[39]

---

[36] George R. Noyes, ed., *The Poetical Works of Dryden* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1950), p. 255.

[37] Burnet, III, 257; See also, Rapin, XII, 93-94.

On June 30, 1688, an invitation was dispatched to William of Orange appealing for his help. The signators of the letter expressed their regret that William had recognized the legitimacy of the child and informed him that not one in a thousand believed the infant to be the Queen's. They reminded William that one of the main principles upon which he could base his invasion of England was to protect the right of his wife to the throne from a supposititious heir. Prayers for the young child were discontinued in William's chapels on July 7th. Mary had been convinced from the announcement of the pregnancy that James's alleged son was not to be a legitimate Prince of Wales. Most historians agree that as pious and conventional as Mary was, she would never have supported William's "impious and unconventional policy" if she had had any doubts on this issue.[40]

In mid-October William published a declaration in which he set forth his reasons for the invasion. He directly accused James and Mary Beatrice of attempting to foist a supposititious prince upon the kingdom, writing that "not only he himſelf, but all the good Subjects of the Kingdom, did vehemently ſuſpect, that the Pretended Prince of Wales was not born of the Queen."[41] James was furious over this accusation concerning his son. He answered William's charge by a counter-attack in which he stated that the Prince of Orange was so eager to gain the throne of England that " 'he called in Queftion the Legitimacy of the Prince of Wales, his Majefty's Son and Heir apparent; tho' by the Providence of God, there were prefent at his Birth fo many Witneffes of unquesftionable Credit, as if it feemed the peculiar Care of Heaven, on purpofe to difappoint fo wicked and unparrallell'd an Attempt.' "[42] In the midst of this controversy, the child was baptized as Jacobus Franciscus Edwardus in the Roman Catholic chapel of St. James's. The Pope and Louis XIV were Godfathers and the Queen Dowager, Godmother.[43]

---

[38] Burnet, III, 253-257.

[39] J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship* (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1958), p. 175.

[40] Sir Charles Firth, *A Commentary on Macaulay's History of England* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1938), p. 314. See also the following: Waterson, p. 30; Baxter, p. 226; and, Kenyon, *The Stuarts,* p. 174.

[41] *The History and Proceedings of the House of Lords from the Restoration in 1660 to the Present Time* (London: Ebenezer Timberland, 1742), I, 322.

A pamphlet allegedly written by Bishop Burnet and entitled *A Memorial from the English Protestants for their Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Orange* was distributed in England at this time. After listing national grievances, the author stated that it was evident that the King and Queen had foisted a spurious child upon the nation because "his majesty would never suffer the witnesses who were present at the queen's delivery to be examined."[44] James could not ignore this challenge. Therefore, he called an extraordinary meeting of the Privy Council on the 22nd of October for the purpose of hearing the testimony of witnesses present at the birth.[45]

In the council chamber at Whitehall assembled the King, the Queen Dowager, Prince George of Denmark, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord-Mayor and Aldermen of London, all the lords spiritual and temporal who were in the city, members of the Privy Council, and witnesses. James addressed the crowd by condemning the malicious endeavors of his enemies which had so poisoned the minds of some of his subjects that "very many do not think this son with which God hath blessed me, to be mine, but a supposed child."[46] James continued to say that he expected the arrival of the Prince of Orange at any time, and was, therefore, determined to have the matter of the child's birth cleared before the country became engaged in conflict.

---

[42] *Ibid.*, I, 328

[43] Letter of Nathaniel Molyneux to Roger Kenyon, undated, *Historical Manuscripts Commission* (Kenyon MSS), p. 204.

[44] *Somers Tracts*, X, 40.

[45] Howell's *State Trials*, XII, 123-125.

[46] *Ibid.*, II, 125.

Depositions of all witnesses were taken. Forty ladies and gentlemen of high rank plus the mid-wife, nurses, and four physicians testified that they were present at the child's birth and believed him to have been born of the Queen at ten o'clock on the morning of June 10, 1688. Of the witnesses, twenty-three were Protestants and seventeen Roman Catholics. The depositions of all except the Queen Dowager were taken upon oath, confirmed by them the following day, and enrolled in Chancery. The evidence given at this hearing was so positive, minute, and detailed that all who were present appeared to be satisfied.[47]

The testimony was published on November first and was considered by judicious and impartial readers to be conclusive. But, as Macaulay wrote, "the judicious are always a minority; and scarcely anybody then was impartial."[48] The great majority of the people were still unconvinced of the child's legitimacy and viewed the testimony with a sceptical cynicism. The Protestant nation firmly believed that the papist witnesses had perjured themselves in the interest of their Church; thus, their testimony was totally disregarded. What evidence remained was carefully scrutinized while accusations of greed or fraud were levelled against those who gave it. The depositions taken at this hearing failed to remove the prevailing doubts and suspicians of the masses because so many questions remained unanswered. For example, why was there no prelate of the Anglican Church present? Why was the Dutch Ambassador not summoned to represent the interests of William and Mary? Why were not the Hyde brothers, uncles of Anne and Mary and loyal servants of the Anglican Church and the crown, not present? Why, in summary, was there no witness present whose testimony could command public respect and confidence?[49]

James's failure to carefully authenticate the birth of his son was considered inexcusable. Though posterity has, according to Macaulay, fully acquitted the King of the fraud with which his people imputed him, one certainly cannot acquit him of "folly and perverseness." James was aware of the suspicions which were abroad and exhibited gross negligence in not insuring the presence at the birth of witnesses whose testimony would command respect and belief. Even though James was surprised that the delivery date of the Queen occured earlier than expected, he still managed to find time to crowd the room with Roman Catholics and court followers whose word was unsatisfactory to Protestant England. Just as easily, the King could have procured the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Hyde brothers, and other eminent persons whose loyalty to the Church of England and the two princesses would have been unquestioned.[50]

---

[47] Macaulay, II, 424: See also, Strickland, IX, 187.

[48] Macaulay, II, 424.

[49] *Ibid.*

On November 15, 1688, William began his march from Torbay to London. Deserted by friends and family, James fled to France where he, Mary Beatrice, and their son were given the palace of St. Germaine and an annual pension of 40,000 pounds by Louis XIV. Prayers for the Prince of Wales were discontinued on December 30th in all Anglican churches.[51] In his declaration, William had promised to investigate the legitimacy of the child's birth, but by the time the Convention assembled in 1689, the matter was dropped. Though the government itself made no effort to pursue the subject of a supposititious prince, it made no attempt to curb the flood of rumors, broadsides, and pamphlets asserting that James Francis Edward was a bricklayer's son or a miller's child. From these stories came the custom of featuring a windmill as the family's coat-of-arms on derogatory pamphlets and the nick-name, "James O' the Mill."[52]

In the spring of 1692, James, in exile, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury and to his former Privy Council inviting them to come to St. Germaine and witness the birth of a child expected in May.[53] No suspicion, scepticism, or even attention was accorded this pregnancy. The birth of Maria Theresa had few Protestant witnesses; yet this child was always acknowledged as being the legitimate daughter of Mary Beatrice and James II. James Francis Edward, the 'Old Pretender," died in Rome, January 1, 1766. The rumors surrounding his birth were abandoned by the Whigs in 1710. From that time on they preferred to assert that James II had been deposed for breaking the "Original Contract" instead of for foisting a supposititious prince.[54]

---

[50] *Ibid.*, II, 330.

[51] *Evelyn's Dairy*, IV, 496.

[52] Kenyon, "The Birth of the Old Pretender," p. 425.

[53] Letter of James II to the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 23, 1692, *Historical Manuscripts Commission* (Finch MSS), IV, 40.

Though most scholars today treat the legend of the supposititious prince as an absurd fabrication, the accusations levelled against James and his Queen are impossible to completely prove or disprove. An evaluation of the evidence indicates that in all probability James Francis Edward was their son and rightful heir to the English throne. In ordinary circumstances the question of the legitimacy of the child's birth would never have arisen. Circumstances, however, in 1688 were not ordinary. Though Catholics were regarded with total and abject suspicion, had James been a more perceptive man, wiser in the ways of his subjects, history might have omitted the legend of the supposititious prince and the chapter of the Glorious Revolution.

---

[54] Bryan Bevan, "The Old Pretender—1688-1766," *Contemporary Review,* CCVIII (January 1966), 36.

RUDYARD KIPLING IN FRANCE: FRENCH IMPERIALIST AUTHORS AND LITERATURE

by James J. Cooke

Every student in history and in English is very much aware of British imperial literature. Reading Kipling is a part of every survey course in this area, and is also vital for the student in modern British history. The verses of *Gunga Din* or *White Man's Burden* are indicative of a special nineteenth and early twentieth-century phenomenon, the colonialist mentality. However, few students of English literature and history realize that while Kipling was urging his fellow Englishmen to take up their imperial tasks in India and Africa, there was a corresponding, yet different, movement in French literature. The British and French messages were somewhat the same—to spread European civilization to the colonies, economically exploit them for the benefit of the mother country, and enhance the prestige of the state. The Englishmen named their movement the White man's burden, and the French called it the *mission civilisatrice.*[1]

Unlike British imperialism, French colonialism was based on a very serious effort to recover lost national prestige. In 1870, France was crushed by the might of the German nation. Bismarck, seeking to forge a new state out of the small, disunited Germanic kingdoms, openly sought a war with France. The Franco-Prussian War was swift, and France, defeated without any doubt, was forced to surrender Alsace and a third of Lorraine. She was saddled with a massive indemnity and found that, as a disgraced state, she had lost most of her heavy industry. Imperialism was an out-growth of the desperate need to recover what she was forced to give up in 1870. Consequently, French colonialism and colonialist literature became militant and intense, permeated with a sense of national necessity. Colonies, the politicians of the embryonic third Republic believed, would help to reforge France's damaged prestige and provide markets for her post-1870 industrialization. The civilizing mission, the Frenchman's burden, was quickly subordinated to the basic necessities of nationalistic pride and the simple economy of recovery.

---

[1] There have been studies of the ideology of French colonial theory. Most textbooks have accepted the idea of the civilizing mission at face value. However, for new interpretations see Raymond F. Betts, *Assimilation and Association in French Colonial Theory 1890-1914* (New York: Columbia University, 1960), and Agnes Murphy, *The Ideology of French Imperialism 1871-1891* (New York: Fertig, 1968).

This is not to say that the desire to bring the benefits of French culture to Africa and Asia disappeared from the French colonial scene. That desire was, however, subordinated to the goal of rebuilding France. As one leading colonialist put it, "Every colonial enterprise is a business which must be prudently and practically conducted."[2] Jules Ferry, France's leading political advocate of empire in the decade of the 1880's, stated, "Colonial policy is a son of industrial policy." The French mission by 1880 became one of economics rather than education. Inundating France for four decades, from 1880 to 1920, literature propagandizing the empire emphasized the absolute necessity to reap a profit from imperialism. Secondary to the exploitation of the empire was its education, and no colonialist could ever resist pointing with pride to the hospitals and schools that were constructed in Africa or Asia. Aware that the colonialists in France were of various political and social persuasions, the imperialist authors knew that the civilizing mission was at least a good propaganda device.

There never was a French colonialist party, in the strict political sense of the word, and the colonial bloc, as the imperialists preferred to call it, was a coalition of men of many ideologies and from various parties. They had one goal in common: the expansion of France's overseas colonial empire.[4] The future socialist leader of France, Jean Jaurès, worked with the capitalist and the arch-representative of colonial exploitation, Eugène Etienne. Finding their desire to colonize to be somewhat similar, they agreed on the value of imperialism, at least for a while. However, as it became obvious by the early twentieth century that colonialism was exploitive and brought on increased hostility in Europe, Jaures gave up his adherence to the doctrines of imperialism.[5]

---

[2] Betts, *Assimilation and Association,* p. 137.

[3] Henri Brunschwig, *Mythes et realities de l'imperialisme colonial francaise 1871-1914* (Paris: Colin, 1960), p. 80.

[4] Henri Brunschwig, "Le Parti colonial francais," *Revue francaise d'histoire d' outre-mer,* CLII, (September, 1959), pp. 49-83.

Jean Jaurès is a good example of the type of colonialist of the left in France in the nineteenth century. More representative of the Kipling school of colonial expansion, Jaurès was a firm believer in the *mission civilisatrice,* and he was a humanitarian and fighter for social justice. Jaurès believed that it was France's mission to carry to Africa and to Asia the great philosophical truths of 1789: liberty, equality, and fraternity.[6] For the future leader of French socialism, the empire was a vehicle for the transmission of French culture. As a journalist, he could propagandize the empire and, as an effective orator, he helped to create in the minds of his readers and listeners a respect for the colonies. Once, when speaking to a conference of the Alliance française at Albi, France, in 1884, Jaurès stated that the natives would be greatly helped "when by their intelligence and heart they have learned a little French."[7]

There were many colonialists like Jaurès who saw imperialism as only a justifiable means to a desired end. However, not all colonialists were social Darwinists. Social Darwinism was a paternalistic thread in the tapestry of colonization. Unlike the traditional, historic French equalitarianism of Jaurès, the social Darwinist saw the Frenchmen's burden as simply trying to raise the standard of living of the native and helping him to acquire some of the most tangible benefits of French colonialism, Jules Cambon, Governor General of Algeria in 1895, wrote for an influential colonialist journal that "France has shown her generosity: she wants to upraise the Algerian Muslim's moral and intellectual standard and improve the conditions of their persons . . . "[8]

Cambon was not alone in his elitist, paternalistic attitudes toward the natives of the empire. Certain that something could be done to aid the subject peoples, many colonialists viewed the French role in

---

[5] Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), pp. 333-337.

[6] Jean Jaurès, *Textes choisis I, contre la guerre et la politique coloniale* (Paris: éditons sociales, 1959), p. 75.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Statement by Jules Cambon as cited in "Colonies françaises: Algérie," *Bulletin du Comité de l'Afrique française V* (January, 1895), 15. (Hereafter cited as BCAF).

Africa and Asia not as an equalitarian force, but as a transmitter, to allow a slight filtering down of their superior culture. Another celebrated paternalist was General Joseph Galliéni,[9] one of the great activists of French colonialism. His *politique des races* was a natural extension of Jaures' interest in the *mission civilisatrice* and the paternalism of Jules Cambon. Galliéni's attitudes were based on the assumptions that there were vast cultural and social differences between the races and that the Europeans were the superior group. Following a policy of divide and conquer, the General played upon tribal differences. Exploiting these differences and administering the tribes was a simple matter for Galliéni. Because of his successful, energetic administrative policies in West Africa, Indochina, and Madagascar, he became a popular figure in France. Over a period of twenty years he published almost a dozen works, primarily collections of his letters and reports written while he was a colonial soldier. Besides his personal correspondence, Galliéni also wrote several *mêmoirs* pertaining to his campaigns in the colonies.[10]

The publication of *mêmoires,* collections of letters, and personal narratives of exploratory missions became popular in France in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Almost every military figure who participated in colonial pacification wrote something. Never lacking in tales of glory and in support for the cause of colonialism, these books were sold in great numbers to the general reading public. One such author was Hubert Gonzalve Lyautey, who won his fame as a pupil of Galliéni while in Indochina and Madagascar. Throughout his life Lyautey, who became a hero of France, published almost a dozen *mèmoires* and collections of letters.[11] During his career as a colonial soldier, Hubert Lyautey maintained a close relationship with the Viscount Eugène Melchior de Vogüé, a noted man of French letters, who convinced Lyautey to publish his first work, "Le rôle social de l'officer" in the *Revue des deux mondes* in 1891.[12]

---

[9] For a brief study on Galliéne see Robert Delavignette et Ch. André Julien, *Les constructeurs de la France d' Outre-Mer* (Paris: Correa, 1946), pp. 38-420.

[10] There has not been a definitive biography concerning Galliéni.

[11] The standard biography of Hubert Lyautey is André Maurois, *Lyautey* (New York: Appleton, 1931). However, there is definite room for a scholarly work on the life of Lyautey.

Probably some of the most widely read colonialist-oriented works in France were those produced by the soldiers and explorers that opened Africa to French domination. Almost every major explorer wrote something about his contribution to the process of French imperialism. For example, in 1902 François Foureau recorded the history of the 1898-1899 mission into Central Africa.[13] The *Mission saharienne Foureau-Lamy d'Alger au Congo par le Tchad* (Paris: Masson, 1902) recounted his ill-fated expedition. He also made a case for a trans-saharan railway which had been an imperialist dream for almost twenty years. In 1903, Captain Eugène Lenfant told of his exploits in Africa in *Le Niger: Voie ouverte à l'émpire africain* (Paris: Hachette, 1903) and posed a very convincing argument for imperialism in West Africa.

This trend was also apparent in Great Britain, where numerous explorers and military men wrote personal accounts of what they saw and did in the empire. Henry M. Stanley described his many explorations in a two-volume work *In Darkest Africa* (New York: Scribners, 1890). The famous Stanley was only one of a long list of men who popularized the British Empire. They gave, as did the French explorers, the reading public a rare personal glimpse of Africa and Asia. It was a contact which the people of England and France would not have otherwise had. For years, the British had been engaged in heavy fighting with the Ashanti tribes in the Gold Coast area of Africa, and this conflict produced a large number of books comparable to the French story of the opening of central Africa. For example, Richard A. Freeman wrote of his mission in *Travels and Life in Ashanti and Jaman* (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1898) and Robert Baden-Powell told the story of his part in the Ashanti campaign in the *The Downfall of Prempeh: A Diary of the Life with the Native Levy in the Ashanti* (Philadelphia: Lippencott, 1896). Official explorers always gained the most amount of publicity and public respect. One such man was Royal Navy Commander Verney L. Cameron, who retold of his mission in *Across Africa* (London: Harpers, 1877). So important was his trek across Africa that Queen Victoria gave her permission for Cameron to dedicate his book to her. But, while the British were greatly interested in West Africa, especially the Nigeria and the Gold Coast region, the French became more interested in Morocco.

---

[12] Delavignette et Julien, *Les constructeurs,* pp. 473-475. Lyautey's "Le rôle social de l'officer," can be found in the *Revue de deux mondes* (March 15, 1891), pp. 449-451. Also Hubert Lyautey, *Vers le Maroc: Lettres du Sud Oranais* (Paris: Colin, 1937), and Hubert Lyautey, "Letters de Rabat, 1907," *Revue des deux mondes* LXIV (July 15, 1921), 273-304.

[13] For a recent short account of the Foureau-Lamy expedition see James Wellard, *The Great Sahara* (New York: Sutton, 1967), pp. 266-267.

By the turn of the century, Morocco dominated the personal *mêmories* of France's soldiers and the explorers. Since 1898 the French imperialists had moved toward the addition of Morocco to the French empire.[14] The colonialists believed it was imperative that the French reading public learn about Morocco and about the benefits which would be gained for France once the North African state was annexed into the empire. By the first decade of the twentieth century there were many accounts of travel in Morocco. Perhaps the most important writer on Morocco was the famous explorer and geographer the Marquis de Segonzac, who was a close friend and confidant of Eugène Etienne, France's leading imperialist. In 1904 and 1905, at the request of Eugène Etienne and the French imperialists, de Segonzac undertook an explorative mission to Morocco, and in 1910 he recorded his experiences in *Au coeur de l'Atlas; Missions au Maroc 1904-1905* (Paris: Larose, 1910).

The de Sagonzaç mission to Morocco was well-known to the French reading public because in 1906 Louis Gentil, a member of the Marquis' party, wrote his account of the mission. Gentil's *Missions de Segonzac: dans le Bled es Siba: exploration au Maroc* recounted the trip to the untamed Bled es Siba, or controlled region of Morocco. Combined with the personal accounts of other renowned explorers and colonial administrators, the literature concerning Morocco and French interests in that area grew to tremendous proportions. As the desire to annex that part of North Africa into the empire became more pressing, the number of books grew. The colonialist author had little trouble gaining access to a major press.

---

[14] In 1898 England and France clashed on the Nile at a small village named Fashoda. While not engaging in military action, France was obliged to withdraw her mission from Fashoda. The French imperalists after 1898 turned their attention toward Morocco. In 1904, England and France signed an accord which recognized England's rights on the Nile and France's rights in Morocco. See Christopher Andrew, *Theóphile Delcassé and the Entente Cordiale* (New York: St. Matins Press, 1968), and George N. Sanderson, *England, France and the Upper Nile 1882-1889* (Edinburgh: University Press, 1965).

While the personal accounts of the French explorers were exciting and were eagerly purchased, the vast number of books, articles, and tracts that were written by imperialists within the government and in the Paris-based colonial lobby represented the most important sourse of information for the French people. For forty years, men like Eugène Etienne, an energetic, big man with short grey hair, deluged the French population with arguments in favor of empire. As Undersecretary of State for Colonies from 1887 to 1892, as Minister of the Interior in 1905, and as Minister of War in 1906, he was able to use his position to help brcng Morocco into the empire.[15] A proflific author of articles and an energetic orator, Etienne became the symbol of French colonialism.

It can be said that the intensive French effort to convert the people to the cause of imperialism started with Etienne in 1890. While Undersecretary of State for Colonies, he saw the definite need for an all-out effort to colonize. Disgusted with what he considered to be a weak governmental policy in regard to territorial acquisition, Etienne gathered about him thirty imperialists and founded the *Comité de l'Afrique française* (the Committee for French Africa). The new Committee, dedicated to winning a reluctant public and an apathetic government to the cause, founded a new journal entitled the *Bulletin.* The *Bulletin,* a monthly publication, became the forum for France's leading advocates of empire. Men like Harry Alis, Robert de Caix, Joseph Chailley-Bert, Eugène Etienne, and Auguste Terrier wrote continuously for the magazine.[16]

A year after its founding, the committee had grown to 942 members and had a working capital of 187,000 francs. Baron Alphonse de Rothschild and the huge, influential *Maison Hachette* gave freely to the coffers, as did Armand Templier, Hachette's director-general. Very quickly the French colonialists made an alliance with the publishing industry; it would be profitable for both groups.[17] Many jounalists and professional scholars joined the ranks of the *Comitê de l'Afrique française* in 1891. The Journalist Théophile Delcassé and the historian-author Gabriel Hanotaux were members. Both men would become Foreign Ministers of France.[18]

---

[15] Unfortunately, there has not been a definitive biography of Eugène Etienne. Born in Oran, Algeria, in 1844, Etienne entered the Chamber in 1881 and quickly became the leader of the Colonial bloc. Roland Villot's *Eugène Etienne* (Oran: Fougue, 1951) is the only attempt at a biography, but it is scanty and biased. Herward Sieberg's *Eugène Etienne und die Französische Kolonialpolitik 1887-1904* (Köln: Westdeutscher, 1968) lacks substantive material on Etienne's career after the signing of the Anglo-French Entente of 1904.

[16] Brunschwig, *Mythes et réalités,* pp. 116-117.

The task of editing the *Bulletin* of the French colonial association was given to Hippolyte Percher, a well known journalist and colonial advocate. The magazine of the colonialists was to appear on a monthly basis with supplementary publications at a regular interval. Percher, who wrote under the pen-name of Harry Alis, devoted his time to the spread of the gospel of French imperialism. His editorials, straightforward and coherent, had one message: The empire must grow and prosper.[19] Besides his duties as editor of the *Bulletin,* he became a major speaker for the *Comité de l' Afrique française.* He wrote several books exposing colonialism, his most important being *Nos Africains* (Paris: Hachette) appearing in 1894. Alis argued in favor of many imperial causes, and at one point he espoused the cause of the Belgians in the Congo. So great was his influence in colonial circles, that agents of the Belgian King Leopold II paid him subsidies to maintain his editorial interest in the Congo.[20]

Alis, who also held the position of Secretary General of the *Comite,* undertook a series of lectures popularizing the colonialism of France in central Africa, which had been a favorite cause for years.[21]

---

[17] Henri Brunschwig, *L'avènement de l'Afrique noire du XIX siècle à nos jours* (Paris: Colin, 1963), p. 135; Brunschwig, *Mythes et réalités,* pp. 118-119.

[18] There are excellent works on both Hanotaux and Delcassé which dwell in some length on their associations with colonialism. See Alf Heggoy, *The African Policies of Gabriel Hanotaux* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1971), and Andrews, *Delcasse* (see footnote 14).

[19] For more on Alis and the *Comité de l'Afrique française* see Sanderson, *England, France, and the Upper Nile,* pp. 118-119. Alis' editorials appeared on a regular basis in the *Bulletin* for the period 1890-1895.

[20] Evidently Etienne and Alis did not fully agree on the support for the Belgians in the Congo; see J. Stengers, "Correspondance de Leopold II avec van Eetvelde," *Académie Royale des sciences d'outre-mer* XXIX 2 (1953), 480-487.

[21] For Alis and Central Africa, see A. S. Kanya-Forstner, *The Conquest of the Western Sudan: A Study in French Military Imperialism* (Cambridge: University Press), pp. 169-208 and 211.

In 1895, Percher was killed in a duel with an outraged husband, and the Secretary Generalship passed on to other capable men, all of whom were accomplished and well known writers and authors. The most famous successor of Harry Alis was the Viscount Robert de Caix, who was a close friend of the powerful Etienne and who, in colonial philosophy, differed little from Alis or Etienne.

De Caix wrote for the imperialist cause at an opportune time. The French public was apathetic in respect to colonialism, and de Caix, as foreign editor of the *Bulletin,* speaker for the *Comité,* and an author of many books, made it his task to popularize the empire. In 1898, France had suffered a great national humiliation at Fashoda, a small village which was located on the upper Nile in the Sudan. The French had never given up their claims to Egypt; and since the British takeover of Suez in 1882, they had tried to reestablish some imperial presence in the Nile.[22] In the spring of 1898, a small force of French officers and Senegalese infantry reached the village, and there they planted the Tricolor, claiming that area of the Sudan for the French republic. Unfortunately for the Fashoda mission, there were large numbers of British and Egyptian troops under General Kitchener in the immediate vicinity. Fresh from their victory over the Muslim followers of the Mahdi, a self-proclaimed Islamic messiah, Kitchener's forces moved up the Nile to Fashoda to confront the French at that point. A full-scale diplomatic crisis ensued, the government in Paris fell, and the new French Foreign Minister, Théophile Delcassé, extricated France from her embarrassing predicament.[23]

The reactions of the colonialist writters to the military evacuation of Fashoda were odd. Most of the leading imperialists played down the humiliation of France on the Nile. De Caix, Etienne, and others took the position that since France had failed on the Nile, she ought to turn her imperial attention toward the acquisition of Morocco. France's real imperial interests, the colonialists argued, were in North Africa, not on the Nile. However, Delcassé was not convinced that

---

[22] Pierre Renouvin, "Les origines de l'expédition de Fashoda," *Revue historique* CC (1948), 187-197.

[23] For more on Delcassé consult the Andrew's monograph and, Charles Porter, *The Career of Théophile Delcassé* (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1936) Pierre Renouvin, *Politique exterieure de Théophile Delcassé 1898-1905* (Paris: centre de documentation universitaire, 1954); Sanderson's *England, France and the Upper Nile* is also a good source for this question.

France should seek some sort of arrangement or barter concerning Egypt and Morocco. The task of popularizing such a diplomatic, colonial exchange fell to the imperialists.[24] De Caix, as foreign editor of the *Bulletin,* was concerned with the prospects of the Egypto-Moroccan trade. Writing in the *Bulletin* that the Fashoda mission would, in the long run, prove to be a victory, he said that France should seriously try to start negotiations with England. It was high time, he indicated, that France revise her militant policies in regard to England.[25] De Caix openly advocated such a barter in his book *Fachoda: la France et l'Angleterre* (Paris: André, 1899), and his sentiments were echoed by Etienne and the rest of the *Comite de l'Afrique française.*[26] By writing hundreds of articles and editorials, Robert de Caix helped pave the way for the Anglo-French Accords of 1904, which recognized the barter of Egypt for Morocco. In 1904, he pledged that the editorial staff of the *Bulletin* would give first priority to the cause of Moroccan annexation.[27]

The annexation of Morocco was also one of the great themes of Auguste Terrier, another of the important imperialist authors. A member of the *Comitê de l'Afrique française* and a well known journalist, Terrier wrote editorials and books which were masterpieces in the area of colonial propaganda. In 1898, Terrier worked with de Caix to salvage something out of the Fashoda debacle. In the *Bulletin,* he speculated that, because of the growing naval power of Germany, England and France would have to join together for their mutual protection. "We of the *Comitê de l'Afrique française* can say that we desire an understanding with Britain," he wrote.[28] Terrier quickly became one of the leading proponents of the Anglo-French accords.[29]

---

[24] The first indication that the Egypto-Moroccan barter would become a primary goal of the colonialists is contained in a letter from Paul Bourde to Etienne, Paris October 27, 1898, as found in *Correspondance d' Eugène Etienne,* Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris, France, letter 36. Also see Andrew's *Delcassé,* pp. 103-106.

[25] Robert de Caix, "Les relations franco-anglaises," *BCAF* IX (March, 1899), 84.

[26] Andrews, *Delcassé,* pp. 103-106.

[27] Robert de Caix, "L'accord franco-anglaises," *BCAF* XIV (April, 1904), 107.

[28] Auguste Terrier, "Les relations entre la France et l'Angleterre," *Ibid.,* IX (February, 1899), 45.

[29] Terrier and de Caix continued to write editorials for the *Bulletin* concerning the Egypto-Moroccan trade. Their language, idea, and styles were quite similar.

In 1906 he was chosen to co-author with Marcel Dubois a semi-official work for the colónial exposition of 1900 which was to be held in Paris. The book, *Les colonies francaise: un siècle d'expansion coliniale* (Paris: Augustin-Challamel, 1901), clearly reveals Terrier's concepts toward the empire. Never a firm advocate of the *mission civilisatrice,* he placed greater emphasis on the economic benefits of the empire for France. While not neglecting the benefits of French colonial rule for the African and Asian, Terrier devoted most of his time to popularizing the empire as a source of new power and prestige. A decade later, as Secretary General of the *Comité,* he wrote, in conjunction with Charles Mourey of the French colonial office, *L'oeuvre de la troisième republique en Afrique occidentale: L'expansion française et la formation territoriale* (Paris: Larose, 1910). Etienne called this the "golden book, filled with a colonial, patriotic faith."[30] Through the pen of Auguste Terrier the empire was popularized, and, because of his firey editorials in the *Bulletin,* the French were brought closer to the final conquest of Morocco. Few writers played such an important role in the history of French imperialism.

Harry Alis, Robert de Caix, and Auguste Terrier formed the great editorial triumvirate of the *Bulletin.* Their contribution within the colonial movement was considerable and effective. But all three were quick to acknowledge the literary and philosophical brillance of Joseph Chailley-Bert, and Alis, before his death in 1895, recognized that Chailley-Bert would become one of the most effective of colonial propagandists. An admirer of the British colonial system, Chailley-Bert tried to popularize the English colonial system in France. As a colonialist author, he was one of the most widely read writers in France. He began his colonial career in Indochina in 1886, and there was fully converted to the cause of imperialism.[31] His *La colonisation de l'Indo-Chine: L'experience anglaise* (Paris: Colin, 1890), and *Dix années de politique coloniale* (Paris: Colin, 1902) were clear examples of his infatuation with the concepts of English imperialism. However, Chailley-Bert was no champion of the *mission civilisatrice;* he was too much a part of French nineteenth-century imperialism.

---

[30] Etienne was asked to write the preface for this book. Over a period of twenty years Etienne probably wrote two dozen prefaces for colonial works. It is interesting that he never wrote a book of his own.

[31] Betts, *Assimilation and Association,* pp. 46-53.

He told the *Comité de l'Afrique française* that "the natives do not love us and can never love us . . . They should never be asked to love us."[32] To Chailley-Bert, the French colonialist and the native occupied two different and almost totally irreconcilable worlds. There could be no fusing of the two cultures; France had to concern herself with the necessities of reforging a nation through an empire which would be second to none.

Throughout his career in government as a colonial administrator and as a member of the Chamber, Chailley-Bert had great influence. His voice was continually heard and respected by the *Comité,* and his advice was valued by such leading imperialists as the powerful Etienne. So powerful did he become that he was able to challenge the theory of immediate exploitation of West Africa as espoused by Etienne. By praising the deliberate policies of the British in Africa, Chailley-Bert warned that Etienne's demand for immediate profits from the African colonies was foolish. Rapid development, Chailley-Bert warned, was the "weakest means of colonization."[33] Massive efforts to build large industries in Africa were premature, and success, he claimed, would "no longer depend on the faith of public opinion in the colonial cause."[34] Despite criticism directed at Etienne, the two imperialists remained close friends; and in 1904 Chailley-Bert named Etienne as one of the men most responsible for the final culmination of the Anglo-French accords.[35] The author of hundreds of articles, books and tracts, Chailley-Bert's name appeared in every journal in France, except those devoted to the anti-colonial political left.

Chailley-Bert's influence was felt by every imperialist author. His style, message, and enthusiasm were copied by dozens of younger colonial writers like Lucien Hubert and Raymond Aynard. These two men are examples of the colonialists who were influenced directly by Chailley-Bert. They adopted zealous methods of propagandizing the empire. In 1904, Lucien Hubert, a politician and friend of Chailley-Bert, wrote *Politique Africaine—Maroc, Afrique occidentale, Algérie, Tchad, l'effort étranger* (Paris: Dujarric) which praised the deliberate methods of colonization. In the preface, written by Etienne, the Deputy from Oran finally accepted the slow, methodical attempt at colonization. Another colonial associate, Raymond Aynard, wrote *L'oeuvre française en Algérie* (Paris: Hachette, 1912). Aynard, a government official in Algeria for many years, admired Chailley-Bert's concepts of colonial expansion. In his conclusion, Aynard warned that there were vast inherent differences between the Muslims of North Africa and European colonial settlers of Algeria. The colonist would have to guard against the hostility and the treachery of the native. Like Chailley-Bert and like Gallieni, Aynard rejected the Frenchmen's burden, the *mission civilisatrice.*[36]

---

[32] Vincent Confer, *France and Algeria: The Problem of Civil and Political Reform, 1870-1920* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1966), p. 49.

[33] Chailley-Bert, *Dix années,* p. 126.

[34] *Ibid.* Also see Joseph Chailley-Bert, "Le Ministère des colonies," *Revue des deux mondes* LXIV (March, 1894), 906-924.

[35] Joseph Chailley-Bert, "Le traité franco-anglais," *La Quinzaine coloniale* XV (April 25, 1904). 249-251.

There were literally hundreds of young imperialist writers in France over a period of three decades from 1880-1910. Few of them, however, reached the fame of Harry Alis, Marquis de Segonzac, Eugène Etienne, Robert de Caix, or Joseph Chailley-Bert. Among colonial authors, these men were giants, molders of public and official opinion, and they could not be ignored. They did reflect a trend in French imperial literature that was strictly French. The French imperialists never produced a man like Rudyard Kipling, and there was little of the romantic fiction in their work. French colonialism was at least for the imperialists, a product of a practical national necessity. The need to win converts to a policy, which the colonialists saw as vital to the recovery of France after the disaster of 1870, was overriding and all consuming. Most of the great colonialists, men like Etienne, de Caix, Galliéni, and Lyautey, rejected Kipling's concept of the white man's burden: it made no practical sense to them.

In the context of the necessities of French imperialism after the Franco-Prussian War, the *mission civilisatrice* was simply a luxury which France could not afford. The first priority was for the reforging of French industry. A nation's prestige, pride, and self-confidence was at stake, and nothing could deter the colonialists from what they saw as a patriotic goal. Certainly criticism may be leveled at the French colonialists for their lack of interest in the welfare of the natives and for their desire to exploit immediately the African and Asian colonies; but it must be kept in mind that they worked and wrote in the political and nationalistic climate of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Then there were few voices opposed to colonial expansion. Eugene Etienne stated that "Every colonial enterprise is a business. . . ." Etienne represented the majority of French colonialists who saw the empire as a national necessity. The mission of the empire, in their minds, was simple: to rebuild and re-structure France as a world power as quickly as possible. All else was subordinated to this goal. Consequently, the white man's burden or the *mission civilisatrice,* became secondary or was forgotten. The literature of the French colonialists reflected this trend.

---

[36] Aynard, *L'oeuvre française,* pp. 335-354.

THE YEAR OF JESUS'S BIRTH

by Allen Cabaniss

It is common knowledge that the traditional computation of years of the Christian era is inaccurate, owing to a mistake by Dionysius Exiguus, a monk and scholar of the sixth century. Since early modern times, therefore, it has become customary to move the date of Jesus's birth back to 4 B.C., the year in which it was supposed that King Herod died. Since later research, however, has suggested that Herod's death may not be so precisely fixed (there is a range of 4-2 B.C.), a growing tendency has appeared that shifts Jesus's birth date to a period about 7 B. C. From reexamination of available sources, I think it is highly probable that we must consider a still earlier date.

Although it is not usually emphasized, the gospel of John exhibits an extensive interest in Jesus's origin. Apart from allusion to His birth in the hymnic Prologue,[1] there is Philip's remark to Nathanael, "We have found the One about whom Moses (in the Torah) and the prophets wrote, Joshua ben Joseph of Nazareth."[2] Shortly thereafter occur several verses indicating that Jesus's mother was present with Him at a marriage in Cana,[3] as well as that she and His foster brothers accompanied Him to Capernaum for a brief visit.[4] Near the end of the gospel is a touching scene at Calvary, where again His mother was present, along with her "sister-in-law," Jesus's "aunt" Mary, wife of Cleopas.[5] (It is strange that John never gives the mother's name, Miriam or Mary.)

---

[1] John 1:14.

[2] John 1:45. All translations in the essay are mine.

[3] John 2:1, 3, 5.

[4] John 2:12.

[5] John 19: 25-27. Cleopas was a brother of Joseph and father of Symeon, second bishop of Jerusalem. See the genealogical table in Philip Carrington, *The Early Christian Church* (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), I, 31; cf. also Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* III, xi.

The words of Jesus in Jerusalem, "You know me and you know where I am from,"[6] may, of course, be read as a question, but it is far more likely that they are an assertion.[7] If the latter, they suggest that the evangelist believed that Jesus was by no means an obscure or unknown person. Indeed they suggest the precise opposite, that Jesus, His family, and His origin were quite well known. That presumption seems to be confirmed by a remark in John 7:41f., recognizing Galilee as the provenience of Jesus at that time, but an allusion in John 4:43f. intimates that He was not born there.[8] Some kind of curiosity about Jesus's birth is strongly implied in John 8:41 when antagonists taunted Him, "We are not illegitimate; we have a father." It is true that the text adds, "namely, God," but Jesus Himself had already made the same assertion[9] and His hearers had not objected. It seems probable, therefore, that the addition was not part of the argument.

Owing to increasing perception of the historical worth of John's data,[10] it is appropriate to look at what that gospel intimates about the age of Jesus. Three passages may be adduced, two of which have been noted many times before by students.[11] In John 8:57 occurs a hostile protest, "You are not yet fifty years old; have you seen Abraham?" One does not look at a man in his thirties and say, "You are not yet fifty"—he says, "You are not yet forty."[12] On the other hand, the gospel statement is exactly what one says to a man in his mid-forties. And the context shows that the speakers were familiar with Jesus and His origin.[13]

---

[6] John 7:28.

[7] So the Jerusalem Bible and the New English Bible, but the Revised Standard Version treats it as a question.

[8] Jesus declared that a prophet was not honored in his home area, yet when He went into Galilee He was welcomed by the Galilean natives.

[9] John 5:18.

[10] See much bibliographical material assembled by Peder Borgen, "John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative," *New Testament Studies,* V, No. 4 (July 1959), 246-259.

[11] See, e.g., George Ogg, 'The Age of Jesus when he Taught," *ibid,* 291-298.

[12] This observation was made very early; for example, by Irenaeus, second century bishop of Lyons, in his treatise, *Adversus Haereses,* II, 22, 6.

[13] Cf. John 8:41.

There is an earlier allusion giving substance to the foregoing assumption. At the beginning of His ministry (according to John), Jesus gave as a sign destruction of the temple of His body and its resurrection within three days.[14] Listeners, supposing that He spoke of the Herodian Temple, challenged Him with a declaration, "This shrine has been built forty-six years," as if they were saying, "This shrine is as old as you are." In any case the author presumably intended such a concatenation of ideas.

A third possible indication of Jesus's age lies in the story of His healing a paralytic at the pool of Bethesda. The account relates that the man had been crippled thirty-eight years. Amid a throng of sick, blind, and lame persons waiting for the healing waters, Jesus caught sight *(idon)* of this man in particular and recognized *(gnous)* him as one who had been there a long time.[15] The man did not know Jesus,[16] but one surmises that Jesus had often noticed him, perhaps at numerous intervals over the long stretch of thirty-eight years.

If, in view of the preceding considerations, we take seriously the forty-six years of John 2:20, we reach the period 17 B. C. when the *naos* of the Herodian Temple was indeed completed, and perhaps about 15 B. C. as date of Jesus's birth. At His death, therefore, in A.D. 33,[17] He was approximately forty-eight, an age consonant with the datum of John 8:57, "You are not yet fifty."[18] With a single exception, that position agrees with related facts presented in the New Testament. The exception is Luke 3:23, where the writer observed that Jesus was "about thirty years old" at His baptism, although since we do not know the date of baptism that vague allusion may not be a true exception. Even the midrashic statement in Matthew 2:1, that Jesus was born "in the days of King Herod," rings better for a time about 15 B.C., in the heyday of Herod's reign, than for 4-2 B.C. If the latter, it should have read, "in the days when King Herod died."

---

[14] John 2:19-21; cf. Mark 14:58, Matt. 26:61, Acts 6:14.

[15] John 5:6.

[16] Cf. John 5:12f., 15.

[17] The best treatment of the crucifixion date is Paul L. Maier, "Sejanus, Pilate, and the Date of the Crucifixion," *Curch History,* XXXVII, No. 1 (March 1968), 3-13, who makes an unusually strong case for 3 April, A.D. 33.

[18] See the material assembled by Ogg, *Op. cit.,* 293. Although I had reached my conclusions before reading Ogg's discussion, I have been pleased with our general agreement. We approach the problem, however, by slightly different routes.

Other ancient traditions tend to strengthen the foregoing. Symeon, "cousin" of Jesus, was chosen second bishop of Jerusalem after the death of Bishop Jacob. He was reputed to have been a hundred twenty years old[19] at his martyrdom in A. D. 106/7, hence born about 13 B. C. Even if we make allowance for exaggeration, he must have been junior to his predecessor, who was an older foster brother of Jesus and who may have been born around 20 B. C., thus "eightyish" at his murder about A. D. 62.[20] Another foster brother of Jesus, Judah, had at least two grandsons who were from thirty-five to fifty years old in the last decade of the century.[21] By ordinary genealogical calculation, therefore, Judah was born well before the Christian era, possibly as early as 25-20 B. C.

Presumed longevity need not be a disturbing factor. It seems, on the contrary, to have been characteristic. We have only to think of the advanced age of John (Apostle or Presbyter), one hundred at the time of his death about the turn of the century,[22] and Bishop Polycarp, near a hundred at his martyrdom in A. D. 156.[23] According to apocryphal accounts, the mother of Jesus was close to eighty at her dormition[24] and Joseph apparently lived to the age of seventy or eighty.[25] A Biblical source records age of the prophetess Anna as from eighty-four to about a hundred four when she saw the infant Jesus.[26] There is also a Biblical statement that near the end of the first century A. D. Jesus was visualized as white-haired.[27] That text may indeed reflect the Danielic "ancient of days."[28] It may reflect remembrance by one who had seen Bishop Jacob, Bishop Symeon, the Presbyter John, or some other very elderly worthy. Or, it may reflect the writer's attempt to picture Jesus as He might have appeared if living at the end of the century.

---

[19] Hegesippus in Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, xxxii.

[20] Gal. 1:19: Eusebius, *op. cit.,* II, i, xxiii; VII, xix. Eusebius is citing Clement.

[21] Hegesippus in Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, xx, xxxii.

[22] Irenaeus in Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, xxiii; cf. also John 21:23.

[23] *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* IX, 3.

[24] *Protevangelium of James,* XII, 3 states that Mary was sixteen at the birth of her Son, thus born ca. 31 B.C., if Jesus was born ca. 15. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament,* reprint (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), 197, cites some texts stating that her dormition occurred in Jerusalem ten to fifteen years after the resurrection, that is, ca. A.D. 43-48.

[25] *Protevangelium of James,* IX, 2: Joseph an "old man" with children when he was betrothed to Mary, who was then about twelve *(ibid.,* VIII, 2). Supposing "old man" to mean at least over thirty, he was born ca. 55-50 B.C. He must have died ca. A.D. 20-25. See Ogg, *op. cit.,* 293, n. 1.

[26] Luke 2:36f.

[27] Rev. 1:14.

A further suggestion is that the term "disciple" *(mathetes)* carries a probable connotation of being younger than one's teacher or master (cf. the German *Jünger).* In that event Jesus was older than His pupils, the youngest, John, born about A. D. 1, others going back to 12-5 B. C. All in all there seems to be strong intimation that Jesus Himself was born about 15 B. C., a date we mentioned earlier.[29] If that is so, we must then eliminate Luke 3:23 from consideration as a historical datum.[30] Or, alternatively, we may accept it as indicating the baptism of Jesus about fifteen years before His death, thus rendering untenable the much too precise dating in Luke 3:1. It is worth noting that in the Johannine record John the Baptizer speaks of Jesus's baptism as some time in the past. This may be confirmed by a Matthean intimation that the Baptizer's ministry began in the days of Archelaus (3 B.C.—A.D. 6)[31]

If we accept 15 B. C. as probable date of Jesus's birth, the age of forty-eight for His death, an active ministry of fifteen years more or less, and perhaps a specific ministry of three or four years, there is greater opportunity for a number of matters in the gospel which seem to require length of time. For instance, the meager notices of Joseph, foster father of Jesus, would accord with a period while he was still living.[32] When he died about A. D. 20-25 and disappeared from the record, we have references to his widow and orphans, and above all to Jesus's concern for His mother, especially at the crucifixion, when she was sixty to sixty-five years of age.[33]

---

[28] Dan. 7:9, 13; 10:6.

[29] Luke 2:2 can be read that the census took place "before Quirinius was governor of Syria." Since he was governor first between 11 and 7 B.C., this datum accords with our interpretation. See A. J. B. Higginson, "Sidelights on Christian Beginnings in the Graeco-Roman World," *Evangelical Quarterly,* XLI (1969), 197-206; Ogg, *op. cit.,* 297f., is cautious on this matter.

[30] Cf. the influence of Gen. 41:46 and II Sam. 5:4.

[31] John 1:32-34; cf. Matt. 2:22-3:1.

[32] Mark 6:3f., Matt. 13:55f., Luke 4:22; Matt. 1:16, Luke 3:23; Matt. 1:18f., 24, Luke 1:27, 2:4, 16; Luke 2:43; John 1:45, 6:42.

[33] Mark 3:31f., Matt. 12:46f., Luke 8:19f.; John 19:25f.

A longer ministry of fifteen years or thereabouts would allow time to gain a significant following,[34] for extensive teaching, for performance of newsworthy mighty deeds. Without radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and the daily or weekly press, news traveled much more slowly. From John indeed it appears that there were numerous serious and official attempts over an extended period on Jesus's life or on His freedom, and that on many occasions He was successful in escaping them.[35] If, as seems likely, the data in *Toldoth Jeshu* reflect the ancient, no longer extant, gospel of the Hebrews, we have account of at least one previous arrest and escape.[36]

A greater length of time may be illustrated, for example, by studying variations in the Synoptic and Johannine versions of the Temple cleansing. It is usually presumed that they record one and the same occasion, for there are unquestionable similarities in the two accounts. Both note the time as Passover season,[37] place as the Jerusalem Temple,[38] the objects of Jesus's wrath as sellers of doves,[39] the event as driving them out[40] and overturning tables of moneychangers,[41] and the justification as a statement from Scripture.[42] But if we conjecture two such incidents, with considerable lapse of time intervening, we may be nearer the truth, for the dissimilarities are striking and equally important. In John the account adds cattle and sheep to the doves,[43] omits purchasing from the selling,[44] adds another word for "moneychangers,"[45] describes Jesus's act of violence with particularly apt detail, transliterating a Latin word for *whip*,[46] attributes citation of Scripture to later recollection by His disciples rather than to Jesus Himself,[47] cites a notably different Scripture,[48] and concludes the pericope with Jews challenging Jesus's authority rather than their leaders plotting His destruction.[49] Differences appear significant enough to warrant belief that two such episodes occurred,[50] that the Johannine event was the initial one, early in the ministry of Jesus,[51] and that the Synoptists record a *pro forma* action designed to provoke authorities to recall the more serious remoter incident.

---

[34] Related to this is a significant and convincing paper by H. W. Montefiore, "Revolt in the Desert?" *New Testament Studies,* VIII, No. 2 (Jan. 1962), 135-141.

[35] John 5:16; 7:2, 32; 8:59; 10:31f., 39: 11:53f.; 12:36; cf. Luke 13:31-33. See R. S. Barbour, "Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion," *ibid.,* XVI, No. 3 (Apr. 1970), 231-251, esp. 243.

[36] Hugh J. Schonfield, *According to the Hebrews* (London: Duckworth, 1937), 45-47 *(Toldoth Jeshu,* III, 36-43).

[37] Mark 14:1 and John 2:13.

[38] Mark 11:15 and John 2:13f.

[39] Mark 11:15 and John 2:14.

[40] Mark 11:15 and John 2:15.

[41] Mark 11:15 and John 2:15.

[42] Mark 11:17 and John 2:17.

[43] John 2:14.

[44] John 2:14; cf. Luke 19:45.

[45] Cf. Mark 11:15 with John 2:14, but note John 2:15.

The foregoing discussion does not, as a matter of fact, contravene material in the Synoptics. It simply places their meager data in broader perspective. Hurriedly compiled, they telescoped events for their essentially missionary purpose, ignoring chronology. That they served their specific objective well is amply attested by later Christian history. Nonetheless more time than they (apparently) intimate is required for an effort to reconstruct a scientific biography of Jesus.

---

[46] John 2:15.

[47] Cf. John 2:17 with Mark 11:17.

[48] John 2:17 cites Ps. 69:10, while Mark 11:17 cites parts of Isa. 56:7 and Jer. 7:11.

[49] Cf. John 2:18 with Mark 11:18.

[50] Cf. similarly E. D. Johnston, "The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand—an Independent Tradition?" *New Testament Studies,* VIII, No. 2 (Jan. 1962), 151-154.

[51] In John 2:14 it is said that Jesus "found" merchants in the Temple, as though for the first time, whereas Mark 11:15 notes rather casually that He went into the Temple and began immediately to drive out the tradesmen. *Per contra,* see R. Dunkerley, "Lazarus," *ibid.,* V, No. 4 (July 1959), 326f.

AUTHOR-TITLE INDEX TO STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Volumes I-X, 1960-1969

by Obion W. Feagin

About This Madman Stuff. John Pilkington. VII (1966), 65-75

ADAMS, MARTHA LATIMER
  The Greek Romance and William Shakespeare. VIII (1967), 43-52

Aftermath of a Novelist. John Pilkington. X (1969), 1-23

Alleluia: A Word and Its Effect. Allen Cabaniss. V (1964), 67-74

Anti-Christian Myth in James's *The Tree of Knowledge.* Tom J Truss, Jr. VI (1965), 1-4

BAKER, DONALD C.
  Exemplary Figures as Characterizing Devices in the *Friar's Tale* and the *Summoner's Tale.* III (1962), 35-41

  The Poet of Love and the *Parlement of Foules.* II (1961), 79-110

  Some Recent Interpretations of Chaucer's *Hous of Fame.* I (1960), 97-104

BALLEW, HAL L.
  Irving and Ticknor in Spain: Some Parallels and Contrasts. VIII (1967), 57-66

BAYLEN, JOSEPH O.
  G.B.S. on the "Art of Living," 1908. VII (1966), 89-92

  George Moore, W. T. Stead, and the Boer War. III (1962), 49-60

  A Note on William Archer and the *Pall Mall Gazette,* 1888. IV (1963), 21-26

  Oscar Wilde Redivivus. VI (1965), 77-86

  William Archer, W. T. Stead, and the Theatre. Some Unprinted Letters. V (1964), 91-103

Ben Jonson and Shakespeare: 1623-1626. James E. Savage. X (1969), 25-48

Ben Jonson in Ben Jonson's Plays. James E. Savage. X (1969), 25-48

BOSWELL, GEORGE W.
  Picturesque Faulknerisms. IX (1968), 47-56

Proverbs and Phraseology in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* Complex. X (1969), 59-65

Browning's Ambiguities and *The Ring and the Book.* Tom J. Truss, Jr. V (1964), 1-7

Browning's Attitude Toward Miracles. Floyd Ronald Stuart. IX (1968), 1-10

Browning's "Childe Roland" in Light of Ruskin's *Modern Painters.* Tom J. Truss, Jr. II (1961), 13-21

CABANISS, ALLEN

Alleluia: A Word and Its Effect. V (1964), 67-74

Folk-Catholicism in Mississippi. VII (1966), 85-88

Joseph of Arimathea and a Chalice. IV (1963), 61-67

Judith Augusta and Her Time. X (1969), 67-109

The Matron of Ephesus Again: An Analysis. II (1961), 41-53

The Matron of Ephesus: An Identification. III (1962), 75-77

Shakespeare and the Holy Rosary. I (1960), 118-128

The Song of Songs in the New Testament? VIII (1967), 53-56

A Source of Faulkner's *Fable. VI (1965), 87-89*

CAMPBELL, HARRY M.

Some Facts about the Theory of Fictions. I (1960), 51-65

CANNON, CHARLES D.

The Religion of the Anglo-Saxons. V (1964), 15-33

A Warning for Fair Women and the Puritan Controversy. IX (1968), 85-99

Chaucer's Complaints: Stanzaic Arrangement, Meter, and Rhyme. A. Wigfall Green. III (1962), 19-34

Chaucer's "Sir Thopas": Meter, Rhyme, and Contrast. A. Wigfall Green. I (1960), 1-11

The Cloaks of *The Devil Is An Asse.* James E. Savage. VI (1965), 5-14

Cooper's Prairie as Wasteland. Evans Harrington. IV (1963), 27-40

COWLEY, MALCOLM
The Literary Situation, 1965. VI (1965), 91-98

A Crawford Bibliography. John Pilkington. IV (1963), 1-20

DOLLARHIDE, LOUIS E.
The Logic of Villainy: Shakespeare's Use of the Fallacies. X (1969), 49-57

Othello's Descent from Reason. IX (1968), 37-45

The Paradox of Ruskin's Admiration of Renaissance English Writers. VIII (1967), 7-12

Drummond of Hawthornden and the Divine Right of Kings. Charles L. Hamilton. II (1961), 23-27

Echoes of Shakespeare's Sonnets, Epitaph, and Elegiac Poems of the First Folio in Milton's "On Shakespear. 1630." A. Wigfall Green. IV (1963), 41-47

The Effects of Revision in the Beaumont and Fletcher Play, *Wit At Several Weapons.* James E. Savage. I (1960), 32-50

Exemplary Figures as Characterizing Devices in the *Friar's Tale* and the *Summoner's Tale.* Donald C. Baker. III (1962), 35-41

F. Marion Crawford's Lecture Tour, 1897-1898. John Pilkington. I (1960), 66-85

Fathers and Sons in *Absalom, Absalom*! Sarah Latimer Marshall. VIII (1967), 19-29

Faulkner Writes *A Fable.* James W. Webb. VII (1966), 1-13

Folk-Catholicism in Mississippi. Allen Cabaniss. VII (1966), 85-88

Fuller and "The Americanization of Europe's Youth." John Pilkington. VIII (1967), 31-42

G. B. S. On the "Art of Living." Joseph O. Baylen. VII (1966), 89-92

The Genesis of *Mr. Isaacs.* John Pilkington. II (1961), 29-39

The *Genre* of "Dover Beach." Tom J. Truss, Jr. III (1962), 43-48

George Moore, W. T. Stead, and the Boer War. Joseph O. Baylen. III (1962), 49-60

Gibbon and Mohammedanism. Beverly E. Smith. IX (1968), 11-22

The Greek Romance and William Shakespeare. Martha Latimer Adams. VIII (1967), 43-52

GREEN, A. WIGFALL
- Chaucer's Complaints: Stanzaic Arrangement, Meter, and Rhyme. III (1962), 19-34
- Chaucer's "Sir Thopas": Meter, Rhyme, and Contrast. I (1960), 1-11
- Echoes of Shakespeare's Sonnets, Epitaph, and Elegiac Poems of the First Folio in Milton's "On Shakespear. 1630." IV (1963), 41-47
- Meter and Rhyme in Chaucer's "Anelida and Arcite." II (1961), 55-63
- Platonism in the Works of Edmund Spenser. VI (1965), 23-38
- Significant Words in Shakespeare's Sonnets. III (1962), 95-113
- Structure of Three Minor Poems by Chaucer. IV (1963), 79-82
- William Faulkner's Flight Training in Canada. VI (1965), 49-57

HAMILTON, CHARLES L.
- Drummond of Hawthornden and the Divine Right of Kings. II (1961), 23-27
- Notes on Political Poems ca. 1640. I (1960), 129-132

HARRINGTON, EVANS
- Cooper's Prairie as Wasteland. IV (1963), 27-40
- Sensuousness in the Poetry of William Cullen Bryant. VII (1966), 25-42

Henry Blake Fuller's Satire on Hamlin Garland. John Pilkington. VIII (1967), 1-6

Hume's "Umbrage to the Godly" in His *History of England.* Charles E. Noyes. I (1960), 86-96

HUTCHERSON, DUDLEY R.
- Milton's Adam as a Lover. II (1961), 1-11
- Milton's Eve and Other Eves. I (1960), 12-31

"In Another Country": *Three* as Symbol. Rosemary Stephens. VII (1966), 77-83

Irony in Shelley's *The Cenci.* Sara Mason Miller. IX (1968), 23-35

Irving and His "Favorite Author." James W. Webb. III (1962), 61-74

Irving and Ticknor in Spain: Some Parallels and Contrasts. Hal L. Ballew. VIII (1967), 57-66

Irwin Russell's Position in Southern Literature. James W. Webb. IV (1963), 49-59

John Milton's *History of Britain:* Its Place in English Historiography. Michael Landon. VI (1965), 59-76

Joseph of Arimathea and a Chalice. Allen Cabaniss. IV (1963), 61-67

Judith Augusta and Her Time. Allen Cabaniss. X (1969), 67-109

Katherine Anne Porter's Use of Quakerism in *Ship of Fools.* Gerald Walton. VII (1966), 15-23

KNIGHTLY, WILLIAM J.

The Perfidy of the Devil's Council. V (1964), 9-14

LANDON, MICHAEL

John Milton's *History of Britain:* Its Place in English Historiography. VI (1965), 59-76

Literary Conventions in *The Book of the Duchess.* Rebecca Larche Moreton. IV (1963), 69-78

The Literary Situation, 1965. Malcolm Cowley. VI (1965), 91-98

The Logic of Villainy: Shakespeare's Use of the Fallacies. Louis E. Dollarhide. X (1969), 49-57

MARSHALL, SARAH LATIMER

Fathers and Sons in *Absalom, Absalom!* VIII (1967), 19-29

Rationality and Delusion in Jane Austen's *Emma.* IX (1968), 57-67

The Matron of Ephesus Again: An Analysis. Allen Cabaniss. II (1961), 41-53

The Matron of Ephesus: An Identification. Allen Cabaniss. III (1962), 75-77

Meter and Rhyme in Chaucer's "Anelida and Arcite." A. Wigfall Green. II (1961), 55-61

MILLER, SARA MASON
Irony in Shelley's *The Cenci.* IX (1968), 23-35

Milton's Adam as a Lover. Dudley R. Hutcherson. II (1961), 1-11

Milton's Eve and Other Eves. Dudley R. Hutcherson. I (1960), 12-31

MORETON, REBECCA LARCHE
Literary Convention in *The Book of the Duchess.* IV (1963), 69-78

Mummies and Ducks. John Pilkington. VI (1965), 15-22

The New Philosophy and Its Style. Dwight Van de Vate, Jr. IV (1963), 83-91

A Note on William Archer and the *Pall Mall Gazette,* 1888. Joseph O. Baylen. IV (1963), 21-26

Notes on *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* James E. Savage. II (1961), 65-78

Notes on Political Poems ca. 1640. Charles L. Hamilton. I (1960), 129-132

A Novelist and His Public. John Pilkington. III (1962), 79-89

NOYES, CHARLES E.
Hume's "Umbrage to the Godly" in His *History of England.* I (1960), 86-96

Samuel Johnson: Student of Hume. III (1962), 91-94

On Translating Greek Lyric Poetry. Lucy Turnbull. V (1964), 75-89

Oscar Wilde Redivivus. Joseph O. Baylen. VI (1965), 77-89

Othello's Descent from Reason. Louis E. Dollarhide. IX (1968), 37-45

The Paradox of Ruskin's Admiration of Renaissance English Writers. Louis E. Dollarhide. VIII (1967), 7-12

The Perfidy of the Devil's Council. William J. Knightley. V (1964), 9-14

Picturesque Faulknerisms. George W. Boswell. IX (1968), 47-56

PILKINGTON, JOHN
About This Madman Stuff. VII (1966), 65-75

Aftermath of a Novelist. X (1969), 1-23

A Crawford Bibliography. IV (1963), 1-20

F. Marion Crawford's Lecture Tour, 1897-1898. I (1960), 66-85

Fuller and "The Americanization of Europe's Youth." VIII (1967), 31-42

The Genesis of *Mr. Isaacs.* II (1961), 29-39

Henry Blake Fuller's Satire on Hamlin Garland. VIII (1967), 1-6

Mummies and Ducks. VI (1965), 15-22

A Novelist and His Public. III (1962), 79-89

Stark Young at the Southern Literary Festival. V (1964), 35-42

Platonism in the Works of Edmund Spenser. A. Wigfall Green. VI (1965), 23-38

The Poet of Love and the *Parliament of Foules.* Donald C. Baker. II (1961), 79-110

Proverbs and Phraseology in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* Complex. George W. Boswell. X (1969), 59-65

Rationality and Delusion in Jane Austen's *Emma.* Sarah Latimer Marshall. IX (1968), 57-67

The Religion of the Anglo-Saxons. Charles D. Cannon. V (1964), 15-33

Rowan Oak, Faulkner's Golden Bough. James W. Webb. VI (1965), 39-47

Samuel Johnson: Student of Hume. Charles E. Noyes. III (1962), 91-94

SAVAGE, JAMES E.

Ben Jonson and Shakespeare: 1623-1626. X (1969), 25-48

Ben Jonson in Ben Jonson's Plays. III (1962), 1-17

The Cloaks of *The Devil Is An Asse.* VI (1965), 5-14

The Effects of Revision in the Beaumont and Fletcher Play, *Wit At Several Weapons.* I (1960), 32-50

Notes on a *Midsummer Night's Dream.* II (1961), 65-78

Some Antecedents of the Puppet Play in *Bartholomew Fair.* VII (1966), 43-64

Troilus and Cressida and Elizabethan Court Factions. V (1964), 43-66

An Unpublished Epigram, Possibly by John Webster. VIII (1967), 13-18

Sensuousness in the Poetry of William Cullen Bryant. Evans Harrington. VII (1966), 25-42

Shakespeare and the Holy Rosary. Allen Cabaniss. I (1960), 118-128

Significant Words in Shakespeare's Sonnets. A. Wigfall Green. III (1962), 95-113

Simms as Biographer. James W. Webb. II (1961), 111-124

SMITH, BEVERLY E.
Gibbon and Mohammedanism. IX (1968), 11-22

"So, We'll Go No More a Roving." Robert W. Witt. IX (1968), 69-84

Some Antecedents of the Puppet Play in *Bartholomew Fair.* James E. Savage. VII (1966), 43-64

Some Facts about the Theory of Fictions. Harry M. Campbell. I (1960), 51-65

Some Recent Interpretations of Chaucer's *Hous of Fame.* Donald C. Baker. I (1960), 97-104

The Song of Songs in the New Testament? Allen Cabaniss. VIII (1967), 53-56

A Source of Faulkner's *Fable.* Allen Cabaniss. VI (1965), 87-89

Stark Young at the Southern Literary Festival. John Pilkington. V (1964), 35-42

STEPHENS, ROSEMARY
"In Another Country": *Three* as Symbol. VII (1966), 77-83

Structure of Three Minor Poems by Chaucer. A. Wigfall Green. IV (1963), 79-82

STUART, FLOYD RONALD
Browning's Attitude Toward Miracles. IX (1968), 1-10

Tennysonian Aspects of *Maud.* Tom J. Truss, Jr. I (1960), 105-117

Troilus and Cressida and Elizabethan Court Factions.
James E. Savage. V (1964), 43-66

TRUSS, TOM J., JR.
Anti-Christian Myth in James's *The Tree of Knowledge.* VI (1965), 1-4

Browning's Ambiguities and *The Ring and the Book.* V (1964), 1-7

Browning's "Childe Roland" in Light of Ruskin's *Modern Painters.* II (1961), 13-21

The *Genre* of "Dover Beach." III (1962), 43-48

Tennysonian Aspects of *Maud.* I (1960), 105-117

TURNBULL, LUCY
On Translating Greek Lyric Poetry. V (1964), 75-89

An Unpublished Epigram, Possibly by John Webster.
James E. Savage. VIII (1967), 13-18

VAN DE VATE, DWIGHT, JR.
The New Philosophy and Its Style. IV (1963), 83-91

WALTON, GERALD
Katherine Anne Porter's Use of Quakerism in *Ship of Fools.* VII (1966), 15-23

A Warning for Fair Women and the Puritan Controversy.
Charles D. Cannon. IX (1968), 85-99

WEBB, JAMES W.
Faulkner Writes *A Fable.* VII (1966), 1-13

Irving and His "Favorite Author." III (1962), 61-74

Irwin Russell's Position in Southern Literature. IV (1963), 49-59

Rowan Oak, Faulkner's Golden Bough. VI (1965), 39-47

Simms as Biographer. II (1961), 111-124

William Archer, W. T. Stead, and the Theatre. Some Unpublished Letters. Joseph O. Baylen. V (1964), 91-103

William Faulkner's Flight Training in Canada. A. Wigfall Green. VI (1965), 49-57

WITT, ROBERT W.
"So, We'll Go No More a Roving." IX (1968), 69-84