71-15,134

EBERLY, Ralph Stephens, 1944-
JOYCE CARY'S THEME OF FREEDOM AND A COMPARISON WITH JAMES JOYCE AND GRAHAM GREENE.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1970
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

JOYCE CARY'S THEME OF FREEDOM

AND A COMPARISON WITH JAMES JOYCE AND GRAHAM GREENE

by

Ralph Stephens Eberly

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(English Language and Literature)
in The University of Michigan
1970

Doctoral Committee:

Professor James J. Gindin, Chairman
Professor Frank X. Braun
Associate Professor W. H. Clark
Professor Marvin Felheim

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

ABSTRACT

JOYCE CARY'S THEME OF FREEDOM AND A COMPARISON WITH JAMES JOYCE AND GRAHAM GREENE

by
Ralph Stephens Eberly

Chairman: James J. Gindin

The theme of freedom in Joyce Cary's novels has been discussed by John J. Kelleher in his dissertation at the University of Pittsburgh (1964), "The Theme of Freedom in the Novels of Joyce Cary"; and by Charles G. Hoffmann in his book Joyce Cary: The Comedy of Freedom (Pittsburgh, 1964). This theme has not, however, been compared in detail with similar themes in the works of other modern British novelists. This study, therefore, is a consideration in depth of Cary's theme, using and extending the work of Kelleher and Hoffmann, in order to compare it with novels by Joyce and Greene.

Joyce was chosen as a major figure in the contemporary novel and one whose works reflected some of the same artistic and moral concerns as Cary's fiction. Greene was chosen to include comparison with a more recent, living writer, one whose books concern themselves deeply with the religious side of man's nature. By comparing the moral frameworks of the three writers, it was possible to draw conclusions about the various attitudes towards the paradox of man's striving for freedom in a world of limited possibilities.

The primary conclusion was that Cary's characters share with those of Joyce and Greene a "fall into freedom," the moral dilemma of free choice which inevitably brings error and destruction as well as success and glory. Yet, while Cary's people strive for freedom through creative effort coupled with the realization of their limitations, Joyce's people strive for a freedom as a result of unshackling their spirits from the bonds of guilt and the weight of conventions. Greene differs even more, in that his characters fall into freedom through the process of damnation, gaining and losing what freedom is possible for them within the narrow sphere of human relationships. Both Joyce and Cary show that man's freedom is linked to acceptance of the ever-changing quality of daily life; Greene sees hope only in the cataclysmic insight into another being's soul which comes with love in the moment of self-damnation.

Although Cary uses the trilogy form, in which the truth comes to the reader in various versions which must be sorted and weighed before judgment can be made, his moral assumptions can be assertained with little difficulty. He believes that men should live by a faith which can motivate not just their careers but their entire lives, a faith which allows them to pursue their vision of truth into creative freedom. And although Joyce presents a different version of man's "fall into freedom," and Greene emphasizes the inevitability of man's damnation without love, all three present man's freedom within moral contexts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

Introduction. 1

Joyce Cary

I. The African Novels. 10

II. The Chronicles and the Novels of Childhood. 40

III. The First Trilogy 52

IV. The Second Trilogy 72

V. The Unfinished Trilogy. 101

James Joyce

VI. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. . 110

VII. Ulysses 127

Graham Greene

VIII. The Heart of the Matter. 145

IX. The End of the Affair. 154

X. The Quiet American. 162

Conclusion. 167

Notes 169

Bibliography. 175

PREFACE

I wish to acknowledge the special help given me in formulating this study by my chairman, Professor James J. Gindin. In addition, the patience and encouragement of my wife and colleagues has been of immeasurable aid. Thanks are also due to the typist, Mrs. Cecelia H. Milner, without whom the results would be unreadable.

INTRODUCTION

The theme of freedom is central to Joyce Cary's works. In his fiction he presents people trying, as best they can, to achieve personal or social freedom in a world so full of change that nothing can be definitively "achieved" in the sense of being finished, in which change itself becomes the foundation of all freedom through a process of renewal. In such a world to cease to change is to cease to grow; and the inevitable result is captivity. In his nonfiction, however, Cary presents a clearly elaborated theory of human freedom. A brief look at the nonfiction, primarily Power in Men, gives a foundation for one's study of the novels; but it must be noted that the theory of the nonfiction is not identical to the dramatization of freedom which appears in the novels. First of all, Cary's ideas develop, becoming increasingly complex in the later novels; and even in the novels which came before the nonfiction it is clear that Cary makes a great distinction between the ideal concepts of theory and the more murky occurrences of life -- or even an artistic presentation of life.

In Power in Men (1939) Cary presented his most far-reaching explanation of what ideal freedom meant to him in all its aspects -- political, economical, educational, religious, and personal. Although certain of his other nonfiction, such as The Case for African Freedom (1941, revised 1944), Process of Real Freedom (1943), and Britain

and West Africa (1946), apply some of his theory to existing situations in Africa, Power in Men keeps a general focus on man's freedom. Cary defines freedom in this work as an active power to be found in every man, something as innate as the power of thought or motion. Freedom is, in fact, both physical (the ability to will voluntary action, as long as there are no restraints on the body) and mental (the power of thought and creative imagination, if the mind likewise is not restrained). Cary feels that, in the political and social spheres, this power naturally tends to express itself in terms of democracy, since he believes that this is the only form of governmental and social structure which encourages change and individual expression; all other forms will prove too inflexible to adapt to the stresses of human life and will either subtly or violently change at last to democracy of some sort. Freedom is a positive creative force, ever-growing and itself undergoing change; a force which develops through individual and mass efforts alike (education, religion, economy, politics, and the whole mish-mash of influences of man and environment).

If Power in Men presents a rather different idea of freedom than what appears in the novels, this difference is more evident in the other treatises. The Case for African Freedom, in its insistence on proper education and economic groundwork before colonies are politically "freed," is much closer to the simple issues presented in the African novels than the later ones; but even so there is a decided distinction

between the theoretical benevolent overall policy which might bring about stable and constructive self-determination and what actually takes place in colonial or native governments and societies. Although not as complex as his later works, the African novels show the paradoxical nature of change, the twist of fate which brings evil out of good intentions and good out of mistakes. At no time do Cary's ideal notions of freedom blind him to the fact that seldom if ever do men's actions achieve the desired results. He is aware that it is only by almost superhuman effort that one maintains, even for a short time, the proper balance of power and flexibility necessary to remain creatively free.

As indicated, freedom and creativity go together in Cary's thinking. Man tends to become free when he is developing his creative talents, and, if he is free to express his imagination, he tends to be more able to create. The idea of responsibility also enters in, but as a point of disparity between the ideal of the nonfiction and the artistic reality of the fiction: man should be not only free, by nature, to make choices which can lead to creative freedom, but he should be bound by the consequences of those choices. However, this is not always the case in life, as Cary makes manifestly evident in the novels (Gulley Jimson's roguish career is a good example). From an ideal social point of view, responsibility means that men should temper their actions in order to live in harmony with their fellow men, as well as with the natural world and with

themselves. But in fact some men, like Gulley, are more creative when they put their art above social considerations. Cary suggests that there is a subtle demarcation between the natural, social and personal capabilities of man, and that the creative man is the one who constantly tests these boundaries to see if he cannot safely go a little farther. This, he states, is a compulsion due to the fact that man is "condemned to be free" (as Sartre puts it in Being and Nothingness). Cary's people therefore are forever pitting themselves against the existing boundaries of life and action, whether they be "schools" of art and static views of history (Gulley Jimson) or unimaginative and undemocratic types of government (Chester Nimmo) or narrow and dogmatic concepts of religion (Walter Preedy). They test not only their own abilities to rise to the challenges which meet them, but their abilities to win support from others, whether by honest appeal on the basis of their constructive efforts or by cunning and trickery in the name of that overriding goal. Although the artist-free man implicitly realizes that total freedom is impossible, he is willing to strive to his fullest towards the point of precarious balance between the greatest creative freedom and that chaos in which creative effort no longer is possible.

Gulley Jimson is contrasted with Tom Wilcher, not because Gulley despises those beautiful things which Wilcher claims to believe in; but because Gulley has managed to create a free world through vital energy of which Wilcher,

given up wholly to abstract thinking, has never been capable. Behind Gulley's seemingly total iconoclasm is a belief in allowing change, not only in art but in history, politics, and everything else, in the firm belief that only through such change can life and freedom continue (or for that matter ever be gained). Wilcher, however, having never come into his own creative powers when he was young, looks back to the past as a time when life was fuller, more beautiful, and people were more sensitive to the real values of life. He allows his abstract review of the past to glamorize his brother and sister, who were dynamic and creative; and he manages to misread Sara's character in the same way, making her an abstraction, too. He decides that she is the personification of a Christian pilgrim, capable of taking each day as it comes; when actually she is merely amoral, totally without values other than a love of life and pleasure and people. She, the Female of the triad, cannot believe in ideas or codes, only in herself and her female vitality. But, having no codes except that of survival, she can accept any idea temporarily, when it becomes advantageous to do so. Her willingness to accept suggestions helps mislead Wilcher, who proves himself no deep judge of human character anyway.

In this situation, as in others which Cary presents, the artist is a creator in conflict with society in general, which tends to preserve the <u>status quo</u> against whatever it feels to endanger it -- such as "immoral" art. The artist

is also in conflict with men like Wilcher who abstract the vitality out of life, who become separated from the actual creative process of free living by the barrier of abstract thought; and with women like Sara who try to channel or limit the creative power of the artist by domesticating him. From the point of view of society, the woman's dedication is of a two-fold nature: the domestication of the artist would satisfy society by channelling and limiting the artist's powers, lessening the destructive possibilities; but since that domesticity is amoral, natural, rather than social, the relationship often strikes society as degenerate and immoral. In the Blakean terms of the first trilogy, the artist recognizes the woman's influence as an attempt to limit his power; he therefore tries to keep her for his pleasure and comfort without allowing her to draw him into forms of behavior which, while socially comfortable, might limit his creativity. Since the amoral woman might, if left to her own devices, follow the way of least resistence into acceptable social behaviour, the artist is then blamed for "leading a poor girl astray." While this means very little if anything to the artist himself, it adds another missile to the arsenal of those who, for whatever reason, see him as a threat to their peace and tranquility. Such enemies may help bring about the artist's downfall sooner than he might have accomplished it on his own. In the Blakean terms borrowed from "The Mental Traveller," the woman is both crucifier and saviour of the artist, both

his domestic jailor and his means of escape through love and sexuality into imaginative creativity.

Cary's women are consistently amoral. The artist is more complex: he is, even while breaking rules of conventional thought and behaviour, realizing his individual tendency towards freedom. He knows that the goal towards which he strives transcends ordinary social or moral bounds. While one might argue (from Cary's own nonfiction) that the final destruction of the artist, or the curtailment of his activities, which he himself generally brings about, is proof of irresponsibility towards society and self, Cary seems to feel otherwise. The activities of the artist, chaotic or destructive as they seem, serve to wake the world to new possibilities, to start or continue the inevitable and necessary movement towards change which makes life what it should be. The artist's free choice of his goal in the face of overwhelming odds is as close to heroic as man can come today, and death in defense of the cause is, if absurd and sometimes laughable, also somewhat glorious.

Although many others before him have dealt with the extremely complex problems involved in man's search for freedom in a world of conflicting forces, Cary's treatment is sufficiently different to set it apart. It bears relation to the thoughts of several writers of philosophy, and the theme of freedom has been central to the works of many novelists. Of these latter James Joyce and Graham Greene

have been chosen for comparison with Cary: Joyce because his work preceeded Cary's and is generally accepted as part of the modern British novel; Greene because his work is contemporary with Cary's later work and gives a different aspect of human freedom.

Cary's idea of freedom strikes something of a balance between a freedom which is philosophical, social and political and one which is religious and personal, too. Yet, as seems evident in the novels, his concepts of freedom are not too rigidly consistent. Even in his nonfiction, where he tries to explain clearly what it is, he points out repeatedly the extreme complexity of human creative freedom. It is complex because human nature is complex and because anything predicated on constant change is hard to characterize finally.

The philosophical basis of Cary's ideas, at least as presented in Power in Men, derives from a disagreement with John Stuart Mill's definition of freedom as "lack of restraint." This, Cary points out, is a negative approach; he prefers to call freedom a power, paraphrasing Bentham's famous concept to produce this definition of social freedom of democracy: "the greatest freedom for the greatest number." In the novels, of course, Cary seems much more apt to follow Blake than the more formal philosophers. And the result is that, from a purely philosophical point of view, Cary's definition and use of freedom is arguable. The question ultimately to be answered in this discussion is whether his

ideas of freedom as presented in the novels bear any relation to the ideas in Joyce's and Greene's novels.

Several works have been written on the subject of Cary's theme of freedom, including primarily J. J. Kelleher's dissertation, "The Theme of Freedom in the Novels of Joyce Cary" (U. of Pittsburgh, 1964) and Charles G. Hoffmann's Joyce Cary: The Comedy of Freedom (1964). Neither of these excellent books deals in depth with the relation of Cary's ideas to other novelists, however, which allows ample room for such a study. Andrew Wright, whose Joyce Cary: A Preface to His Novels is a very good general study of Cary, does not deal specifically with the theme of freedom. So these writers will be referred to only briefly, at certain points in the following discussion, although it will be understood that they have provided the foundation and direction for this work.

I. THE AFRICAN NOVELS

Cary wrote four novels set in Africa, and these books form an obvious group within the whole of his fiction. In these novels Cary presents a world in which the forces which produce and oppose freedom are rawer, simpler, than those found in the sophisticated world of modern Europe. Cary saw Africa as a land in which creative freedom derived from a "war" between the various cultural, religious and social ways of life represented by the native and colonial groups and individuals who came in constant conflict with each other.[1]

A. Aissa Saved

Aissa Saved (1932)[2] deals with conflicts which center on the religious involvement of one native girl, showing how her naive enthusiasm leads to her death. The primary conflict is between Aissa's native paganism and the Christianity to which she repeatedly turns when the old order cannot provide a stable world for her. But "Christianity, primitively understood,"[3] is hardly more stable. The book shows, without explicity condemning them, how little religions can do to provide order in the face of "religious instinct."[4]

But Aissa Saved is not an attack on religion, per se. Wright points out the fact "that no final resolution is possible until death itself" as one of "the glorious and the fatal outcomes of freedom."[5] He notes that all of the African novels deal with freedom, exploring its facets through the conflicts between religions, or, in the other

novels, those also between economies, educations, politics, and whole ways of life. Religion, to the extent that it gives one a faith by which to live fully, is necessary to freedom. But Cary feels that education and money and the system of government under which one lives are also quite important in viewing the total question of human freedom. Yet each of these forces, unwisely brought to bear on a primitive people, may cause more suffering than good by undermining the steadiness of traditions, no matter how backward, which had given some manner of order to life. Without adequate foundations on which to build a new life, the "freedoms" which seem so glorious in theory may devolve into little more than chaotic destruction (as happens so often in Cary's novels).

Cary repeatedly shows the ironic effects which efforts to promote more enlightened policies bring. The Carrs, for instance, sincerely think they are providing their mission pupils with insight into the true religion, as well as facts and examples of civilized behavior which will help free them from their primitive surroundings; but the teaching is spotty, at best (as Cary makes manifest in the opening chapters), and the Carrs' example is as much that of bickering as of civilized self-control. The <u>feeling</u> which the pupils get, one of enthusiasm and an almost mystic at-oneness with Jesus, is what drives them to the excesses with which the book is centrally concerned. The irony of such pseudo-education, and the problems which it causes,

is reflected also in the suspicions of the Emir's council: they know how precariously life is balanced on traditions and respect for elders. Education, in the white man's sense of the word, has come to mean an upsetting of these traditions, together with lack of respect towards the elders and rulers who represent the old order. The young Mohammedan, Ali, embodies for the Council all the worst aspects of education as taught by the British Government School: Ali not only laughs at the rulers, his betters, but he assumes airs unfit for any but the Emir himself. The fact that Ali's laughter is justified -- he has learned the real reason for rain and derides the local superstitions -- and that his airs are no worse than those of any romantic schoolboy whose sights have suddenly been lifted to the skies is all the more ironic in that Ali is still trapped in a society where his knowledge is worse than useless -- where it becomes ultimately fatal.

The irony of freedom-through-change is that it often causes as much if not more suffering to the good, innocent, and well-intentioned as to the evil, crafty and malicious. Bradgate, who wishes to bring a measure of freedom to his area by raising the economic standard through increased trade, feels that a bridge over the Akoko River would serve this purpose by allowing increased access to the richer north. But, as in Mister Johnson where Rudbeck acts under the same belief, the good accomplished is singularly diminished by the evil which opening the primitive area

brings: an increase of crime, and a general disorienting of the settled way of life of the area. While this is natural and even necessary to the process which produces freedom, the people responsible are seldom happy with the results. They, too, are aware of how much of the old order which is lost was good, or beautiful; and they wonder whether the change was actually worth it.

This question always seems to crop up in Cary's novels: Are simple people like Aissa and Ali really any better for the trouble which people like Bradgate and the Carrs took to "educate" them? The answer is implicitly on the side of change, the assumption being that these two died somehow "saved" by their beliefs, somehow freer for their contact with the forces of change. But there is at all times a deep ambivalence in Cary's statements; for, as stated above, every action has it ironic overtone. The free man in Cary's system is the one who gains and retains the maximum of creative power by which to express his potential; while alive Aissa and Ali were infinitely more free than the Council and most of the others around them, but dead they are not free at all. Whether death is seen as a glorious finale or a kind of failure, it is certainly an end of creative freedom.

Although Aissa is subjected to the blows of fate and the pressures of the fickle crowds who can as easily hate as love her, it is her own action which directly causes her death. Perhaps this is her ultimate freedom, that she

could choose her own death. But did she realize that this was what she chose? The story has shown her capable of almost any action to preserve her life heretofore. But at the climax there is a deliberate process of denial of all that has meant the most to her: Gajere, her lover; Abba, her child; and then herself, too, as the ultimate sacrifice to the Jesus in whom she now believes so strongly that he speaks within her.

But, ironically, this spirit seems to be the echo of Aissa's emotions alone, sparked by the rhythms of one particular hymn, and it is this hymn rather than thought which activates both her reconversion at the mission and her subsequent sacrificial decisions. This suggests that Aissa, far from being free in the sense in which Ali was striving -- free in mind as well as body and soul -- was more an instrument upon which the emotions of others played, especially with the catalyst of the hymn.[6]

The Carfax Edition of Aissa Saved includes Cary's preface explaining the genesis of the book and several of the ideas in it. Originally his idea had been to show Ali, whose role was to have been central, as a native whose sense of dedication to duty transcended the local norm. But Ali's concern is education; and as the story developed, Aissa became more central "because she was more central to a deeper interest, that of religion. . . . The fundamental question for everybody is what they live by; what is their faith."(8)[7]

Cary also becomes concerned with the question: "How sound is the faith; how will it stand the big knock; how deep does it send its roots into reality." He says:

> I think, from experience, that some Christian missions do not realize the effect of telling African primitives that God is 'Almighty' or 'Omnipotent' and allowing them, uncorrected, to suppose that this means not 'the final power in the Universe' but the 'one who can do all things.' So that they blame God for a sore throat, and thank him for a fine day or a good bargain. (8-9)

It is clear that Aissa's relation to Jesus is often on the basis of thankfulness for services rendered; or of repentent suffering when things go wrong, realizing that this means Jesus (God) is displeased with her. Yet her faith is so deep and sincere, in its way, that she can face death full of the conviction that God will respond to her repentent sacrifice either with an outright miracle, saving her life, or give her a happier life in a heaven full of just those things which she most enjoyed on earth -- Gajere, Abba; beer and love.

Another insight into what Cary has attempted in his novels comes from his statement that he discovered, in writing Aissa Saved, the basic injustice of life. There is inescapable injustice in life, evil which comes unexpectedly from the best of intentions. The Carrs' good intentions in trying to teach religion of a more civilized sort to such dregs of society as Aissa and others ends in riot, bloodshed, and general destruction of all the tenuous order which the mission had established. The puny list of positive effects

which the uproar causes (159) -- a bit more money for Bradgate's bridge, five new pupils sent to the government school, several new missions set up -- is an ironic note to the much larger list of human suffering and loss. So much, it seems, has been given for almost nothing. But, Cary says, life is like this, full of apparently needless strife and injustice.[8] Yet this injustice, inextricably interwoven into the fabric of change, suggests the corollary that the actions of every free man, aimed as they are at constructive creation, manage nonetheless to endanger not only himself but those he loves and even the innocent bystanders. For like the faith that moves mountains, the creative power of the free man is somewhat cataclysmic: it shakes the very foundations of the order upon which the average man walks so trustingly.

One of the ironies which the book communicates is that the artistic goal towards which one strives cannot, when and if it is ever seen clearly (for it cannot, by nature, ever be fully achieved, since it is part and parcel of change itself), be shared with others. It simply cannot be valid for anyone but the one who created it. Cary puts it that "different people needed different kinds of faith, 'true' for them."(10) This is why Aissa is "saved" by a faith wholly different from that which Hilda Carr thinks she has taught her. Although, by Hilda's standards, Aissa has distorted the religion given her, she finally created for herself the truest faith possible for her, even though

it does destroy her and itself in her. It is truest because through it Aissa achieved the greatest degree of freedom possible for her. It is always possible that people more conscientious or capable than the Carrs in the mission or Bradgate in political position might have contained the excessive energies of Aissa and her followers by better teaching and wiser rule. But the irony is that, without omniscience or a general severity contrary to the civilized society towards which they were trying to lead the natives, neither Bradgate nor the Carrs could have done more than they did. Each person was acting to the fullest of his ability and was defeated merely by the chance injustice which comes with change.

But the idea of injustice is important here: it assumes that there exists a code of justice external to man's somewhat arbitrary codes. Cary finds this absurd. The truth is that men try their best to live in cooperation but that natural forces exist which tend to subvert the codes of social life. It is obvious that man's striving towards personal freedom, the power to create his own world, often has little or nothing to do with codes of conduct established previously by other men. It is this which makes the actions of so many of Cary's artist-figures seem immoral or anti-social; actually they are responding to the dictates of their own creative goals, quite "moral" in terms of these visions. Aissa, however, falls into a simpler category than Gulley Jimson or Chester Nimmo; she has none of their ability

to understand the moral implications of what she does. She is motivated on a much less complex level, an emotional feeling for religion. Yet, in terms of the raw force of power which Cary often associates with his most artistic free men, she seems repeatedly capable of freedom. The world which she creates, short-lived as it is, is one in which she can act as freely and as fully as she desires. Wright, however, points out that this book has no character who really fits the definition of creative freedom: a man creating "a free world for himself."[9] He feels that Aissa's world is more a result of almost fortuitous happenings around her, not so much the outcome of her own creative powers. In this view, she is more like Sara Monday -- the amoral female, energetic and vibrant -- than like the free artist. Wright sees both Carr and Bradgate as slightly free and creative; but it is Ali, who might have achieved a freedom through education, who is the closest to the free man.[10] Yet, in the finished version, with its emphasis on Aissa, Ali is lost, a minor character at best.

B. An American Visitor

Cary's next book, An American Visitor (1933),[11] deals not only with the conflicts in politics and religion between two different cultures but also those conflicts within each culture. The political figure, Bewsher, has tried over more than ten years to teach cooperation among the various Birri tribes under his control. But he has been, until the present, thwarted by traditional rivalries between tribes

and by the division of rule in each tribe. The nominal leaders, the chiefs, have no real authority; power lies in the hands of the ju-ju priests, who are less inclined to do anything which would lessen their control.

But even Bewsher's culture, represented in Africa by the colonial community of traders, miners, political men, and mission people, is rent by **dissension**. The miners resent Bewsher's protection of the Birri reserve, wanting it opened to their exploitation. The mission is the other important influence, since it tends to subvert tribal laws and customs by luring women and sometimes men away. Since Bewsher is trying to balance a tricky situation, one which will turn out the way he wants only if Birri customs are kept strong and intact, he wants both the missions and the prospectors kept away. However, the other political men involved cannot see the purpose or legality of this; and so Bewsher's careful plans are jeopardized. The ironical situation is that, although Bewsher dictatorially favors curtailing the rights of the miners and the mission, his reasons are the very best: an effort to make life better and free[12] for the thousands of Birri under his jurisdiction.

Another irony occurs when the "American visitor," Marie Hasluck, whose views of the African primitive are distorted by anarchistic ideas of the "noble savage," converts suddenly to a trust in God due to the mission influence. She has, in characteristic Carian improbable

fateful progression of events, become Bewsher's mistress and then his wife.[13] And her newfound faith comes to the test just at the moment when Bewsher himself, his life in danger, falters in his implicit trust of his Birri: Marie decides to trust God to see that he will not be killed, and of course he is. Thus, ultimately, the climax is a conflict between the ideas of Marie -- call them religious, mystical, naive; perhaps amoral -- and the political and humanly practical beliefs of Bewsher. Although she is presented sympathetically (Wright points out that this is one of the major differences between Cary's and Greene's naive Americans), Marie's freedom, such as it is, derives from Bewsher's vitality. And the very direction in which her efforts go -- that of achieving a happy home in England for them -- is detrimental to Bewsher's creative schemes. Had she not been responsible for his physical death in Nigeria, one supposes that she might have brought about a more serious spiritual starvation through her "domestication." One can not picture so autocratic and creative a man settling down to retirement in a quiet English village; so perhaps his death, ironic as it is, comes as the only possible glorious ending to Bewsher's career. Even though he views it, in the moment of final realization, as a joke on him (229).

In the preface Cary explains that his initial idea for this story had come from the glimpse of anarchy which an American friend had given him in her educational theories. She had felt that small children should be allowed to "decide all moral issues for themselves, without guidance."(7)

This idea, carried over to apply to primitive peoples, is the central germ of Marie's naivete; for she, like her prototype, cannot at first distinguish between the true freedom of the mature adult and the need for guidance and restriction of the young or immature mind. Marie assumes that the Birri can be at the same time free of all the vices which afflict modern western society and yet naturally capable of all the social virtues. But her worst mistake is oversimplification: she misses the subtle mixture of truth and falsehood, goodness and evil which characterize all societies. She finally learns that one can only live by accepting the "insecurity of things." (193)

But her inherent desire for order, for a simple belief to replace her lost belief in "the natural order of things," leads her to the simplistic belief in God which results in Bewsher's death. She becomes cynical, but perhaps she has learned a lesson which, in a small way, makes her freer. She tells Cottee and Gore:

> 'Doesn't it make you laff the way I fell for it. And it wasn't John Dobson's god -- it was just the oldest kind of juju. But I guess religion is like real estate -- the Get-rich-quick always picks upon the worst lot because it looks so cheap -- he doesn't wait to be stung -- he just stings himself.'(237)

Marie's change has been somewhat extreme: from naive but self-assured reporter to penitent but cynical widow in eighteen months. But Cary lets one see that the old mystical Marie is still there, beneath the hardening experiences. Her prayer -- or meditation -- on Bewsher's grave (239)

expresses her feeling of oneness with Bewsher even though he is dead. Cary seems to present this as the natural thing for her to do now, although Cottee, a practical but self-seeking miner who is a continual foil for the romantic and humanistic thoughts and actions of Marie and Bewsher, thinks her ridiculous. She is, rather, the somewhat foolish, somewhat heroic modern woman, who by the very nature of her female dedication to him could recognize the freedom and creativity of the artist in Bewsher. And it is this realization and dedication which gives her a freedom from the pettiness of the workaday world, represented to the end by Cottee.

At the death of an artist such as Bewsher or Gulley Jimson all that remains of what they have striven to accomplish is the memory of their energy and personalities; these are much more viable than the few physical monuments which they may have completed. It is this memory of their vitality, their vision, their freedom and creativity which is the most lasting monument of all, for it tends to perpetuate some of the artist's power by sparking the idea of freedom in others. Just as Nosey Barbon remains, improbable successor though he seems, after Gulley's accident; so Marie, influenced deeply by Bewsher's example, remains to honor the artist and possibly to strive, in some small way, to create a freer world because of him.

Although Marie is educated and given to mental approaches to life (as Cottee says, she likes to talk

of "'Beauty, truth and goodness.'"), her actions seem motivated by emotional involvement, making her somewhat akin to Aissa. Cary intended Marie to be "'an anarchist of the most extreme kind'"(7); and this seems to apply equally to Aissa. Both women tend to do what they want, ignoring authority. Aissa, for instance, ignores the mission orders not to stir up trouble with the pagans; she feels a deeper sense of allegiance to her "Spirit." Marie begins with free love, a general hedonistic disregard for the so-called dictates of social morality; and she later disregards Bewsher's command for his gun, preferring that he be forced to depend on the God in whom she thinks she believes. But they are surrounded by people who at times make clear their belief that authority can become an impediment to be circumscribed: the Carrs openly express their dislike for Bradgate's order restraining mission gatherings, while Bradgate himself puts his bridge-building above orders from his superiors; and Bewsher makes a game of avoiding orders from Alabaster, his superior, by staying away from stations where wires or other messages are likely to come. Both men, as well as the missioners, encourage somewhat unlicensed behavior by their example; this type of character is more fully drawn in the district officer, Rudbeck, of Mister Johnson.

Despite Bewsher's prominance as the artist-figure, it is Marie who is central; Bewsher figures as the catalyst for the change in her thinking and feeling. It is her

character into which the reader comes to see most clearly, seeing Bewsher mostly through his actions and occasional statements.[14] In this way the book foreshadows A Fearful Joy, which follows Tabitha Baskett: she, too, is presented in depth; but it is from Bonser that she derives the freedom which she enjoys only for brief periods of her life. It is not until the trilogies and The Captive and the Free that Cary delves deeply into the personality and character of the artist himself. In these earlier books there is not only too great a profusion of characters to make this possible, but the center of focus is just as likely to be on a derivative or less mature person, trying to achieve freedom but not of the stature of Gulley or Chester.

C. The African Witch

Cary's most successful African novel is The African Witch (1936),[15] in which the whole spectrum of the "war" between cultures and within them is presented in a balanced manner. The light and comic Mister Johnson, which Cary enjoyed most, seems like a lyric epilogue to the statement of The African Witch. He began, he explains in the preface, with an idea of "the Black Prince," who would have been "a much more violent and hysterical man than Aladai." He meant to trace the power "of religious imagination, for good or evil, on men's minds and so upon history."(9) What developed was a book in which, although he is still central, Aladai shares the dominant position with his sister Elizabeth, the witch. And yet she is certainly not the

artist-free figure; to the extent that such a figure emerges, it is Louis Aladai, despite his lack of adequate power to upset the ju-ju priesthood of his sister.

The question of education is more important than in the earlier books, although religion remains central, too. Cary believes that education of a few, if it is high quality, is better than mass education in which none receive the best instruction. These few can then help educate their fellows. This is the proposition behind Aladai's education at Oxford: he, being a Rimi Prince, returns in the hope of gaining the throne, with British help, and ruling his people in benevolent wisdom. Through good educational programs, he will overcome the forces of superstition which plague his people. However, due to the conflicts of Louis' ideas with those of his own people and the British who control Rimi, he fails.

Cary makes two points in his preface which are useful in understanding this book: 1) that universal education is not, as popularly thought, the cure-all for "barbarity and violence"; nor 2) is it "a natural and 'obvious' right of mankind." (12-13) The reason for education is to provide one's fellow men with enlightenment, on moral or religious grounds. Education is important

> not because it will give /the Africans/ peace and happiness, but for the same reason that they desire wealth (if only a reach-me-down suit of cotton and a Manchester cloth for their wives) to satisfy need, to create some glory and dignity for themselves and those they love.(13)

Aladai seeks to free his people by giving them this sort of glory and dignity; yet fate seems bent on turning his efforts against him, letting him fall victim to the forces which oppose his plans through the weakness of his sentimental nature.

It is almost inevitable, given Cary's somewhat cynical attitude towards idealistic naiveté, that Aladai's single-handed determination to change the centuries-old patterns of his peoples' life would be doomed. But it is not merely the failure of the British to champion his cause, nor the underhanded scheming of the Mohammedans who support Salé, which defeat Louis: it is ultimately his involvement with the British girl Dryas Honeywood, leading to his humiliation by Rackham(206-7), which defeats him; his injured pride makes him eschew the British, disdaining their help. Naturally, Salé becomes a shoo-in.

But the emotional center of the book, Elizabeth, is also a force with which Louis has to contend. He needs her help when he thinks he might win the Emirate, because she controls -- through fear and respect -- the loyalties of nearly all the Rimi women and many of the men, too It is ironic, first, that Louis thinks he can use Elizabeth to establish his power and then, in keeping with his enlightened principles, destroy her ju-ju house and its influence. Elizabeth helps him because she knows, once he is in power, that she can control him.[16] The irony increases when one finds that Coker, the supposedly Christian preacher who

aids Louis' campaign, is heavily embued with the spirit of ju-ju. Like Aissa, Coker adapts the Christian symbols to the framework of the old religion, with its emphases on fertility and bloody sacrifice. Louis' second severe shock, after his humiliation by Rackham, is the discovery that Coker's popularity has increased with the masses due to a strong ju-ju symbol: the shrunken head of the missioner Schlemm.

The book presents the gradual undermining of Louis' idealism, his step-by-step reversion to the "old ways" when he finds his hopes and plans rebuffed and attacked on every hand. At last he comes to feel the white man's education, religion, and society in general useless in his efforts to free Rimi; and he joins Coker again for one last futile show of force against the oppressors, as he sees them now -- the British. Louis knows spears have no chance against guns, but by this time he would rather die in this gesture than go on living under the double tyranny of the British and the ju-ju. The ironic touch with which Cary ends the book is telling: Judy Coote, Louis' friend at Oxford, Rackham's one-time fiancée, tries to teach English to Akande Tom, because she regards him as Louis' friend. But she misunderstands his reasons for wanting to learn to read and write: she thinks it is pure desire for knowledge, to free himself from ignorance; actually, as he is the former lover of Elizabeth, he hopes to "learn book" and thus gain a power greater than Elizabeth's

ju-ju which he fears. And well he might fear it. He has betrayed Elizabeth earlier to Salé's men, who tried to kill her; she not only wants Tom back as her slave and lover, but she wants to punish him. In the end, the ju-ju queen wins, and British education topples in its last vestige to the power of witchcraft in Rimi.[17]

As in An American Visitor, this book deals with the changes of attitude of a sensitive young woman. Judy sets the station in an uproar because she treats Louis as a friend when he and Coker go into the "reserved" section at the Rimi racecourse. Although all the British would accept polite action towards a black at Oxford, it "simply is not done" in Africa. The blacks must be made to know their place. Judy professes to feel that her friendship for Louis, however, is more important than some stuffy social conventions; and she proceeds to jeopardize her engagement with Rackham in order to uphold her principles. And though Judy is not another Marie Hasluck, a naive idealist, she manages unwittingly to stir up extra hatred against Louis, leading to the inevitable conclusion of his frustration and death. For her friendship -- and later that of Dryas Honeywood-- is misleading to the young prince: her support leaves him totally unprepared for the bitterness with which the whites finally attack him. Thus Judy's counsel, less emotional and steadier than Coker's as it is, is nonetheless bad for Louis.

Right from the beginning, when Judy talks with Louis of his plans for Rimi, he mentions the forces which

will cause his downfall: his outward acceptance of European dress and customs, which some of the British will resent; Coker's "Christian" ju-ju, which Louis will not be able to control; and, of course, the older, stronger ju-ju of Elizabeth, which will continue unaffected by Louis' life and death (25). But it is primarily the products of European "civilization" -- that amorphous culture which Louis thinks can free his people from superstition and strife -- which cause his downfall: Rackham, Prince, Honeywood, and the women like Mrs. Pratt whose idle talk of supremacy is the least "supreme" aspect of their would-be civilization. Yet, beneath the veneer of Europeanism which Louis finally sloughs in indignation is the ju-ju, "the blood of what you call Rimi civilization," as he tells Judy (24). And it is this from which Louis never really gets free. Cary's suggestion is that, aside from the ritual over which the African Witch presides, there are aspects of ju-ju which are inherent in men, not just in Africa: feelings and emotions which, like spells and magic, have greater power over his life than reason or the habits of any amount of education. Louis is not only the victim of the many plots around him but of this ju-ju within his own blood.

Elizabeth is described in terms which are similar to descriptions of other "spellbinders," but she cannot be seen as a free artist. The ju-ju priest or priestess, Cary tells us, has

> a quality which marks him off from others -- the quality of power. A woman may have the quality

> as well as a man, and then she may become a priestess. The power is real, and so no one would dream of setting it aside by artificial rules limiting priestcraft to one sex or caste.(33)

Yet there is a world of difference between the Carian artist who, through his creative power, tries to make himself and others free, and one who, like Elizabeth, simply creates some order through a tyranny of fear and punishment.[18] It is Louis who is the free man, in spite of his failure to implement the metamorphosis of Rimi through education. Even in the light of the seemingly total destruction of any lasting effect of Louis' dream, the fact remains that he dreamed it. And for awhile he lived with the energy of creative conviction for the purpose of making that dream come true.

D. Mister Johnson

After the broad scheme of The African Witch, Cary limited his approach and experimented with a new style in Mister Johnson (1939).[19] He limits himself to one principle character, the native clerk Johnson; and he uses the present tense to give a sense of immediacy. The result is a delightfully vivid fantasy about an uneducated young man whose boundless ambitions and imagination make him think that he can accomplish anything -- and almost succeed.

Unlike Louis Aladai, for whom education is the factor upon which one tries to build a free world, Mister Johnson uses the fantasies of a fertile imagination, coupled with great energies and an indomitable spirit, to cope with the everchanging world in which he finds himself.[20] His naive

good nature does not safeguard him, however, from the charge, cast by some of his fellows, of being overly ambitious: the "Mister," a term of honor reserved for higher persons, is a mock-title bestowed on him by his cynical associate Ajali. Ajali is the voice of doom, constantly prophesying the punishment which he feels ought by right to fall on the head of the lawless and flagrantly wild Johnson. And what is amazing is not that Johnson does indeed come to grief, but that it takes so long for retribution to catch up with him. The implicit answer is that Justice is just as blind to actual wrongdoing as the gullible people who represent it; and the rest of the world will let the crafty artist - con man woo them with his actual or seeming opulence. There is an obvious correlation between the ease with which Johnson cons his fellows or woos their silence through his generous gifts and the way in which Chester Nimmo and Bonser and even Gulley Jimson get around the general public. Common man, Cary seems to say, is very gullible; and when not gullible, corruptible.

The book opens with Johnson's first wild impulse: to win Bamu for his wife. To do this, he has to convince her family that he is rich, althoughhe is merely a clerk. He manages to get Bamu, but not before he loses almost all available assets: money, clothes -- all but his pants and his English shoes, a mark of his self-appointed rank as an "Englishman." But for all the trouble to which he goes to get Bamu, Johnson finds her very resistant to his plans to make her into his image of a "government wife"

(another feather in his cap, a status-symbol). She remains bewildered by his antics, frightened by his attempts to teach her "civilized" ways of dress and action, and generally a static center in the never-ending change which characterizes Johnson's world. She remains indifferent to all the crises or successes which her husband meets, coming and going as others tell her (primarily her family), rarely expressing more than mild confusion at Johnson's rapsodies over her beauty or rages at her stubborn adherence to the old ways.

Bamu's reaction is that of most of the local people to Johnson, who is a "stranger" (anyone not born and bred to the local customs). They assume that he is mad, but decide that as long as he confines his madness to enriching the local people -- either by giving too much for a bride or giving extravagant parties -- they will tolerate him. If he reneges on the payment for bride or beer, they know they can always take the girl back or sue Johnson in native court.

Johnson's life, his freedom, consists in always striving to make his life more glorious. He wants to be well-liked and looked up to; and he knows of only two ways to accomplish this: to have a cultured and well-dressed wife, whose beauty will be admired; and to give parties at which there is plenty of beer and music. Although the first attempt fails, in that Bamu refuses to dress and act the part of a "government wife"; the second scheme works fairly well. Johnson's parties are quite popular, and

great fun is had by all. The problem lies in the fact that such parties are, like Bamu's bride-price, well beyond Johnson's actual means. He must seek, by appeal and then by cunning, finally by desperate act, to gain the money needed to keep him out of prison. This pattern of desire, fulfillment, crisis, followed by stop-gap resolution, spirals downward into greater and greater crises and more amazing resolutions until the resolution collides with authority and Johnson seals his doom. But the pattern requires that he live, while he can, by his wits; and this is the essence of free life -- a continual process of creation in which no one day is like another. The tragedy is that Johnson's understanding of his world is too limited to allow him legitimate scope for his creativity;[21] or at least to understand that his outlaw creativity balances on the brink of jail and yet captivity is less final than death. Johnson's view, less sophisticated than that of Bonser or Jimson, is that he could not sustain the humiliation of prison. Yet knowing that he courts disaster one way or the other, Johnson would rather act than accept justice sitting still. His imaginative nature is such that he can never give up hope, not only for continued day-to-day life but also for the magnificent and the glorious.

And, to make matters easier, almost every time Johnson seems caught (prior to the last time), some quirk of fate causes a change of Residents or suggests a means of escaping doom. But, events move so quickly, no

sooner has he seemingly escaped one predicament than another comes to a head. Ajali, the clerk at Sargy's store, encourages Johnson out of boredom and a desire for excitement; at the same time wondering how justice can take so long to smash the wild man. Benjamin, the postal clerk, is more of a friend; but Johnson gets less encouragement from him. Cary explains:

> Although /Johnson/ knows perfectly well that Ajali is not really his well-wisher, that he is a spiteful and dangerous man, he prefers him greatly as a confidant to the honest and friendly Benjamin. The reason is that Ajali can never hide his wonderment at Johnson's deeds and Johnson needs an admirer far more than a friend. He is one of those people who scarcely notices whether he has friends or not; he gives friendship but he has no time to ask whether he gets it. He is too busy. (60)[22]

It is this busy-ness, this ability to work happily towards some goal which others do not understand (even if this goal is merely self-glorification), which marks the artist in Johnson. At another time, when Johnson's troubles seem at their usual crisis, Benjamin and Ajali come to see him; the former out of concern, the latter out of fascination:

> Ajali gazes at Johnson with the joy of those who rush to see a murderer dragged to prison and death. He gets a definite feeling and almost a definite idea from Johnson's misery. (64)

From the artist, Johnson, others derive things: feelings of joy at parties or sadistic pleasure, as in Ajali's case; but almost everyone who comes in contact with Johnson is, for that moment, liberated from his own petty cares and routines of life, freed by contact with the artist's energy.[23] For even Johnson's sorrow is lyric:

> He feels it even more acutely than he feels his pleasures, because when he is happy, he simply enjoys, forgetting himself; but when he is unhappy, he hates himself and dwells on his own faults. (62)

At such times he gets imaginative about his failings, his treacheries, and thinks up various ways in which the world might dispose of him. Even misery cannot stop his creativity.

Johnson's best creative efforts, however, are expressed in song, the bubbling over of joy. He sings when he gets married, at his parties, and -- his tour-de-force -- composes mighty work-songs for the laborers on Rudbeck's "impossible" road. In fact, it is solely due to Johnson's imaginative program of songs and beer, financed by illegal taxation (which ultimately, inevitably, leads to Johnson's fall into disgrace), which makes the completion of the road possible.[24]

In the inimitable way which Cary has, he makes good intentions and evil results so intermix that it is hard to say which is greater. Rudbeck feels powerless to stand up for Johnson, despite his good work, when his methods become clear. And Johnson, shocked at his sudden fall into disgrace (had he not kept careful records of his "taxes" to show Rudbeck?), cannot make clear his reasons or motives. Without a job, he loses Bamu again; and pinched for money, he robs Sargy Gollup's store. And finally his confidences to Ajali become too much: Ajali, driven to distraction by the fact that Johnson thinks himself impervious to law, tells Sargy to watch his cash drawer. Gollup waits to catch the thief, finally catches him and

is killed. This action, of course, is completely impulsive on Johnson's part; nevertheless, he is arrested for murder.

The rest of the novel deals with Rudbeck's efforts to deal as fairly as possible with Johnson, as well as with Johnson's own reaction to his situation. Both are trapped by the consequences of their "creative" actions: Johnson, obviously trapped by his killing of Sargy, the last act in his career of theft and burglary; Rudbeck, by the adverse results of his new road -- primarily a crimewave, of which Johnson's action seems a pronounced part.

Instead of the increased trade and rise in the standard of living which Rudbeck had hoped, he finds himself forced to try and, when his efforts at leniency fail, to execute Johnson, for whom he had felt warmly at one time. Feeling more and more like a pawn in the game of civil administration, for whom human beings simply cannot exist as separate entities, Rudbeck feels himself forced to either resign in protest or follow orders which are inimical to his sensitivities. He chooses the latter, deciding that he will follow such orders with a slavishness which will show the superiors involved what utter fools they are. But when it comes to the execution itself, Johnson begs him not to hang him, as the rules call for; this, he feels would be an ignoble way to die. He would prefer that "his friend Rudbeck" shoot him instead; this, he believes in his usual imaginative way, is a "more gentlemanly" way to die.[25] That Rudbeck finally executes him this way

is a tribute more to Johnson's imaginative thinking than Rudbeck's. One sees, however, an awakening sense of creativity in Rudbeck, one which goes beyond mere road-building (which he got from his superior Sturdee, anyway). In the closing lines of the book, he appropriates Johnson' death to his own initiative:

> Rudbeck, growing ever more free in the inspiration which seems already his own idea, answers obstinately, 'I couldn't let anyone else do it, could I?' (227)

Rudbeck could never have made the road without the primal creative energies of Johnson. Even Johnson's lawlessness was necessary: had he not suggested to Rudbeck the idea of transferring money from one fund to another for the purpose of finishing the road, it could never have been done.

As a creative free man, Johnson seems to live in a world without limits. Whatever suggests itself to the imagination is possible until proven otherwise. He, like Cary's theoretic concept of the creative force within men, strains at the extreme limits of human capability; the result is inevitable destruction, with chaos lurking at every step. But it also means that life, while it lasts, has a vibrancy and tension which heightens joy as well as deepening pain. Johnson is a rogue, a picaro, but most of all an artist.[26]

The African novels as a group present Cary's idea of the never-ending war between various cultures and concepts. As Charles Hoffmann notes,[27] Cary considered calling all his work together "the comedy of freedom"; and originally

he meant to call the African subgroup of novels "There's a War On." Thus the necessity of conflict to freedom seems clear. Each man who wishes to be free must, to some extent, be his own authority for his actions and his purpose in life. And yet, since men are gregarious and tend naturally toward social union, clashes are bound to occur when two or more advocates of different approaches to life and freedom come face to face. This is what happens repeatedly in the African novels and throughout Cary's fiction. In these former books, however, it is primarily a matter of Western or British culture clashing with the African way of life; the modern, urban, civilized as opposed to the primitive, rural and tribal. But Cary does not let his readers escape with a simplified view of the problems of freedom: it also involves all those multitudes of clashes to be found within each of the opposing cultures, those eddies and currents which further mix the forces which seem in primary conflict. All this might, he indicates, result in either stasis or total chaos if it were not for certain men in whom the creative urge is stronger than in most: these men become the artists, the free men in politics, religion, education, economy, "pure" art, or simply in life itself, who prod the rest forward, who produce change which keeps all men alive.

It is out of this life-producing change that freedom comes, both for individuals and for whole groups of people. Cary seems to suggest that, whatever a man strives to create, the mere effort of creation -- whether it produces anything

constructive or merely chaotic turmoil -- in which he "loses" himself fully produces freedom for a man. The contrast between the civilized man, like Rudbeck, and the "wild" primitive, like Johnson, often becomes that of unfettered freedom and creativity as opposed to restriction and the suppression of creativity. Yet, so often it is the less imaginative man who is left, in his ordered world, when the free artist has finally exceeded the limits which society or life can allow. Civilization paradoxically teaches the means for creative freedom while stressing an order which may suppress creative effort; it sometimes takes an "uncivilized" artist to break into the too-rigid forms and revitalize life again in order for freedom to be reestablished. The irony of the artist's situation is that, although he aids society in this way, he never perceives the limits beyond which society's wrath will come upon him until they are exceeded. Such a paradox is essential to the "comedy" of freedom; as Bewsher observes, the final "joke" is on the creative man as he is ultimately trapped and destroyed.

II. NOVELS OF CHILDHOOD AND THE CHRONICLES

These five novels are considered together not due to any sequence in writing, but rather because they fit neither with the African books nor the trilogies. They range in publication date from 1938 to 1949, thus transcending the periods of the African work and the first trilogy. Three can be called "chronicles," since they deal with a period of time and its effects on a family or individual; the other two deal with childhood, the specific process of growing up from childish innocence to more mature experience. The first group includes: Castle Corner (1938),[28] The Moonlight (1946),[29] and A Fearful Joy (1949);[30] the latter: Charley is My Darling (1940)[31] and A House of Children (1941).[32]

Although all of these books deal with aspects of freedom, two stand out stylistically, being closer to novels than the other books; these are Charley is My Darling and A Fearful Joy. Both show a single character or small group of characters in depth, developing their search for freedom and a meaningful life. Both Charley, the young boy who seeks adventure, and Bonser, the con-artist of A Fearful Joy, have this much in common: they set themselves against the established patterns of life in civilized society. The major difference is that Charley's rebellion is intuitive, almost a game at first, only gradually becoming all that is meaningful to him; Bonser, older and more experienced and crafty, has learned to play the game

seriously, making a living out of the respectable dupes around him while generally escaping their wrath and indignation.

These books seem closer to the usual novel form than the other three because they have a more narrow and subsequently more intense focus of concern. Even the chronicle form of A Fearful Joy, covering as it does the events of eighty years, is kept within bounds by the use of Tabitha Baskett as the reflector of change. It is through her that the stimulus of Bonser's actions is felt. But the other three are so loose in form that they lack the coherence necessary for a novel. Castle Corner, strikes the reader as an interesting but amorphous mass of under-developed character and events.[34] Although the cast of characters is much reduced, A House of Children suffers somewhat the same problem of diffuseness: it sketches episodes, the raw materials of the experience of growing up, without the dynamic conflicts of Charley is My Darling. It is vaguely patterned on Proust's A la recherche du temps perdu,[35] with the story arrested, however, after the reminiscences of volume one. What becomes of these children is never seen. The last of these three, The Moonlight, seems Cary's least successful. It was first intended as an answer to Tolstoy's The Kreuzer Sonata;[36] but, like so many of his works, it blossomed into something which Cary had not foreseen. It deals with the conflict between two generations of women and the inter-family strife which comes from the misunderstanding of good intentions. The book becomes so

much an intellectual exercise, pitting the ideas of Victorian propriety against the seemingly total lack of principles or direction in the period of anti-Victorianism after the first world war, that the characters lack the vitality necessary to seem real.

One possible reason for the disparity between the quality of the two better books and the others as novels is the sense of immediacy which the present tense narrative gives to the former. As a result, there is something of that sense of vitality which carries the reader willingly through the simple story of Mister Johnson;[37] a vitality noticeably lacking in the other three books of this group.

Although these five books are of minor importance to the theme of freedom in Cary's work, it is of value to note several of Cary's remarks concerning them. In the preface to Castle Corner he points out that this chronicle was meant to show "not only the lives of all the characters in the first volume, but the revolutions of history during the period 1880-1935."(5) It is this same period which is encompassed in A Fearful Joy and The Moonlight. Therefore, one can see that the chronicles try to present the people not merely in conflict with each other but with the changes from what came to be known as "the late Victorian period" to "the early modern period."

A. Castle Corner

Cary saw the failure of Castle Corner as a failure in characterization, a failure to achieve what he had intended:

> I did not mean to write crude social philosophy into Castle Corner. I meant to create characters and leave them to act; characters conceived with those springs of action which seemed to me most important in all character, working out their fates in a world charged throughout with freedom and individuality, and the consequences of that inescapable freedom, where moral principles must be like those of an army on the march, inventive, flexible, for ever balanced between the immediate circumstances (this man's nature, this crisis) and an ultimate end (the good, the true, etc.) and a final judgment is final only in the sense that it is the best (however bad) solution of an immediate problem.(6)

He wondered if such meanings would be discernible in the book as it turned out, or whether the balance of characters and events would produce a "neutral" effect: "For life, as it occurs, has no meaning. It is too full of chance, too stupid. We give it meaning by choosing from it what we call significant patterns." (7) The free man is the one who, to the best of his ability, takes advantage of the stupid chances in events to push towards that ultimate end which he desires; and who has the energy and courage to accept the consequences of bad judgments if necessary and keep trying to achieve his goal.

One of his problems, he states, was that of "universal values" which permit freedom only at the expense of peace and security. The best society could ever hope for was a condition

> of limited insecurity, limited physical misery on the one hand, and on the other, richer possibilities of experience, both in fulfilment and despair. The tragic dilemma of freedom is incurable; that it can't have either security or justice, which belong only to robots, to machines; that because it has the power to know goodness, it must also suffer evil. In fact, those who have the keenest intensity of happiness, in love and achievement, are those most exposed to suffering in loss and defeat. (Ibid.)

But in trying to express these ideas in the book, Cary found a paradox involving characterization and ideas: "The better I drew my characters, the more they would fail as illustrations of general laws."(8) And so, being more drawn to characterization, he gave up the long chronicle and wrote Mister Johnson, "the simplest of characters in a simple background, with the simplest of themes. . . ." (Ibid.) And when, later, he returned to the chronicle, he attempted to deepen characterization by limiting the cast.

B. The Moonlight

In The Moonlight he had meant originally to write a refutation of the ideas of Tolstoy's The Kreutzer Sonata; but this first manuscript was abandoned after several chapters. When he returned to the story years later, to see if it could be incorporated into a new novel he was working on, he found "that it was no good to me":

> I wanted to show the different sexual ideas of two or three generations in their relation with each other and with the final shape of things, the nature of sex itself, of the woman who serves, the woman who rebels . . . and the woman who is taught to conform, for her own good.(11)

The original version, he found, was too strongly committed to its own plan, and he feared too much perusal of it might "seduce me from my now determined plan."

As it came out, The Moonlight deals with the problems inherent in the duty of every parent or guardian: "to manage the lives of children, to take responsibility for teaching them, that is, forming their character. (5) Cary

states that this is not only necessary to the society in which the children live but is desperately desired by the children themselves, "for their own peace." This is a central point in Charley is My Darling: that children, if deprived of the guidance they need and want, will often go astray. Cary states that he intended Rose as a woman who tries to live up to her duties but is hated for it. She is not, he insists, the "'typical Victorian tyrant'" which the critics called her; but rather "the woman of character and unselfish goodness, who had sacrificed her own happiness to her duty." (Ibid.) But, in spite of Cary's protestations, it seems clear that Rose is indeed a tyrant:[38] since she has given up her own happiness, her own suitor, she will see to it that her charges, her sister and her niece, have neither. Yet there is force in Cary's argument for the validity of the Victorian idea of family, an idea which had been lost in the anger of reaction. In the Victorian life-scheme, Cary saw an "answer to the eternal problem of sex"; for it placed a woman at the heart of the family group, which in turn is "the original state of affairs from which, should every idea of civilization be abolished, a new one will instantly begin to grow."(6) Like all freedoms, Cary sees the freedom of women in the modern age as one which, while it allows the possibility of greatness, also carries with it anxiety about the right choice, towards family, society and self. Yet, for all this, Cary sees freedom as "the soul of their dignity as modern women." (9) The Moonlight contrasts the Victorian

assurance and dominance of Rose, who knew her role in life but imprisoned others; with the weak ambivalence of Ella, who felt herself wronged but whose efforts to free herself and others were continually frustrated; as well as with the utter freedom of Amanda, who could not, however, find any happiness or direction in life. [39]

C. A Fearful Joy

Skipping to the last of the chronicles, one finds that Tabitha of A Fearful Joy has a better time with life: unlike Ella, she is not guilt-ridden, nor like Amanda is she given to intellectualizing her situations; she can endure tragedy and enjoy good times. However, the reader is given a much larger slice of her life than of Amanda's -- a span stretching from the late decades of the nineteenth century well toward the mid-twentieth century. And whereas Amanda is made to choose (which she never can) between an intellectual cynic and an earthy farmer, Tabitha is given, on the one hand, a whole series of marriages and attachments with "acceptable" and well-to-do men, and a recurring affair with a loveable conman on the other. Since the first category of men are generally either unimaginative or very narrow in the scope of their creative talents, it is Bonser, the conman, who makes the greatest impression on Tabitha: he causes her "fearful joy" by his reckless inventiveness in living, his happy crime approach to society.

Although it is not Tabitha who is capable of creating the freedom central to the book, she is the "social control"

upon whom the various types of economic entrepeneurs make their impressions. Gollan is the primary example of the legal pirate, whose ambitions run to the control of whole nations; while Bonser is an economic artist only interested in carving out enough "to have a good time" whenever he can. Gollan can provide security of sorts for Tabitha, which Bonser never can; but the latter stimulates her spirits to joy in life through love which Gollan cannot. Any joy without security is, though "fearful joy," far preferable to security without joy.

D. Charley is My Darling

In Charley is My Darling (1940) the focus is not on the changes within generations or lengthy periods of social history; but rather the turmoil of one boy's adolescence. Cary presents a boy who, sent as an evacuee from London to the West Country, is forced to overcome humiliation to assert his right to a place among his peers. Yet the same "bold enterprises" which gain Charley favor with his friends are those which finally "land him in the courts."(5) Cary wished to show the thin line between childish exuberance which is guided into the proper channels and that which is not. Most children, he is convinced, are "by nature" delinquent;

> the only difference between us as children was the extent of our delinquency, whether we were found out in it and how we were punished for it. (Ibid.)

From his own experience, Cary is sure that seemingly wanton malicious acts are the child's way of creating: he "tests"

to see what evil feels like, or he tries to see at what level of wrongdoing justice prevails; and sometimes, he lashes out against a world which refuses to take cognizance of him as a thinking and feeling person. (8-9) Thus much of the responsibility for a child's acts rests with his parents or teachers; for they must judge between various motives, always providing a sense of social justice through correction, but tempering this with love.

Cary feels that a child's mind is complex, like that of an adult, with constantly warring forces at work:

> The suddenness of temptation or, rather, inspiration, which (like many that come to an artist) is so quick that he doesn't even notice it, it leaves no moment for reflection. The imagination sees its opportunity, its prey, and instantly leaps upon it. (7)

The major difference between the adults and children is that the latter have "powerful imaginations and weak control"; the former should have strength in both areas. Without guidance and love, the child will not only give in to wrong choices but is very likely to be bored. It is boredom which leads Charley and his gang on their house-smashing escapade: the beautiful things which, under different conditions Charley most certainly would have deeply appreciated, become for the children emblems of the power and wealth of people -- and a world in general -- who care nothing for them or their abilities.

Cary indicates the extent of Charley's capabilities by his ability to draw. Yet, both from lack of adequate guidance from the **crotchety** artist and from a desire for

the adventure of gang-leadership, this talent is never developed. That Charley is capable of seeking and finding freedom, of creating a world which, however wrong by social standards, is viable for him, is evident. But, being a child, he has neither the sense of proportion which makes house-smashing unlikely nor the power of age which would allow him his love for Liz.

Cary's major indictment of the adults who handle Charley's case is that they use his love, as natural and deeply good as it is, as an argument against him in the house-breaking case. Charley, trapped by incomprehension of social law or custom in this matter, cannot fathom what is wrong. He admits error in the house-smash; but why should he be made to feel evil for loving Liz? By standing up for his love and for the inherent goodness that he sees in it, Charley dooms himself to misunderstanding by his would-be saviors. And in so doing, he becomes a confused martyr to the cause of freedom, steadfastly refusing, even in his misery, to profess what is false to the world he and Liz wished for themselves.[40]

E. A House of Children

The other novel of childhood, A House of Children, is less satisfying in that its treatment of developing ideas and talents among a group of Corner children is too diffuse. Not only is the principal character and narrator reflected through his memories of childhood, but his brother Harry and cousins Kathy, Delia, Frances, Anketel and Robert

have roles almost as central. Yet the sensations of growing up in a houseful of children, the routines, the pastimes and the exploits of childhood are conveyed through a series of interesting episodes. Evelyn Corner, the narrator, looks back to those years leading up to his first hunt at the age of ten -- a symbolic entering into manhood. The entire book shows the development of artistic talents and tendencies in the children; and through the hopes and frustrations of the would-be pianist, the poet and the playwright Cary attempts to show the distinction which children feel between sense and thought. Thus, for instance, the children experience the effect of light reflected from the waves of the lake into the house -- onto walls, ceilings and everything -- long before they think about why or how this effect should or does occur, or before they accept the possibility of its having a reasonable explanation.

What A House of Children does, in spite of its unnovelistic looseness, is to show what the growing process of a child can be if he has parents and teachers to guide him past the pitfalls which beset Charley. What it fails to do is to present the picture of even one child in a fulness similar to that with which Charley is portrayed. The effect is, although pleasant, more of an amorphous group than of one individual person.[41] Evelyn, the narrator, is reflected so much in the other children, and they in him, that there are no sharp distinctions left. Yet this is probably true of children fortunate enough not to have,

like Charley, to try to establish a would-be adult's free world before they are capable of sustaining it against the forces of conflict in the world.

In all, these books show some added insights into Cary's idea of freedom; but they lack the vigor and/or style which make his best books stand out. They show how the question of human freedom seems to be modified by changes over a series of decades -- how, in fact, change is the heart of freedom; and how those who cease to change and accept change cannot continue to be free. They show how imagination in children, unfettered as it largely is, can be channelled positively or allowed to run riot. Although children, per se, play almost no part in Cary's subsequent work, the once-and-present child in every man can be seen in every one of Cary's artists,[42] balanced by the craft and reason necessary to live in adult society -- or at least to survive for some time. And the chronicles reiterate and develop the views of history and change which are central to the last works.

III. THE FIRST TRILOGY

The first trilogy, comprised of Herself Surprised, To be a Pilgrim, and The Horse's Mouth, is Cary's "art trilogy," since it is climactically concerned with the painter Gulley Jimson. In the preface of Herself Surprised,[43] Cary says he intended to have "history and art"(7) as the principle concern of the three narrators. As an indication of the multitudinous facets of reality in life, he presented three versions of life subjectively stated which, in impinging on the others, would qualify each narrator's version. The whole trilogy would show up the biases of each speaker through the evaluations of the others, as well as his own mistakes;[44] the whole being, paradoxically, larger than "the sum of the parts." Yet, as the characters evolved, they took on qualities of their own unforeseen by the author; and the final version of the trilogy became something other than what he had expected to create. For, as it worked out, Sara Monday, the amoral woman, was incapable of the knowledge of history and art necessary to balance that of Wilcher and Jimson. (Ibid.) And Sara's feminine character was so expansive that, even after paring, it dominated the trilogy. Thus, Wilcher relates to her alone, hardly mentioning Jimson; and Gulley similarly involves Sara deeply in his narrative, mentioning Wilcher only very briefly in connection with her. Sara's position is between Wilcher's abstract paralysis and Gulley's vital creativity, sharing some qualities of each; but she is different, too, having the

Blakean quality of the female, natural creativity. Gulley's primary creative freedom is aided by Sara at times but always in danger of being engulfed by her domesticity. Whereas Wilcher presents an example of arrested creative development, Sara's provides something of a negative definition of Gulley's creative freedom.[45]

A. Herself Surprised

Herself Surprised (1941) is Sara's story -- written, she seems to imagine, from a sense of penitence for the sins and crimes which have brought her to prison. But at the end one discovers that she is writing because she has been offered "a hundred pounds in advance for my story in the newpapers, when I come out"(220). As for her "penitence," this is a rationalizing aspect of her character, merely an awareness in retrospect that society expected her to have acted differently; although at the same time she glories deeply in the joyful memories of her life in all its aspects.

Yet Sara, despite her seeming ability to weather all the storms of life -- to "endure" -- cannot be seen as primarily free, because her ability to create a world depends upon having a man to create it around. She is, however, in her sincere (though not moral) dedication to each of the men in her life, representative of "the female creative force" in Cary's scheme of freedom. It is possible to see none of the three characters in the trilogy as being fully free in themselves; in that case, it is the composite of the three which most closely approaches full human freedom.

However, in a less paradoxical interpretation of Cary's idea of freedom it is Gulley, as the artist, who is the free man, achieving not only freedom for himself but also influencing those like Sara and Wilcher who, for differing reasons, tend to oppose the freedom of the artist.

Sara's world largely revolves around her job as a cook and housekeeper, wife and mistress, to the various men with whom she comes in contact. It is fairly evident from the trilogy as a whole that Sara, for all her inability to stay with one man, is sincere in her dedication to each of her men; and that she sees no basic immorality in her actions -- until she is punished for them. In prison, as she tells the reader, she is made aware of her sins and states repeatedly her remorse. But as soon as her fortunes change, her remorse goes out the window, being only a useful form, not something she really believes.[46]

Her real beliefs are in money and security -- although, as she is the first to admit, she enjoyed the wild joy which Gulley could get out of life at times.

> What I wonder at in my life with Jimson was how much happiness we had, with all our ups and downs. For it was not only that I lost all my money at Ancombe, and got my nose broken, but that we never had a day's full peace from the picture. And let me tell you it took five years. (126)

This picture was a commissioned work for a church, which expresses Gulley's Blakean ideas: "naked men and women in a kind of garden with queer flowers and trees, and some of them speaking words out of their mouths, written on coloured puffs."(128) Sara describes the reaction of the

parish, who apparently thought it an outrage, "a bolshevist plot." Sara, though she does not express a personal opinion, tells us that no one liked the picture, not even the woman who commissioned it, who bravely bore up under her original decision that Gulley was a genius who could not do wrong (129). Yet at various points she observes that, except for the nudes for which she modelled, she did not think Gulley had ever done anything worthy of being called art.

When she asks Hickson, the millionaire friend and sometimes patron of herself and Gulley, what he thinks of the nudes, however, he explains that the worth of art is inestimable; whereas "the price is anything you can get."(124) In this way Hickson makes it possible to excuse speculation in art -- at as little return to the artist as possible -- without venturing to pass judgment on the "real worth" of paintings as art. In The Horse's Mouth he does not hesitate to capitalize on the possibility of Gulley getting some public attention and reward, since this will increase measurably the value of the Jimsons he already has.

But Sara's story does not involve only Gulley and Hickson: it starts with Matt Monday, Sara's first husband, and deals in turn with all of Sara's "domestic arrangements." For it is in what Gulley calls "nest-building" that Sara finds her most productive role in life -- the home-building, family-raising functions are her creative realm. Sara's story, therefore, is generally concerned with the process of finding and keeping whatever man she finds who, at that

moment, seems to offer her the best chance of making for him and herself that domestic security which she strives to create.[47] It is not immorality but rather a desire for the material comforts of life which seems to motivate her acceptance of Hickson's overtures when Sara is still Mrs. Monday; and Gulley wins her because she thinks he is headed towards a brilliant and lucrative career as an artist. But Sara's drive towards female creativity frees her from the normal bounds of conventional mores; and it is possible for her to remain loyal to Matt while having the affair with Hickson, to stay with Gulley even when the marriage with him proves less rewarding than she might have hoped, and to speak of all her men in terms of their good qualities even after they have ceased to have anything to do with her.

The fact that Gulley and she did have "some good times" together in spite of their financial difficulties is one of the high points in their relationship. Gulley, however, understands Sara's tendency toward domesticity and treats her with caution, always trying to bend her to his own wishes without giving her the power over him which she, as wife, lover and housekeeper, would like to get. While she is happy with him she is always a little resentful that he is so unwilling to "settle down" to her idea of a sensible married life. This disagreement is to Sara a source of disappointment and mild irritation; but to Gulley, who feels her a threat to the artist and free man, it is one of the basic dilemmas of life.

As the title indicates, Sara is repeatedly "surprised" by what she has done:[48] although she is sincerely bent on leading a harmless life, events tend to conspire to tempt her or push her into mistakes. Yet her own condemnations of herself are mild, formal, usually based merely on a realization that society does not condone such behavior. One of the attractions that Gulley has for her is that he refuses to allow his own goals to be circumscribed by such social considerations. Yet she is practical enough, even with Gulley, to realize that society will get its own back against those who flaunt its rules -- unless the outlaw has the power (i. e., money) to withstand society's fickle denunciations. She is aware that, although Gulley has what seems a better way of living than most people, this alone will not protect him from the ravages of social spite and envy.

Not only is Sara not <u>immoral</u> -- as she is judged by society (and, nominally, by herself) -- but, in Cary's scheme, she is the embodiment of the creative female force. This force, as Cary presents it in various women, is <u>amoral</u>, in that it responds to natural, rather than man-made, rules. The natural rules call for the woman to create her free world around the family, caring for children and men (usually one of the latter at a time). This sets the woman off from the male creative freedom, which demands that mind as well as natural forces, such as feelings, come into play. It is in the mind that the man-made rules of ethics, moral systems and mores fit, when they <u>can</u> be made to fit the free scheme; not in the woman's world of feelings.[49]

B. To Be a Pilgrim

To Be a Pilgrim (1942),[50] the second book of the first trilogy, involves the efforts of Tom Wilcher, a lawyer, to hold on to the old farm and house which he loves in the face of the changes espoused by his great niece and nephew. Wilcher is Cary's abstract thinker, almost diametrically opposed to the artist figure as seen in Gulley; instead of creating new forms constantly, producing a flux and change out of which freedom evolves with each moment, Wilcher wants to hold onto what he thinks are those old forms which, through long use and custom, have shown themselves beautiful and worthwhile.

The link between the abstractionist and the revolutionary artist is Sara, the woman in whose domestic worlds elements of both other worlds are combined. Although Gulley looks on Sara as a threat, Wilcher comes more and more to think of her as a means of salvation. He decides that she has found, in her easy-going way of life, the answer to the conflict between change and the old order: to be a pilgrim, always on pilgrimage, ready to make one's home where one can, but willing to move on whenever necessary. But, as he has made a habit of doing, Wilcher has merely abstracted people and "real life" into vague and meaningless concepts.

The book, which is largely in the form of Wilcher's diary and notes, centers around the attempts of an aging Wilcher to get his niece and nephew to retain some of the

beauty of the house and farm instead of changing everything merely for the sake of efficiency and modernity. But the young people come to look on his wishes as more and more the mindless ravings of a senile ghost from a Victorian past against which they react boldly, perhaps desperately. Not only does Wilcher lose this struggle, but he sees the young ones make themselves miserable in the process of upsetting every Victorian moral code they can. Yet the young people can go on, even after their child is born, without reverting to the conventions of marriage for the sake of morality. That they do finally get married is expediency, not any surrender to Victorian morals. Yet Wilcher, for all his profession of belief in the old moral codes, has been an exhibitionist; clearly his judgments are suspect. However, Cary uses this discrepancy to point out the inability of the abstract thinker to correlate his thoughts, which may seem very lucid and concise, with the actual matters of life, which generally baffle him in their extreme complexity.

The reminiscences of the book fall between the period of Wilcher's forced return to Tolbrook when Sara is sent to jail and his attempted return to her when she gets out of jail. If the reminiscences were not enough to show how ineffectual Wilcher had been in the past, in the shadow of his creative older brother and sister, the events at Tolbrook show conclusively that he is less a prisoner of his niece and nephew than of his way of thinking. This is

finally proven when, still unable to understand Sara's modus operandi as a creative female, he tries to reclaim her allegiance, which has since been given to Mr. Byles. He is shocked when Sara turns him over to his relatives again; but the reader is prepared for the fact that Sara, sympathetic as she is, cannot betray her nest -- which has at the time been newly constructed for the care of Mr. Byles.

Wilcher erred in abstracting Sara into his idea of the "Pilgrim": while it is true that Sara could move on whenever it was necessary, she, unlike the pilgrim of Wilcher's dreams, was fully willing to settle down forever if the materials for a nest, and those to put in it, were available. Hers were not the lofty ideals of Christian seeking for salvation which Wilcher decided to apply to her. And thus his disappointment.

It is tempting to say that Wilcher has never been free: that the memories he has of the past are, without exception, totally false. But he seems, although never a "primary" creative spirit, to have shared in the freedom created by his brother Edward, "a waster with talent" (150), whose field is politics. With regard to his sister, Lucy, Wilcher seems to have come less close to his sibling's freedom: he could at least feel the power of Edward's personality, see his acclaim; but he felt Lucy to have wasted herself on the dour sect of Benjamites -- and especially on its leader, Brown. Yet Wilcher sees both brother and sister as the lost heroes of a better age; when actually,

through his own testimony, one sees their foibles and, more important, the creative freedom which transcends eras. They are not heroes; but they are hugely human, capable of just that openness to life and creative energy of which Wilcher dreams but seems forever incapable.[51]

His was something of the problem of the younger son in a family and era which gave the choicest professions to the eldest. But legalism, the nature of Tom Wilcher's profession, also compounded his separation from life: while Edward and Lucy were at grips with the vital stuff of life, its soaring successes and damning defeats, Tom was entering more and more into the vicarious world of legal abstraction -- codes and laws -- where other men's lives and money are handled in an aura of super-refined thought and language.

Yet, Wilcher yearns for the vitality which he now sees in memories of Edward and Lucy, the fervor which sweeps him, too, away into the uproar of life, if only in the fantasies of the moment. This desire for life is, however, thwarted by his abstract view of things: he is either too much given to thoughts to act, or, having thought himself into a false situation, acts rashly. His exhibitionism, for instance, is both an example of vicarious sexual involvement and rash action based on his abstraction of human relationships. Yet the desire for human experience is so sympathetically presented that one feels Wilcher's dilemma deeply; one sees his ineffectuality but suffers with him for it rather than condemning. This is due to Cary's consummate handling of the first-person narrative approach.

It is Wilcher's own subjective view of himself, of his position and relation to those around him which gives him humanity. Had Cary presented him from a third-person point of view, the negative sides of his character and life might have predominated, eclipsing the warmth and sympathy of which the man is capable. And, although Wilcher is for the most part an ineffectual and uncreative man, Cary does not seem to completely disparage abstract thought: in another, better-balanced man, abstract thought might guide or explain creative efforts -- as is true of Gulley Jimson and Chester Nimmo. Abstract thought becomes associated with order, in opposition to the disorder of creative change; and Cary has some sympathy with those who try, from the best of motives, to preserve that order necessary for social continuity.

Both Gulley, Sara and Wilcher become so wrapped up in their private approaches to life that they become too much of whatever they represent: Gulley is too much the revolutionary artist, to the point of scaring the pants off society; Sara is too much the Female and homebuilder, enraging "respectable" society by her penchant for collecting men; and Wilcher is too much the defender of the old order, and then the open life of the "pilgrimage," to permit the easy transition of those around him from what was to what must be. It is characteristic of Cary to present almost Dickensian grotesques: people who, like Pickwick, Micawber and Gradgrind so fully represent the type that they cease to be human. However, by presenting them so fully (as opposed

to the cameo roles in Dicken's novels), Cary makes his grotesques seem human enough for one to feel kinship with them for the time of the reading. It is only later, when one starts to think more abstractly about a Sara or Gulley or Wilcher that they assume their actual larger-than-life proportions. Yet so well-drawn are they that one can see in each, in bolder lines, to be sure, human qualities, strivings, and characteristics.

In the preface to this book, Cary explains Sara's relation to Wilcher:

> By the time Sara goes into Wilcher's service he is old and battered by life. He is deep in his own dream, which is chiefly of the past. (7)

He was overshadowed by an illustrious brother and sister, who took advantage of his unambitious nature and his deep love of home and family. Wilcher understands, however, that all the things he is so attached to about his home, family and way of life are transient, that all things change and "that there is no rest for the soul except in the love of God, and His beauty and justice; that man is condemned to be a pilgrim in an unexplored wilderness. . . ." (Ibid.) But this knowledge does not console him to the vagueries of life; "he does not like it, and so he suffers frustration and loneliness."(8)

Cary's original idea of treating both history and art in this trilogy must be kept in mind; for, although Gulley could represent art quite fully, neither he nor Sara could show the passage of historical time as Wilcher could. As Cary puts it, this book deals with

> historical change seen through the eyes, not of Sara, who knows it only in people and in herself, or of the artist Jimson, who sees it as the battle of aesthetic ideas with each other and with a public always blind and self-assured, but of the man of political and religious intuition. The tragedy of such a man is that he sees the good for ever being destroyed with the bad; especially that irreplaceable good, those graces and virtues of life that depend of tradition. . . . (Ibid.)

But it is not just that Wilcher sees "these true civilized virtues" become mere "elegant affectations or the tricks of a set" -- he thinks he sees his own young relatives aiding such degradation. Wilcher sees himself as perhaps the sanist mind in his family, seeing his family go to ruin, a microcosm of the ruin of the whole British way of life. And, while he is an overstatement of this point-of-view, Wilcher does see something of importance, the beauty which is sacrificed for the new (and not so graceful) order. Cary seems to suggest that, although this very seldom (if ever) happens, the ideal free man would be one who, while inspired by the energy and vision of a Gulley, would be modified by the natural beauty of a Sara and the historical vision and abstract desire for order and grace of a Tom Wilcher. Thus, the endless change of creative freedom might incorporate those good points of the past, producing anew without undue destruction of the positive things created before.[52]

Although Wilcher is ineffective in life, incapable of meaningful action, he is not made so by excessive rational preoccupation. It is not rationalism to which Cary objects, but rather the sort of abstract idealism in which Wilcher indulges, creating fantasies which can have no possibility

of realization in the world. He lacks the vitality and creative energy to bring his visions to fruition; but his visions lack the necessary link to reality which could produce results, even with dedicated endeavor. Gulley's visions, on the other hand, as Blakean, mystical and abstract as they could be, are at once linked to the fabric of human relationships and to the visual forms of which his paintings are made. Wilcher can appreciate the vitality and drive which marked his brother Edward's and his sister's lives; but he never created his own viable world beside them, merely followed, admired or worried lovingly at their dynamic excesses. And, at the time he writes, even that is in the past: he lives now either in dread of the changes which he sees going on in Tolbrook Farm, the symbol of the venerated past; or he abstracts his feelings for Sara into a mythical union which can revitalize his soul and let him recapture the spirit of freedom he thinks he lost in the past but never really had.

His abstract view of things makes everything -- people included -- symbolic of ideas. He loses (or never fully gained) an insight into people as living beings. Due to this, he cannot understand his niece and nephew and what they are doing. And, although Sara's natural vitality and joy stimulates him into the review of the past which gives him deeper insight into what has gone before,[53] even she becomes too much a symbol in his mind. The real Sara escapes him.

C. The Horse's Mouth

The Horse's Mouth (1944)[54] shows most clearly what Cary means by "creative freedom." Although in the trilogy as a whole Gulley does not take the central place, it is he who in telling that portion of his life just prior to his final wall-painting, flavors the whole trilogy with the vibrance of his life-style. His is a constant ability to meet life deeply and mold it to his needs, as Sara and Wilcher cannot. Gulley apprehends the forms and qualities of existence as an objective artist, but also lives within those changing though eternal forms, too.

It is paradox with which Cary, in all his work, seems most interested. And paradox is central to the trilogies: that Gulley, who is the most creative and most capable of accommodating himself to the constant changes which are part of life, is the one whom society in general cannot tolerate; that Sara, who shares Gulley's love of pleasure and the finer things in life, although putting much more emphasis on the necessity of such things, is considered a detriment to society; and that Wilcher, who is so attached in ideas to the old order, should decide to espouse what he thinks to be the "life of the pilgrim" at just the time and in just the manner which is least fated to succeed. It is also a repeated and bewildering paradox that people who have managed to survive nicely through all sorts of crises are thrown into confusion and perhaps fatal conflict with the world around them through a petty point. Such

are the events which finally trip up Sara and which make Gulley meet his doom: they have both survived the seemingly tremendous trials which beset them for years, and then collide over a single sketch of Sara, which is a momento for her, but the means to further creation for him. Yet both go down remaining faithful to their visions of life, Sara faithful to Gulley in her fashion and Gulley faithful to his work.

In the preface, Cary explains why Gulley Jimson's story seems so facetious:

> He makes a joke of life because he dare not take it seriously. He is afraid that if he does not laugh he will lose either his nerves or his temper, that he will want to run away from his duty, or demand with rage 'what is the sense of anything in a world at war'. . . . (7)

Gulley realizes "that in a world of everlasting creation there is not justice." The very nature of originality is that it is not just the artist, <u>per se</u>, who is creative:

> Every living soul creates his own world, and must do so. The human child brings with it very little instinctive equipment for life. . . . It has to create a three-dimensional universe for itself in its own imagination. . . . (8)

But the painter or sculptor, as soon as he dedicates himself or his reputation to a finished work of art, sets himself to some degree against the whole current of what is to come. Although "great art is always an expression of a fundamental character in things, the simple and powerful emotions which have always dominated and perplexed life . . . ,"

> this does not mean that they will be recognized in an artist's lifetime; or that an artist will be saved from that revolution of boredom or hatred which has destroyed every school of art as a living force, within a generation. (9)

It is the full realization of this inescapable stream of change, of fickle fashion as well as meaningful change for the better, which causes Gulley to disparage his own work almost as soon as it is finished, to join with the viewers of his exhibition (Herself Surprised, 120-121) in laughing: "Better they should laugh than cry." Knowing that the true value (if any) of his work can hardly be appreciated in his lifetime, he exults in the actual creative process, which he so completely joins with the process of everyday living that all life is part of his art, and his life is art.

The view which Gulley has of life, of "historical change," is very much tied up with the cosmos which William Blake creates in his apocalyptic verse. It is Gulley's infusion of Blake into everyday scenes and events, tying his ideas to artistic visions of form and color, which give the book such a vibrant quality throughout. "The battle of aesthetic ideas with each other and with a public always blind and self-assured" is not dry and over-philosophical when it comes through Gulley's mind. The book begins with a perfect example, as Gulley, just out of jail for his last series of threats against Hickson, walks along the Thames and expresses his visions of life around him:

> Half-past morning on an autumn day. Sun in a mist. Like an orange in a fried fish shop. All bright below. Low tide, dusty water and a crooked bar of straw, chicken-boxes, dirt and oil from mud to mud. Like a viper swimming in skim milk. The old serpent, symbol of nature and love.
> Five windows light the caverned man; through one he breathes the air
> Through one hears music of the spheres; through one can look
> And see small portions of the eternal world.

> Such as Thames mud turned into a bank of nine carat gold rough from the fire.(11)

Again and again Gulley refers to Blake to synthesize what he feels to be large truths about life. In referring to his relation to Sara, for instance, he repeatedly casts her in the role of the female force in Blake's The Mental Traveller: both the old woman who "nails" down the creative soul of the young man, trying to capture it; and the young girl whom the male pins down "for his delight." (51-52) This image of the Female trying to domesticate the male, imprisoning his poetic soul, and of the Male using the female while remaining free, is central to Gulley's vision of the world.

It is typical of Gulley, so free in mind and spirit, that he cares little for physical imprisonment, feeling it to be one of the calculated risks which he must take in his efforts to get justice from Hickson. But, although one assumes from Gulley's remarks that his prison stays have been shrugged off as "food and shelter with time to think" in the past, he finally cannot accept them as such: he realizes he has a limited amount of time left for his chef d'oeuvre -- whatever it may turn out to be. This leads to the series of running and hiding which Gulley must indulge in when he feels that the police are after him.

Yet the theme of law-and-order versus the arrant should-be jailbird is not the heart of the matter of freedom here. As stated before, it is the problem of how to balance the needs of personal creative talent with the needs, desires, and customs of the society and environment in which the

artist finds himself. That this balance, in Gulley's case, is always tipped towards the seeming anarchy of total creativity is part and parcel of the situation, as Cary sees it, in which the artist-free man finds himself. It is for others, less talented than he perhaps, to try to keep a semblance of order in Gulley's wake: his job is to keep on creating as long as he gets inspiration and visions straight from "the horse's mouth."

However, it seems fairly evident, throughout the book, that Gulley's course of action, while picaresque and at times endearing to his friends and supporters, is bound to lead to his downfall. It is possible, therefore, to see in his fall the inevitable destruction of which Cary speaks in Power in Men and several of the prefaces: that destruction which comes to one who stretches too far the limits of human capability in his search for creative freedom. Gulley, like Johnson and so many others in Cary's works, is self-destructive because he goads that amorphous entity, society, into taking action which "it" considers vital to the preservation of order. Ultimately, since the artist's visions tend to be larger than life, if not outrightly apocalyptic, society must imprison or destroy the free man-artist. This produces the paradox of which society remains largely oblivious: that this menace which they must oppose is the same man whom, years or ages later (if not simultaneous with their punitive action), they will laude him for imaginative creations by which others are

awakened and renewed to life's possibilities.[55] However, it is just such influence which Gulley and other artists leave behind them and which transcend their own lives -- the revitalizing influence of creative change, the heart of freedom.

Gulley's expression of freedom rests not only on his creative energy and vision but on his deep understanding of man's isolation and the resultant inescapable injustice inherent in life. It is necessary, he realizes, to keep on creating in spite of opposition, in spite of misunderstanding. To harbor resentment against life or individuals is merely to sap the creative energy and waste the artist's time, which is better spent working towards the vision. The isolation of man is accented by the different narratives in the trilogy; Gulley's work is an indication of how the artist strives toward freedom in spite of injustice; Sara and Wilcher represent different approaches to life which may at various times either hinder or supplement the artist's efforts.

IV. THE SECOND TRILOGY

Cary's second trilogy (Prisoner of Grace, 1952; Except the Lord, 1953; and Not Honour More, 1955) is known as the "political" trilogy. The central figure, Chester Nimmo, creates his form of freedom within the realm of politics, exploiting to the fullest his power as a spell-binder. But by politics Cary means more than just governmental matters. As he explains in the preface to Prisoner of Grace, he wants to show "the art of human relations, an aspect of all life."(5) Thus the first version told is that by Nina Woodville, "a wife whose marriage needs a great deal of management," for Cary sees such a marriage as part of the "complete political scene."

The three views presented in this trilogy form a more coherent entity than those of the first trilogy, since each book is a deliberate "revelation" of the character of Chester Nimmo, as he is seen by his wife, Nina; by himself; and by Jim Latter, Nina's second husband and Chester's staunch opponent. Nimmo, therefore, provides a focus for the three points of view: the woman, amoral but loyal to her men; the artist, religious but politically expedient; and the soldier, conservative and rigidly unthinking.

A. Prisoner of Grace

The view given in Prisoner of Grace[56] is reflective but also amoral and ambivalent; while Nina cannot condone Chester's methods of getting his way, she comes to give in to his ways under the pressure of his boundless energy.

Her account of him shows Nimmo capable of extreme pampering of her, as long as she is willing to play everything his way. In the face of his insistent refusal to admit that he knew she was pregnant when they married, which she at first feels as deliberate unfairness to herself, she finally capitulates. She comes to the sudden realization that Chester's position is actually far different from what she had imagined. She explains that, although she was deeply aware of his "tricks," feeling that he was "cheating again," she now knew that she "was often wrong."[57]

> For men of imagination (and imagination was Chester's great strength; it enabled him to enter into other people's feelings) are very easily entered by imaginary anxieties, and even wild fancies. Their strength is their "weakness."(47)

It is this strength of imagination which, Nina concludes, makes Chester believe in plots, especially ones originating from the aristocracy. She cannot understand, for instance, why he thinks it was a plot which caused the riot which broke up his rally at Chorlock. Egged on by his friend Goold, Chester becomes so sure of a plot, that he decides to plot a countermove of his own: he will go to Lilmouth, where he had promised not to hold any rallies, and speak at a missions meeting. He would praise the missions and contrast their good actions "with the action of the Government in making war. . . ."(54) As Goold, Chester and Nina all realize, this will get Chester into the national press, giving him publicity by which to further the pro-Boer position. However, as Nina points out, her own opinion of the absurdity

of Chester's suspicions was modified by the events which she witnessed at the Lilmouth meeting. Not only is she, as usual, swept away from what she considers her rational beliefs by Chester's vibrant and impassioned way of speaking, but she experiences the violence which must, despite her ingrained faith in the goodness of the aristocracy from which she comes, have been planned against Chester.

Although Chester seems often wrong in believing that, without interference from the upper classes, the masses would understand that he is championing their best interests, it is true that men such as Latter, officer and "gentleman," do their best to undermine his efforts. They believe for the most part in the old traditions of nation and honor, of the national war fought to foster power and economic growth of one's homeland. Yet, as wrong as the Boer War is from Chester's point of view, he attacks too strongly those who are involved in it for what they feel to be selfless reasons. It is partly what she considers the unnecessary violence of his attack which Nina dislikes; it is not in keeping with the manners of polite society as she has been raised to understand them. Also, however, Nina dislikes one of her men attacking the other.[58]

Latter's view is that Chester is a crook, which Cary points out in the preface to Prisoner is manifestly incorrect:

> A crook is essentially a man who is out for himself, who has no principles. Crooks are uninteresting people because their range is so narrow. In state politics they are especially

> dull. The question had to be how does a real politician, the handler, the manager of people, who is also a man of principles, keep his principles? How far do his ends justify his means? (5)[59]

Ultimately, even Nina has difficulty in believing that the sacrificing of Maufe was justified, even for the sake of the strike which Chester was then leading; this is why she tries to commit suicide at the time Jim exposes the suppressed evidence. But Chester manages to continue in his dedication to his higher goals, sacrificing whomever he feels necessary. Until the end, Chester's "wangle" wins out over Jim's "black-and-white" set of moral values.[60]

One of the central passages in the book, in which Chester persuades Nina to stay with him instead of running away with Jim, comes as a result of Nina's giving in to Jim's advances once again. Chester had insisted on letting Jim stay with them, despite the recriminations with which Jim had left them on his previous visit. The result was that Jim, positive of his power over Nina, had convinced her to make love to him, as proof of her feelings for him. The pleasure of this encounter had convinced Nina that she really did love Jim more and she tries to leave. But Chester manages to convince her that, being more concerned with her happiness than with his career, he will actually let her go. She is then oppressed with the sense of Chester's "queer pompous remarks about freedom or duty, or goodness,"(88) and flees as far as the train station. But he speaks to her there, gently stating his view of her great goodness towards him, "stooping" as she did to marry him, but without

insult. This makes her feel so defensive that, when he leaves her, she cannot get on the train and finally returns to him. She is greatly influenced by the charge, false though she feels it to be, that her flight was due to the class difference between them.

It is significant that, even when about to capitulate to Jim's advances again, Nina hears in Jim's words echoes of Chester:

> When Jim, as we trailed for the tenth time through the kitchen garden, said to me, 'We can't go on like this forever, and you know it; it is a rotten situation for all three of us, not to speak of Tom; we have got to get free', the word free by itself seemed to thrill in my nerves. And it was Chester's word; I mean it carried Chester's tremendous faith and enthusiasm.
>
> Freedom for Chester was the answer to every problem. It meant for him, Let God provide -- don't get in His way. And so, as I looked at Jim's long pale face in the dim light of the sky, which was a kind of luminous cloud, that very word "free" gave me the feeling that we ought to be able to fly away through the air.(83)

But this view of freedom is purely Nina's; Chester's has much more of reality in it. Nina, though more reflective and sophisticated, lives in her emotions as does Sara, especially as regards her men.[61]

Nina, whose world, being amoral, is based on people rather than ideas and ethics, is upset when Chester drives away Aunt Latter. Chester, who hates the old woman as a member of the aristocracy and, increasingly, a busybody, allows a small matter to escalate into a break. When Nina sees how distressed the old woman is, she tries to get Chester to apologize. He merely says that since she is

antagonistic towards his secretary Bootham, and "not a good influence with the children," he is just as glad to see her go. Nina chides him with ingratitude: "In fact, it is just what she says -- you don't need her any more, and so you are getting rid of her."(151) His total indifference to this charge angers Nina, especially since it was Aunt Latter who arranged and urged Nina's marriage to Chester in the first place, against Nina's feeling and judgment. Then, later, she reproaches him for bringing about the downfall of his former friend and ally, Goold, by publishing reports of his profits during the war. She has an insight: "It was as though I had never seen before this man (to whom I had been married for twenty years) who had suddenly revealed himself capable of a cruel and spiteful plot against an old friend."(276) She tells herself that Chester had, in the pressure of the moment done the only thing he could to protect himself and his party from a dangerous enemy.

> But I remembered, too, one of Aunt Latter's angry remarks, that I was a woman who excused everyone and everything because I did not want the trouble of condemning; and this, too, made me uneasy and depressed. (277)

What makes Nina's position so peculiar is that she had never liked Goold, who had treated her with disrespect and hostility; only a short time before, Goold had attacked her for causing Chester to forget his own people, by insisting on a fancy life-style and encouraging Chester to pamper her. (221) Perhaps it best expresses Nina's character that she reacts to those whom she consciously hates with deliberate politeness, and that she, as pointed out above, tends to

excuse and forgive to avoid trouble. She admits being a lover of pleasure, of an untroubled life; this is what makes it so difficult for her being caught between a politician-artist, whose imagination leads him to feelings of persecution, and a soldier-gentleman, whose lack of imagination makes him arrogant and overly-rigid.

Cary indicates that part of the problem in understanding Nimmo is that though he is an obvious egotist, and "not very scrupulous in his eloquence,...the modern leader of the people needs to be a spell-binder, and poets have never been very scrupulous in getting their effect."(6) If this statement is to be taken at face-value, it means that the masses, unable to follow logic, must be cajoled by emotional rhetoric; and that all artists and poets, whatever their realm of endeavor, are magicians of sorts, who create something almost unethically powerful in their incantations and spells. However, as he goes on to point out, this is the result of the extreme rate of change which occurs in the modern world:

> An acute American critic said that Gully Jimson of the Horse's Mouth was a politician in art, and Nimmo an artist in politics. This is true and penetrating in so far that both are creative minds in the world of a perpetual creation. They are inventing unique answers to problems that are of necessity always new. (Ibid.)

Nimmo, then, is capable of maintaining a creative freedom by means of adapting to the changes about him.

Nina, Cary says, understood to some degree Nimmo's goodness, the fact "that he was trying to do right."(Ibid.)

This is the reason, finally, that she stays with him while his career depends upon remaining married. It is only after the death of Tom, due to his disgrace and exile from England, and Chester's own fall from power, that Nina leaves him. And since he no longer needs her, Chester lets her go. Yet later, when she is married to Jim, Nina comes under Chester's influence again, as he insists that she help him write his memoirs. This situation, although reasonable from Nina's point of view, causes unreasoning jealousy in Jim.(366) And, falling under the pervasive power of Nimmo's creative will, Nina soon finds herself giving Jim just cause for jealousy. At last she finds herself so fully under Chester's domination again that "It was 'treachery' on my part to try to leave him even for a day." (397) When his attention for Nina come to Bootham's view, and the secretary is unable to pretend that he saw nothing, Chester turns him away. And when Sally, Chester's "daughter" (actually Jim's child) tries to stand up for the wronged secretary, Chester refuses to follow her ultimatum -- that he return at once to his own home.

> This astonished poor Sally so much that I was very sorry for her. She had never realised how little her 'devotion' meant to a man who was himself 'devoted' -- not even to a human being but to something that seemed to his imagination (which had done so much to invent it) infinitely more beautiful and worthy -- the Cause.(399)

Chester parts with Sally, telling her "that he was not going to be 'held in bondage' even by the 'most well-meaning of his henchmen'."(Ibid.) Nina, though she admits that she

"did not love Chester" and never had, finds herself, as her narrative closes, "now, more than ever, at the end of his life, . . . in his power."(400) Although she realizes that Jim is very suspicious and may any day discover the incautious Nimmo embracing his wife, she resigns herself. She cannot even despise herself,

> which is, I suppose, what Chester means when he says that such and such a 'poor devil' is 'damned'. And I am terrified of 'damnation' for it would destroy my happiness and all the joy of my life, and Jim can only shoot me dead. (402)

Which, as the reader learns later, is just what Jim does.

Thus Nina, who begins her narrative with her dilemma of marriage to one man and love of another, ends with this relationship partially reversed. She is now married to the man she loves but still under the power of her first husband. Although she realizes the danger of the situation, she can not change it, for she is happy. This dedication to the less secure but freer course of action marks Nina as one who is capable of adapting to the changes in life, under the power and guidance of the free male, who can continually help her create her own world. Although she has not learned from Nimmo the primary (male) art of creative freedom, she has gained a freedom of acceptance, the female passive relation to the artist. She is free in her role, just as Sara in hers; and although it is less conscious, less directed than that of the artist, it is still freedom.[62] It is precisely because she accepts her role within the confines of her particular "grace" -- belief in and devotion to Chester -- that Nina is free.

B. Except the Lord

The second book, Except the Lord,[63] is Nimmo's own presentation of his life. It is complete only up to his early twenties, due to the fact that his death cuts short his memoires. But it seems clear, also, that his earlier years of formative experience are more important in Nimmo's eyes -- and perhaps less disturbing -- than the later years during which his youthful principles are sacrificed to expediency. What this book presents clearly is Nimmo's religious background, the strong influence of a strictly sectarian father. Not so clear but coming out gradually through the narrative is a quality of guilt for selfishness in the face of others' need which helps to explain many of the actions which Nina chronicled in her book. Nimmo seems to be especially guilt-ridden, in retrospect, for his inability to understand his sister Georgina's suffering or to help her when she needed it.

It seems that, like Gulley in his way, Nimmo is unable to put people, no matter how much they mean to him, above the ideas and goals towards which he is striving. Yet, he feels that individuals can find what happiness is their lot within a religiously centered family. From the Psalm, "Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it . . .'"(273), comes the title of Nimmo's narrative; and with it the idea that this concept of heavenly guidance, especially in that holiest of groups, the family, is what he wished to guide his own life and actions.

He says that his writing was meant to show not just his own backgrounds but also

> the mystery which lies beneath all history, all politics -- the mighty and everlasting pressure of the soul seeking by ways unseen, and often unsuspected, its own good, freedom and enlightenment. (150)

Biased though it may be, unconsciously, Nimmo's account shows the reader a man both capable and willing to subject his own actions to the light of searching inquiry. As the artist, Nimmo is the most perceptive of the three narrators, if not always the most honest. Yet, as the creator-figure, he also usurps the godlike function of judgment, deciding between the needs and merits of people and ideals, ruthlessly sacrificing whomever he feels necessary in order to achieve his goals. While this makes some of his judgments seem false, in terms of objective ethics and human feelings, such action is within the bounds of the freedom which the creative agent can and must take to himself in order to realize his free world. The problems which practice and ideals in conflict with each other cause for the man of principles is, however, the heart of Nimmo's dilemma; for, as Hoffmann points out, Nimmo is an artist saddled with the weight of public responsibility. It becomes increasingly obvious that, had Nimmo had time to finish his memoirs, they would have involved an increasing amount of apologetics for the sacrifice of principle to practice. Yet, in or behind all that he did, Nimmo held onto the ideals of social justice and a religious faith centered in the Christian family.

The basis of Chester's argument in defence of his motives and principles rests on his life-long belief in the "true religion" which "centres in the family." For, as he cites from a letter written during his early political career,

> "it is only in family life that the freedom and dignity of a responsible citizen accords with his religious duty, and who shall say that one, who knows the burden of authority over helpless dependents, is thereby weakened in responsibility towards the state that is a father to its people."(100)

Yet, in his own life, his marriage was arranged to further his career by gaining Nina's money, and his "own children" suffered the effects of conspiracy and compromise within the family. It is significant that Tom was imprisoned by the personality of his erstwhile father and ultimately destroyed to protect Nimmo's career.

Although Chester cites his father's example as the basis of his own deep-seated religious conviction, he unwittingly shows a father whose example is just as selfish at times as Chester's becomes. Yet his father's willingness to sacrifice others rings more of rigidity than compromise and wangle, as Chester's comes to. The deliberate castigation of an erring member of the congregation, when the man had intended to give the elder Nimmo a job, strikes Chester's brother as wrong at a time when their mother was ill.(15) At the time, Chester is too young to fully appreciate the ideal which his father is placing above his mother's welfare; but later, when he, in his turn, has built a world of ideals (liberally laced with practical expediency), he values the lesson.

The difference gradually becomes one, however, of the stern father who would sacrifice the comfort and even necessities of self and family to uphold his sacred duty, and the son who, in order to get, consolidate or regain political power, would sacrifice anyone.

Nimmo explores, as a facet of freedom, the child's gratuitous fascination with evil.[64] This theme, already explored in Charley and A House of Children, is clearly connected with imagination and creative freedom. Cary has stressed that freedom holds a capability for evil as well as good. Again and again Nimmo states that, as a child, he felt that "to defy the law was brave and free."(20) In the play which he goes to against his father's orders, Chester finds not only ideas of freedom from repressive authority, but the kind of total immersion in imagination which later so characterizes his life. Yet, in this very freedom and imagination, the child "felt its evil"(80), the inherent ability of the gaudy fiction to woo one's emotions and energies away from the way of duty and right into something less stable. But, no sooner has he stated the great power of drama in church and "in the ritual of government," than Chester adds that he realized that the pure evil represented on the stage fascinated him deeply: "it seemed that something flashed from the very centre of evil into my deepest soul."(89)

As pointed out already, this play sparked in Chester deep hatred of the rich, as well as his respect for and

even fear of the power of oratory. But both took years to develop. When Chester hears Lord Slapton, a relative of Nina Woodville, blamed by his sister for the death of his mother, he felt, he tells us, no unreasoning hatred of the man or his class. He saw catastrophes, not as the fault of "Lord Slapton, or that vague entity the rich," but "as the deed of forces beyond my understanding, the decree of a God whose ways were not my ways."(96) He felt the awakening possibilities of being "a hero of the revolution," but one untroubled by wrath or "even revolutionary principles" -- merely making a better world for the joy of exercising power. Although Cary indicates that Chester developed principles, the question remains, in what proportion principles and lust for power stood as time when on.

When, as a child of eleven, Chester practised oratory on the flocks, he did so with the feeling of indulging in something shareful.(107) But the analogy to speaking to the "masses" is too close to be lightly passed over; later Chester finds humans very responsive to the same words: "'as children of God you are each of you free souls born equal in His sight. . . ." His father's failure to correctly predict the end of the world (117.8) became for Chester the basis of his rebellion against his father's authority and religion, forcing him into the worldly arena of politics:

> This family disaster which had made my father a laughingstock in the village, had a precisely opposite effect on Georgina and me -- it brought her closer to her father and nearly abolished from her mind all those strong political feelings which she had

> so suddenly revealed to me after the fair, while it removed from me my complete trust in my father's wisdom and so opened the way to political agitation.(121)

His faith, he says, " -- the unquestioning faith of the child in what he has been told by his parents -- had received a mortal wound." It is not until after his immersion in London politics and the wound which his faith in people receives there that Chester returns to religious belief and to his father's teachings.

It was at this time of chaotic thoughts and feelings that Chester came under the influence of Lanza, a nihilist disciple of Proudhon and one-time leader in the League of Peace and Freedom. His oratory, Chester says, gave him the sense of finding the direction and guidance which he needed within himself. Instead of the bombing, lies and trickery which the League had propounded, Lanza now taught love -- especially "that family love which guarded over all childhood. . . ." Chester refers to this argument as one of "enormous force," appealing to "an experience as deep and strong and true as it is universal" -- "What man does not remember his mother's unselfish affection? Who has not felt the impulsive goodness of a child?"(131) And, suspect as this particular statement may seem, Chester goes on to link it to his first meeting with Nina Woodville, in whom he believed he saw just such "frankness of childhood," a candour and confidence which came from "a soul fearless of man, because innocent of evil."(134) It was Nina's goodness, he tells us, that won him over against his revulsion at class arrogance, which

he thought he saw everywhere at Miss Latter's. It is only due to Nina that he stayed for his overdue interview with Miss Latter, whose subsequent help made possible his entire political career. This, in the light of his open hostility to the aristocracy, implies that Chester was ready to make use of anybody, even his professed enemies, to further his career and the goals towards which he believed himself headed.

The "crime" which Chester feels, in looking back, that he committed against his sister Georgina involved not discouraging her from marriage to Fred Coyte when she first mentioned the possibility. She mentioned it in terms of what it would do for Chester, their father, and the rest of the children. And Chester, though aware of the fact that Georgina was appealing to him to discourage her from sacrificing herself in a way which would not bring her any happiness, kept silence because the advantages were so very tempting.

> True, I did not say to myself, "I shall encourage this marriage -- and as for Georgina's hating Fred, that is a relic of childish prejudice." But did some deep and unregarded partner in my councils, lurking in some back office of my thought but infinitely quick and cunning in knowledge and foresight, tell me that Georgina was seeking support against the pressure of her conscience and that I should withhold it? Did he perceive the enormous advantage to himself, to his own secret ambition, of a settled income, of leisure to read, to think, to study, even to go to the University?
>
> All I know is that I did not speak. (156)

And the result was that, although there was every indication that Georgina really did hate Fred -- she picked several violent quarrels with him -- she managed to keep seeing him, so that the villagers assumed that they would marry. It

was agreed, even by Tom Nimmo, their father, that, if Georgina could "get used to him . . . , she'll not be so touchy. . . ."(162) And, after a visit to her brother Richard, at the University on scholarship, Georgina returns having "obviously resolved by then not only to marry the man, but, in the common phrase, to make a go of it."(165) Although this change was extreme, the villagers had seen similar changes in young girls, so everyone -- family included -- accepted it. Yet Chester does not bother to note the deep unhappiness behind such remarks as Georgina's that she will try to make Fred happy because "at least it makes father happy. It's the first time in his life he's been really pleased with me."(166)

Similarly, the young Chester allows expedience to overcome scruples which generally complicate matters for Fred and his father. When Chester tries to get Wilson, who may be an anti-labor agent, driven away by appealing to Fred's jealousy, it back-fires: Fred refuses to imagine harm where there is no proof.(188-90) Expedience, however, makes Chester try any means, no matter how underhanded, to protect his union of farmworkers from exposure and punishment. Similarly, Tom Nimmo would jeopardize his family's living by telling Fred that his heavy drinking is a sin; when, to Chester, it is far more important to have work in order to carry on with his political activities.(196) While it is obvious that codes of behavior and ethics mean little to Chester, at this time or later, his motives in the

early phases of his career seem commendable: he understands that there are times when it is more beneficial to oneself and those who depend on one to be less than openly frank or even honest. He is concerned with how to make the best of a specific situation, rather than with the following of any strict code, as his father, Fred and Jim Latter are. As Cary has repeatedly said, this ability of the artist to make decisions moment by moment is the basis of real creative freedom. Once one allows oneself to be sacrificed to one's moral values, as Tom Nimmo or Jim Latter do, one has lost the capability of freedom.

It is useful to note that Nimmo's problem of correlation between ideals and actuality applies not only to his own situation but also to others. Although he is writing from the perspective of old age, and knows what his own marriage has involved, he can make the statement that "women's politics" involve "the everlasting politics of love and truth, beauty and cleanness."(210) Although his suggestion that women's viewpoint and emphasis is quite different from that of men is clearly one which Cary himself believes -- it is the basis of his presentation of women throughout the novels -- this statement manifestly ignores the fact, of which Nimmo should be so clearly aware, that women, like men, can allow their worlds to be dominated by stubbornness, mendacity, senseless self-sacrifice, and emotional tyranny.

Yet in such statements he expresses the ideals which, in spite of his actions, Chester seems dedicated to in his

career. He says that, although his feeling was that women were "political children," in the light of his sister's ability to forget injustices, he must have been wrong. Now he believes the women were capable of a natural insight into the fact that

> love and duty and freedom were in the world before the thought and name of any god, before ever they could name themselves, for God is and was and always shall be, or there is nothing at all. (215)

This is so close to Cary's directly stated belief that the family, the natural unit which develops around the woman, is the heart of civilization and well-spring for the development of human freedom, that one must assume Chester to have an insight into the truth of the world in which he has been placed. It is the women in his life who constantly remind (or try to) Chester of the importance of family, friends and loved ones. Without this influence, and often in spite of it, Chester, as the artist, would get too carried away by his visions, his "Cause," to take people into proper account as individuals -- although sincerely trying to help them in masses.

The danger of creative freedom carrying one away into evil as well as the good which is first envisioned is made evident in the passage in which Chester, trying his best to be honest, recalls his part in Pring's "discipline" of "individual weak brothers" during an important strike:

> This book would be worthless if it did not show how men, especially young and ardent men as I was then, come to do evil in the name of good, a long and growing evil for a temporary and doubtful advantage. (243)

However, Chester forgets that, in his long and checkered career, he has done many similar things, culminating in the affair of Maufe, which, especially towards the last, seemed more the desperate efforts of a power-hungry politician to retain his slipping hold than the efforts of a benevolent leader to help his people.

The climax of the book, as Chester leaves it at his death (and, more importantly -- as Cary planned it), is the young man's disillusionment, his discovery that the great and illustrious leader to whom he has looked up as to a god, is a power-hungry manipulator: "no one on earth counted with him beside the cause." (260) That this same charge is leveled (in her gentle, quickly modified way) by Nina at Chester when he throws out his "daughter," Nancy, is another indication of Chester's inability to see his own failure to follow his ideals. In his continuing subconscious revelation, Chester points out that the downfall of Pring's "party of freedom" -- of Liberals -- was due to the evil of slogans, behind which despots can hide and wield their great power. And well he should know! he has wielded just such power through oratory and the opportune use of slogans, as Nina has so clearly pointed out.

However, Chester sees his own career more influenced by the selfless oratory learned from his father, who like his fellow preachers helped awaken the consciousness of the masses by "speaking mercy, truth, kindness towards all men."(264) Having turned again to his father's influence,

Chester says he found in his father's prayer the realization that one must "aim at the life of the soul" if he is to accomplish anything worthwhile.(273) He finds the decision to become a preacher, to take his father's flock, the central point of his life. And, helping to accent this is a visit from his sister Georgina, through whom he receives an insight into love and life:

> Instantly among the turmoil of my senses a darkness fell away, great presences were revealed, things absolutely known and never again to be obscured, grief that I knew for love, love that I knew for life, joy that I knew for the joy of the Lord. (274)

Yet, in the continuing paradox, this realization of Georgina's wonderfulness comes only after she has gone; he is never able to communicate to her the importance she has for him. And one feels the possibility -- the probability, given his past behaviour -- that Chester is using his oratorical skill to assuage the guilt he feels towards the sister he could never help nor even love sufficiently. Despite his motives, however, he makes Georgina the symbol of an eternal newness and creativity in life; she is "a heart that could not know despair because it forgot itself in the duty of its love."

> And my way was made plain. "Here," I said, "the story began and here it shall begin again, in the things I lived with this forgotten one, in the young cruelty of the world, in the making of our souls."(276)

"The making of our souls" is the image of the never-ending artistic struggle to create life and freedom at each moment, to express that God-given drive and ability within each

person. And "the cruelty of the world" is that combination of gratuitous injustice and misguided evil which constrict the artist and destroy him -- if he does not, through his own free creation of evil, destroy himself. Chester, for all his connivance and cruelty, seems to have striven as much as he could to gain freedom not only for himself but for all those masses for whom he accepted leadership. If his own account shows him hypocritical, it also gives depth and necessary background to the argument made by Nina that he was, at heart, a "good man." Cary successfully shows the deep mixture of religion which permeates English politics, emphasizing again his contention that all types of creative freedom rest on the religion of man's efforts to express his soul.

C. Not Honour More

Not Honour More[65] is Jim Latter's statement of his reasons for killing his wife, Nina, and trying to kill Nimmo. The title, which comes from Lovelace's "To Lucasta," exemplifies Jim's abstraction of life, emphasizing simple concepts like honor above the complexities of real life. From what Nina has previously said of Jim and what he himself shows, it becomes clear that Jim is never a free man in the sense of being able to create a world for himself. Everything he does is the result of action initiated by others. Even when he finally "takes justice into his own hands," he is fulfilling the role which he supposes set for him by his class and upbringing.

In Jim's view Nimmo is a scoundrel, a liar who has endangered his country and made Nina's life miserable. Yet, although every charge which Jim raises seems to have some basis, the bias with which Jim presents his story makes it clear that Nimmo is not so evil as Jim thinks him. What is evident is that Jim's guidelines for judging others are often too rigid to allow for human mistakes; while he himself is privileged by class to get his own way. One is reminded of Nina's repeated indications of Jim's character: bull-headedness in politics, finances and social encounters -- including love. If Chester can be fairly accused, as he is by Jim, of exploiting individuals and groups for the furthering of his career and goals, Jim must be accused of exploiting everyone for petty selfish reasons, for the satisfaction of physical desires and emotional gratification.[66]

However, several points come out in Jim's narrative which are not found at all in the previous ones. One is the affair of Maufe, and the other is Jim's in many ways quite reasonable presentation of his beliefs and reasons for what he does. It seems at first surprising that this book, the narrative of the "abstractionist," should be the last of the trilogy, in the climactic position which The Horse's Mouth occupied in the first trilogy; it is explained by the fact that not only is Jim the last one alive in this particular triad, but he represents the bullheaded social codes which destroy the artist and (perhaps, if the court accepts "facts" over "truth") will remain in

modern society. He represents patriotism, defence of country, and, in the England of the time, defence of the colonial basis of national strength and expansion. It is a somewhat cynical comment on the nature of modern society -- any society, for that matter -- that the facile attitudes of Jim Latter can be "the last word" on a man so complex as Chester Nimmo. Yet, even in his own time, Jim is anachronistic. He is an unchanged aspect of England at the turn of the century -- still the same twenty-five years later.

One point which comes out, in spite of Latter's protestations to the contrary, is that much of his basis for action against Nina and Chester is, clearly, based on jealousy. He begins the book with the first occasion on which he found that Chester was "interfering" with Nina. Yet, after describing his attempt to shoot Nimmo, he insists that it was not due to "personal feeling, as has been charged," (5) but to political disagreement, that he finally tries to kill them both. He cites as proof his book The Lugas and British African Policy. The Great Betrayal. In this book he had tried to convince the British public that Nimmo's government policies were detrimental to the Lugas tribes, whose lands were under Jim's colonial jurisdiction. Jim's "charges" against Chester went much further than this, however:

> I say he spent his life destroying the country and selling the people. I say he corrupted everything and everybody that came near him and stole this woman, my wife, from me when she was little more than a child and set to work to destroy her body and soul. He wanted her money to get into

> what he called politics, which was stirring up hatred and envy and making promises he knew would never be fulfilled, and when he caught her he proceeded to rob her and terrify her into his slave. I say if a murderer should be hung, which I agree to, then men like Nimmo should be hung twice over because they don't only murder people's bodies but their souls. I say it's the Nimmo gang who have destroyed all truth and honour in the country, including the sanctity of the home and marriage so that it is nothing but a jobber's match of gimme and what do I get out of it. (5-6)

Both the style, which betrays clipped, unimaginative thinking of the soldier, and the ideas show Jim's military tendency to simplify everything into "what's right" versus "what isn't." The latter catagory, to Jim's way of thinking, should be immediately set right, by whatever means possible -- including force, if necessary. His idea of the right government is that which involves the greatest amount of order; and since he has never found himself in financial straits, he has no reason to imagine that any red-blooded man willing to use his hands should be. Thus he interprets Nimmo's programs of economic betterment merely as the radical promises of a liar and thief out to get what he can. Because he hates Nimmo and despises his political and personal methods, Jim will not consider the possibility that there is any truth in Nimmo's charges against the present government, or that any good could possibly come of such a man regaining power.

What surprises Jim, however, is to find the extent of discrepancy between his ideals and beliefs and the conditions in England as it actually exists. First, when he tries to get his story, exposing Nimmo's "interference"

with his wife, published, he is told that "'Truth can be the worst kind of libel because doing more damage.'"(33) While never considering the actual workings of government, law and newspapers, as Chester has had to for so many years, Jim believed in the Freedom of the Press as an ideal. That it is not, in the fullness of his vision, available to him when he wants it is, to say the least, a great shock.

But worse shocks are in store for the naive Jim: he finds out from the Fascist Brightman, who would like Jim to name Nimmo as correspondant in a divorce case, to ruin him politically, that Nimmo has in effect been supporting both Jim and Nina for some years. (102) Although Jim, in his innocence, has not known of this arrangement, he tells us that "'it was so near the truth that nobody would take it for a lie.'" The actual situation, as he finally learns, is that Nina, trying as always to keep domestic tranquility at all costs, has allowed Nimmo to give her gifts and money rather than tell her spendthrift husband that he has used up his entire dependence. This arrangement, however, is not merely a momentary source of embarrassment to Jim: it comes back to haunt him when he tries to sue the Communists for calling him a "Crypto-Fascist" ally of Nimmo during the campaign. Lawyers tell him that another settlement of jewels on Nina, sure to come out in a court case, would be sure to defame his character even more. (208-9)

It is this growing sense of frustration, of the feeling that conspiracies are continually going on behind his back, which drives Jim finally to seek an explanation from Nimmo. By this time, the question of Nimmo's suppression of evidence which might have saved one of Jim's special law agents from imprisonment has come to Jim's attention, too. But his efforts to get an explanation merely cause Chester, who is caught with Nina after having promised Jim never to see her again, to scream angrily that if Jim wants to shoot him, he should get it over with. Jim is so taken aback by Chester's ridiculous antics, that he begins to pity the old man: "A canting mummy who talked of liberty and believed in swindling the people."(227) When Chester realizes that he has gotten the best of Jim's immediate anger, he talks him gradually out of taking any action at all. He promises that the affair of Maufe will be looked into at once.

Once again Jim, the man of action, has been "wangled" by the shrewd man of words. But, although Nimmo does not satisfy Jim about Maufe's case, Nina, who knows Nimmo's part in the suppression of evidence, tries to commit suicide. This, by taking the men's minds off their antagonisms, relieves the situation for the time being; and when she recovers, Nina promises to go off to Africa with Jim, "to start a new life."

Before they can get away, however, the trial of Maufe comes up. Jim finds out, finally, that Nimmo not

only knew of the evidence which would have freed Maufe, but deliberately suppressed it in the interest of winning support from a rival political party. While Chester knew conclusively that facts indicated Maufe's complete innocence, he knew also that Maufe, the constable, was a symbol of authority in a time when the masses were reacting against "repression" and Fascism. In the letter to Nina which Jim finds, Nimmo said:

> "What we have to do is prove to the country and the world, at this moment, that there is still such a thing as British justice. That this is not yet a police state where a constable can beat up a citizen because he disapproves of his political opinions."(301)

Although Nimmo's action seems -- is -- completely wrong, even evil, he is exercising his free creative judgment as a politican: he knows that for the courts to acquit the policeman charged with beating up a Communist will be taken by the masses as evidence of a government cover-up, an anti-Communist whitewash. From Jim's point-of-view, however, Chester's motives stem simply from a desire to woo Labour votes and exploit, for his own political gain, public sympathy for the "underdog."

There is only one reaction possible in Jim's canon to such a dastardly betrayal of man and country: to shoot both Nina and Chester, the authors of the scheme to sacrifice Maufe. Although Nimmo dies of a heart-attack in the water-closet, Jim manages to shoot Nina, explaining first why he must do it. He hopes, subsequently, to be tried, and if

necessary hanged, as the agent of justice. But once again the naive soldier is betrayed by the petty exigencies of the press: they do not want a story such as the one he tells; they prefer the love-triangle ended by a jealous husband.

This, then is the reason for Jim's book: to present his own version of his actions before the press distorts it. He feels that he has sacrificed himself to the just cause of ridding England of two examples of the cancer which threatens to kill the country from within. He is a prisoner of his abstract notions, to a greater extent than Nina is a prisoner of grace: for at least her imprisonment leads to the constructive end of bolstering Nimmo's creativity. Jim's leads only to the breaking of human lives against the rigid boundaries of his codes of ethics. He is not free because, instead of initiating creative action, he is dependent upon others to prod him into action. He, more than Wilcher perhaps, is a negation of creative freedom: for, although Wilcher is lost in the abstraction of his thought, Jim cannot be said to think at all. His sole purpose is to be foil to and perhaps destroyer of the free creative man.

V. THE UNFINISHED TRILOGY

The Captive and the Free (1959),[67] unfinished at Cary's death, was meant to be part of a trilogy dealing with freedom in the religious sphere. In his introduction, David Cecil calls this a book of "free spirits" versus "captives." Throughout the book, the question is raised, What can religion do to free a man, individually and socially? A number of answers are proposed, including that which Preedy seems to believe: that total faith can create -- or inspire -- miracles, including that of freeing men. He is a sectarian faith-healer, opposed at first by Syson, a Church of England preacher, who sees him as an opportunist and fake.

Among the forces involved, however, are newspaper journalism, which Cary seems to charge with the often-misused power of creating myths which can do more evil than the most self-seeking individual left to himself; and which, at the same time, can give the public the freedom of greater exposure to the facts which make up modern complex social life.

The newspapers are shown, too, as "big business," concerned about the threat of Communism. It is felt by some that Christianity is the only real answer, even in a doubting modern world, to Communism. And the type of revival of faith called for by Preedy is just the sort of Christian resurgeance best fitted to catch the public eye and spirit.(13)

But the question of freedom is dealt with on more individual bases, too: Kate Rideout, the aging owner of

the Argus, finds herself becoming a "thing," to be handled by others, but without a real will and freedom of her own.(22) When she is put in the hospital, she feels that she is in "just a cleaner kind of gaol."(31-2) She finds herself in the prison of wealth which attracts predators, and old age from which that wealth can no longer give her freedom. She finally finds Preedy's religious freedom tempting as a means of gaining freedom of spirit and soul.

Preedy himself believes that people imprison themselves within personal fortresses which must be shattered. His methods include a rude attack intended to startle people, to get them "to crack their shell."(52) His own conversion, at the hands of Jackman, the leader of a very anarchistic sect, was based on the enlightenment which he found in the tenets of personal freedom which Jackman taught: "Their strength is in the faith, the only true faith, of the autonomous individual soul. . . ."(55) Since this belief is based so nearly on anarchy, it is not surprising that Preedy's ideas should differ from those of some members of the board of directors of the newspaper, the Argus. Preedy attacks one member, Tinney, on the grounds that he changed his pacifist position of the first world war to one of support for war against Hitler. How, he asks, can a man who believes, as Tinney professes to, that mankind is "merely automatic machines without freedom, without responsibility, without souls" have ever considered war "a great evil"?(64) Preedy suggests that perhaps Tinney has always been motivated by a desire to "upset the applecart," to

gain acclaim by winning the sympathies of the masses. He is, Preedy suggests, a prisoner of public opinion. One of the points central to the book is that any "public servant" such as a newspaper, dependent as it is on the whims and money of the masses, becomes a trap for those involved in it. Joanna Rideout, Kate's daughter, realizes this: "If she got in there she would be caught in all kinds of tensions and hatreds; she would never be free again."(75)

Joanna finds herself pulled into the question of Preedy's faith-healing when it becomes apparent that her mother wants to accept Preedy as a means of escape from the hospital (73). Joanna feels obligated to check on reports that Preedy is a dangerous fraud, which brings her into contact with Alice and Fred Rodker. Alice had a baby by Preedy, which subsequently died as a result of being kept from a doctor's care. Fred charges that Preedy wanted the baby dead (76).

When Joanna and her friend Harry Hooper hear Rodker's story, however, Hooper decides that the boy is merely one of the "robots" of society, capable of nothing better than reflex actions (84). He finds himself admiring Preedy, no matter what he might have done to a girl of fourteen in the past.

> He perceived that his admiration for Preedy, his work for him, had been sincere and disinterested. Preedy, in short, was a man after his own heart. He had made a position for himself; he had become a power in the land, without help from anybody, and especially without support from the establishment. (Ibid.)

When Joanna takes the normal social line, that Preedy deserves to go to jail for his treatment of the baby, Hooper disagrees; Preedy is, he says, "a real person," and that is what matters.

Yet before one takes Hooper as an example of the free man simply because he recognizes Preedy's real capabilities for freedom it is necessary to note that Hooper is hemmed in by two dangerous threats to real freedom: one is his obvious fear of falling back into the lower classes from which he had come, a fear shown by his great contempt for the people of that class (85); and his profession, journalism, which tends so relentlessly to warp the thinking of its workers to the same moral rigidity to which Hooper claims to object, and from which he at first wants to protect Preedy (365). He recognizes some of the problem in his own thinking, too: that he is trapped between the need for liberal belief in the possibility of bettering human nature through higher standards of living and education, and the private view that the welfare state, the only means to that betterment, would destroy human freedom by fostering lack of initiative.

Preedy, whose vitality and confident action make him free, is, however, not presented as a likeable character. Even while he is talking to others about the need for faith in the love of God, and in the goodness of one's fellow men, he doggedly follows Alice to win her back to him. His agruments to her, based on the sanctity of their former love, are in direct contradiction to his awareness that his feeling for her had been (and still is) mixed with lust and cruelty:

> He knew perfectly well that his love affair with this girl when she was not much more than a child had been full of deceit and cruelty, and pure lechery. But as he spoke of it now it seemed to him that he was merely leaving out all the unessential things, that the moments of ecstasy were the important truth. So too, he told himself that the girl herself was quite an ordinary young girl, not especially clever or good. And yet when he had spoken to Marris of her as an exceptional creature, a rare being who knew how to live in the very love of God, it seemed to him that he had spoken a deep truth. That here had been a miracle of grace, to prove that miracles could happen. (98)

His conversation with Alice makes it clear that, as far as one can tell, she would like to be rid of him; and also that he takes pleasure in the memory of her suffering. When, after repulsing him continuously, Alice suddenly suggests that they make love again, since perhaps God has sent him to her as Preedy used to say He did, Preedy is carried away by her excitement:

> Obviously she was acting upon impulse, she had not reflected on what she was doing, and for him such sudden impulsive actions were always highly significant and important. As he liked to say so often in his sermons, "God moves in a mysterious way." (104)

At such times of sudden change from hostility to acceptance, he felt "God had his opportunity to seize again the direction of a soul." And although Alice has meant only to humiliate Preedy by putting him in an embarrassing situation at a time when her brother and Syson, the Anglican, are due to arrive, she finds herself so effected by his reproof that she cries and falls on her knees -- though she tells herself she is not praying. (106)

Syson, who feels he is doing his duty to expose Preedy, whose influence endangers the lives of some of his parishioners, gets gradually drawn into an attack on Preedy's personal life. He has wanted to restrict himself to attacking the "doctrine of faith-healing for everybody and for every disease." But when he finds himself in a position to attack Preedy's morals, he does; but the result of giving in to his hatred of the man is a libel action and censure by his own church. And when, having been made by Preedy's council to look like a greater hypocrite than his foe (144), Syson loses his temper, he is jailed for contempt.

After this episode, when he is free of prison again, Syson has as his idée fixe the public defamation and exposure of Preedy. When Hooper, who has decided to oppose Preedy after all, asks him why he risks imprisonment by publishing a second libel, Syson tells him he feels stopping Preedy "'would be a good cause.'"(268) He has, in fact, gotten just that sense of the injustice of Preedy's actions of which Gulley Jimson so often warned his friends. And Syson gets so bitter that he becomes imprisoned by his hatred: just as some of Preedy's followers are robot-like in their allegiance to him, so Syson, passing out anti-Preedy leaflets at meetings, goes in a "mechanical march like a robot wound up and set only for this action." (315-6) Yet even Syson himself sees this, though he cannot stop himself: he feels like an uncontrolled brain in a dead body (321), and realizes that in this conflict "between life and death" it is Preedy

who is "alive and I'm dead."(322) From the vantage point of jail again, Syson sees that he was "'the devil's prisoner, so tied up in anger and fear that I was not really responsible for my actions.'" (323)

From this time on Syson begins to have insight, he believes, into the real faith and freedom of Preedy. No longer trapped within the confines of his old ways of thought and action, he comes to respect the force and power of life which he sees in the faith-healer. Although his first feeling, in his bitterness, was that he had lost all faith in God and in life, he is returned to faith by the example of Mrs. Rollwright, whose child he had tried to save from Preedy's faith-healing. Her resignation and forgiveness reminds him of "'the miracle of God's love in the world.'"(326) So sudden is the revelation that he cannot wait to tell people; and when he realizes "'that though I was made free, yet I was a prisoner,'" he wants to laugh at the incongruity of his situation. (Ibid.) This is the laugh of joy in life's creative change which, like that of Gulley at the end of The Horse's Mouth, masks the tragic frustrations of life. It is the laugh of the perceptive free man, and marks Syson's acceptance of the injustice which accompanies creative freedom.

Preedy, while less sympathetic in character than Syson because less intellectual and reflective, is certainly the freer. He is in the best tradition of the "spell-binder," the man who, like Nimmo, uses oratory to persuade the masses,

who like Jimson, creates something of the spirit. When Hooper, trying to bolster the Argus with a sensational story on Preedy as "the beast" who mistreats the young girl, Alice, he finds the girl unwilling to cooperate. She, though beaten, has returned to Preedy because he needs her; and with him she has her role, free within the sphere of his creative power.[68] She dismisses Hooper and Joanna with "the glance of a free soul," full of scorn for the petty tricks which those two use to satiate the appetite of the "free press."(362) It is evident that Cary, although he would certainly have drawn his characters more fully had he been able to finish a trilogy, meant to show Preedy, like Gulley and Chester, as something of an anarchist -- wild, unlawful, but very much alive and creative -- yet ultimately a man striving towards what he feels to be the good. If Nimmo provided problems, however, in the obvious paradox between his ideals and his practice, Preedy (as seen in this novel) is even harder to reconcile. Nimmo, for all his conniving and dishonesty, was seen to have generosity and kindness, at least at times and towards some people. But Preedy is seen almost completely tied up in his own desires and power; his treatment of Alice is so cruel and unmitigated by kindness as to amount to just the beastliness of which Hooper planned to write. But Alice saw more in Preedy than that; and Syson, after his deep hatred, came to perceive a depth of faith and intensity of life of which the reader has seen little direct evidence. That the

ultimate judgment cannot now be made is obvious; but it is just as clear, from past evidence as well as generous hints in this book, where Cary's sympathies lay.

David Cecil points out, in his preface, that everyone in the book is "conceived primarily in their relation to religious truth. Everyone, consciously or not, is represented as seeking salvation."(vii) He believes that Cary meant Preedy's religion to be "the real thing," close to Cary's own unorthodox beliefs.

> Experience had convinced him that man's apprehension of beauty and of human love was inexplicable on any purely rational or materialistic terms. It was proof of some transcendental spiritual reality with which a man must relate himself harmoniously if he is to find satisfaction.(vii-viii)

No matter how much he wavered at times, no matter how "immoral" by accepted social or ethical standards, Preedy most clearly exemplifies Cary's idea of a dynamic faith in the power of God's grace to effect man's life in a tangible way, of God's love to spark man's love for his fellows and to give him a power to freedom with which to create a meaningful life for himself. That Preedy managed also to embody such qualities as egomania and sadistic pleasure in others' pain, and to derive his freedom from the enslaving of others, is part of the paradox which Cary sees in the human condition.[69]

VI. A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN

Artistic freedom is the goal towards which Stephen Dedalus strives in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man[70] /Hereafter referred to as Portrait7. At the end of the book, Stephen makes an involved statement about the necessity of objectivity, of freedom from the "snares" and "nets" of convention and institution influence. Although an immediate difference to Cary's artists appears -- Stephen is more the contemplator of active influences than the creator and dynamic actor of Cary's world -- he believes he has found an answer to the seemingly endless cycle of death and frustration within which the people around him seem caught and paralyzed.

Although Joyce puts more emphasis on contemplation and mental power in the artist than Cary, there are deep similarities in their implications of artistic freedom. For Stephen, after his long period of growing into understanding, comes to see that the artist goes "to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of /His7 soul the uncreated conscience of /His7 race."(253) While Gulley Jimson never iterates so socially-oriented a statement about his art, it seems clear that Cary often has his artists, especially Nimmo and Preedy, state that their aims are to open man's soul through an acceptance of reality and the individual's role in it. Yet, at the same time, the implications of Stephen's statement seem far more indicative of aesthetic intent than social: he means to create art which will give men a new, free conscience; rather

than to preach a social or religious gospel which will open men's eyes to the potential within their souls. Both Stephen and Cary's artists oppose the deadness of conventions which tie the soul in uncreative bondage; but Stephen envisions an art which will raise men above the level of men, while Cary's men want insight which will make them freer to enjoy all those things which are most human.

Portrait, a Bildungsroman, shows Stephen's development from childhood to maturity. But more importantly, it is a novel which traces the development of an artistic temperament. It shares, in this broad aspect, something of the purpose of Cary's A House of Children or Charley is My Darling. But in neither of Cary's books does he attack the personality development with the intensity which Joyce's stream-of-consciousness produces. Wright suggests[71] that Cary may have deliberately avoided this style, not merely to avoid criticism as an imitator of Joyce, but for the purpose of "rediscovering" old techniques. Cary's closest approach to stream-of-consciousness has been the trilogy form, where, if not a supposed complete view of a character's mind, the reader gets several character's views on some of the same actions, people and ideas.

But Joyce treats Stephen more personally, and thus more sympathetically than, for instance, Cary treats Chester Nimmo, the only character whose development can be seen all the way from childhood to late in life. Even here, however, one notes another difference: Stephen Dedalus, even after

being watched through two novels, is still young. One can only guess how Joyce might have shown him in old age.

Joyce shows, from the vantage of Stephen's consciousness, the earliest recollections of family and friends, the way in which people and events impinged upon and shaped his growing sensitivity and self-awareness. Most of these memories are fraught with the pain of dawning awareness of isolation and with the repeated shocks of injustice in the world. (These, of course, are central to Cary's concept of freedom, too.) The sanctity and protection of the family group are marred by such sayings as "Apologize or the eagles will eat out your eyes," and Mrs. Riordan's repeated implications of evil associated with Stephen's Protestant playmate, Elaine. Although, as family and the secular world around show their instability and faithlessness, Stephen is encouraged to put his trust in the Church, he cannot. Not only have the priests, as teachers, shown their cruelty and inhumanity, which the boy cannot forgive; but the Church in its broader body is fraught with corruption and paralysis. Portrait comes to take the form of a series of epiphanies, enlightenments, which come both as resolutions to prior crises and the foundations for further inquiry into life and its meaning. Stephen is perplexed both by the senseless conflicts between spirit and flesh and by the blind way in which people go on using old forms and institutions to try to solve these problems. His final choice, in this book, is to strive to fly on the wings of imagination, and to fall, if fall he must, like Lucifer. This choice, in

words, if not in deed, fits the Blakean idea that man must fall to be humanly free; he must experience life fully and actively, risking failure and wrong choice, to gain his place in the world.

But the triumphant cry of the end of Portrait, the invocation of ancient Dedalus, the "artificer" whose imagination gave him literal wings to free him, is a naïve hope of "the artist as a young man." When one sees Stephen again, in Ulysses, he is not old in years, but he is ancient in spirit. He is spiritually imprisoned by guilt, not capable of "grace" because he cannot forgive himself or others. He knows that "the priest and king" from whom he wants freedom are not external, but within his own soul. No longer can he see flight from physical Ireland as the basis to the flight into freedom which he needs. Instead of forging "the uncreated conscience of his race," he cannot come to grips with his own conscience. He is another kind of "forger," an artistic "bad check artist," who cannot do more than promise a masterpiece "in ten years." His failures overwhelm him, haunting him and "eating his heart": failure to free his family from the nets of starvation and deprivation, failure to free himself in mind or spirit -- as well as the obvious failure to free the souls and minds of his countrymen.

However, much of what seems destined to become the basis of that freedom towards which Stephen continues, however desperately, to strive is first seen in Portrait.

For instance, the reality of the beautiful and sublime ideal within the sordid and common appearance is one of the first paradoxes Stephen must resolve. His spirit is drawn towards the romantic tales of love such as The Count of Monte Christo; and it is in this light that he views his feelings for E. C. to whom he dedicates some of his poetry. But the feelings of the body, which are no less real and sometimes much more apparent, draw him to the street of the whores, where he finds his first sexual experience. After the bitter experience of repentance and a period of religious obsession, Stephen comes to the conclusion that the sordid is the more natural form, with which something of the other, the more ethereal, can at times be mixed. Ulysses shows Stephen practicing this belief, in his choice of friends and in his visits to the whore houses.

But, if Stephen seems to have achieved a closer living practice of the union of earthly and sublime by the time of Ulysses, he seems to lean towards the physical and sordid too much to allow the creation of that poetry which was to have been the result of his theory. He seems to have been too shocked by the realization that he could not easily will himself into exile from the bondage which enslaved him. He seems to have lost any sense of direction and purpose which he had at the end of Portrait. His escape instead of bringing him freedom only gave him a sense of being haunted by the ghosts of his unfulfilled obligations, especially to his dying mother. There is a hint that freedom may be

possible at the end of Ulysses, since Stephen has taken certain steps which free him from bonds which have grown up since his return to Ireland; and he may even, perhaps, have begun the process of laying to rest the ghost of his mother. But this is mere speculation; it is only when Stephen is put in relation to Bloom and his wife Molly that some sort of viable composite free character results.

A primary difference between the freedom which Stephen declares to be his goal at the end of Portrait and that which Cary's characters espouse is Cary's emphasis on active change, Stephen speaks of something which can be discovered, "forged" like an iron kettle, and used; Cary puts stress on the idea that freedom, tenuous as it is, can only be found when one is not looking for it intellectually, when one is caught up vitally in the process of living and creating whatever it is that one can best create, on a day-to-day basis. Ultimately the latter freedom, even in the case of Cary's artists, is not intellectually-attainable, but something which, as a power residing within one's innate being, can only be realized through active conflict in the process of life itself. By this definition, Joyce's books abound with artists, but Stephen is not the best example of them: he thinks too much and acts too little, imprisoned in abstract thought.

Portrait is more than a simple growing-up story. It can be seen as having the structure of the conception of the artist's soul; his growing sexuality, conscience,

and artistic spirit; preparation for artistic birth; and finally, flight into the world. In this way the book ultimately stands as the alternative metaphor to the paralysis of life shown in Dubliners. It is necessary to note that each chapter in Portrait presents a problem, works then towards a resolution; but that this resolution is, in its turn, dashed by the problem which it raises and with which the following chapter begins; until the final resolution seems to present the artist fully fledged. However, if one sees Ulysses as chapter six, the seeming resolution which preceeded is again destroyed. Ulysses, however, ends in stasis; the possibility for resolution is barely implied, the time for dramatic epiphanies being over with the end of childhood and youth.

The rejections which Stephen will make at the end of Portrait are carefully prepared for: one of his earliest memories is of a Christmas dinner ruined by the family squabbles over Parnell and the priests. Such things not only prepare for the dissolution of the family structure which plays its part in unsettling Stephen's life, they show the young boy how violent people can get about the subjects of politics and religion. But Dante (Mrs. Riordan) prepares Stephen in another way, because her objection to Parnell is based not on his politics, which she supported before his affair with Kitty O'Shea, but on sex. She also forbids Stephen to play with Eileen next door, ostensibly because she is Protestant; but apparently also for fear of what

might take place between them. In Stephen's mind she becomes an image of the excessive authority of the Church, which kills good men like Parnell (cf "Ireland is a sow that eats her farrow").

Gradually Stephen finds fleeting moments of freedom in the relaxation of authority (as when the family makes one of its many moves) and in justified rebellion against it (as when he complains about being pandied by Father Dolan for breaking his glasses). The growing sense of arbitrariness or downright injustice about authority, civil or religious, which leads it to turn as often as not upon the righteous as the sinner, leads Stephen finally to disavow allegiance to any authority outside himself. And even then, as we see in Ulysses, he must kill the vestiges of authority within himself before he can be totally free.

Since the Church educates him for the most part, and since he seems to have an aptitude for philosophy and religious doctrine, it is understandable that Stephen's revolt would ultimately take the form of an abnegation of obedience to the Church and all it stands for. This non serviam becomes the basis for Stephen's role as nay-sayer. Stephen often refers to the revolt of Lucifer, whom he views as a courageous figure because of his act of free will, his denial of God's right to obedience. Lucifer is also the image of the beautiful angel whose revolt caused him to fall into hell, a parallel to the fall of Icarus, whose youthful rejection of Dedalus' warning caused him to fall

into the sea. The images of Stephen in Ulysses as light-smasher and water-hater are related to these ideas.

But if Lucifer is the chief of those who acted upon the theoretical freedom granted by God to men and angels, he is also the symbol of those who choose to destroy rather than create. And the poet is one who must eventually create. Lucifer's sin is that of too great an intellect without humility; one who thought his power and glory equal to or greater than that of God. Only when the nay-saying can be at least equalled by yea-saying, the pride matched by humility, can the poet be free to create. But to live the type of freedom of which Cary writes, one must have intelligence balanced in due measure by ability to act and live fully from one minute to the next. This is Gulley's real ability, and Stephen's failing.

In chapter four of Portrait Stephen, repentent, he thinks, shows himself so incapable of humility that he finds it hard to merge with the common affairs of life. His fasts and penances give him such a feeling of pride in his accomplishment (God counting up his merits on a giant cash register in the sky), that he is almost totally without patience with other mortals. By mere effort of will he manages to keep back the flood of sinful earthliness which washes towards him like a tide. This image prepares one for the idea later of flight out over this same flood-tide (and also for the possibility of his Icarus-like fall into that same sea if too-high-flying melts his waxen wings).

The university becomes the alternative to the Church for Stephen. But this decision brings about a break with his family, and he interprets as disloyalty his mother's pronounced preference for the Church over what he feels right for himself. He is aware that this decision is "a first noiseless sundering" of himself from his family, but the vision of the University (Universe) is too much to make him feel regret. It is at the university that Stephen is first given his Greek identity (p. 168 : "-- Stephanos Dedalos! Bous Stephanoumenos! Bous Stephaneforos!") and moves out of the watery imagery of pre-birth into the first images of air and flight (though water lies forever beneath him). As he watches his friends an almost-gratuitous insight, an epiphany, flashes upon him: (169)

> This was the call of life to his soul not the dull gross voice of the world of duties and despair, not the inhuman voice that had called him to the pale service of the altar. An instant of wild flight had delivered him and the cry of triumph which his lips withheld cleft his brain.

It the "prophecy" in his name, that of the "greek artificer," which sets him free, showing him the way that he will follow: that of the artificer of words, the poet. "He would create proudly out of the freedom and power of his soul, as the great artificer whose name he bore, a living thing, new and soaring and beautiful, impalpable, imperishable."(170) In an image foreshadowing the death and resurrection cycles in Ulysses, he feels himself delivered from the death of childhood; born now into a life he had never known before.

At this point, Stephen seems almost cured of the traumas and frustrations of his previous existence, at one swoop; for even his sexual problems are answered in his vision of a girl, not intangible like Mercedes though just as beautiful, neither a whore, at whose grace and beauty he can marvel and joy in pure innocence. He sees her, appropriately enough, in terms of sea-birds. And he recognizes in this flesh-and-blood girl an aspect of real life which has all the wonder of fantasy but which is as real as any of the sordid things he sees at other times. Yet, as he says: "To live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life!" (172) -- this is the process of real freedom; and to this Cary would agree. The image of the "fall into love" is one which Gulley Jimson quotes from Blake repeatedly (the concept of the fall from innocence into experience). Here Stephen joins the various types of creation in the image of procreation, symbol of all creation. He seems to dedicate himself to creating his poetry out of life as it is, seeing that in addition to the ugliness it contains such visions of beauty as this girl.

Chapter five returns Stephen to the problem, however, of his full severance from his family, especially his mother, which must follow on his dedication to poetry.

The image of water, associated with the "death of childhood" and which tempers the images of flight and freedom at the end of chapter four, returns at the beginning of chapter five to emphasize that the past -- Dublin and its

dirt and frustrations -- can exert its power through the commonplace affairs from which the would-be poet cannot escape. Yet part of his decision to be a poet was the recognition that he would have to accept the dirt and squalor as the basis on which to build his poetic edifices; so Stephen accepts, as best he can, the frustrations of family life, even the heavy burdens of his parents' disapproval. It is the tie to his mother, symbolized in Ulysses by repeated references to the navel-cord, which Stephen finds hardest to break. And it is her influence that most symbolizes the possession -- lessening though it be -- of the old world of Dublin upon his soul and body. His mother's hold on him is represented by his letting her wash his neck, as if he were a baby. (175) But also important is his reaction to the pleas made to him by the representatives of "the outer world," those who would advise him to dedicate himself to something practical. Davin, the "Fenian," as his friends call him -- or the peasant student -- is lovable and generous. But Stephen discards his call to nationalism. When pressed by Davin to join the nationalists, he says

> -- When the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of nationality, language, religion. I shall try to fly by those nets. (203)

Davin insists that "a man's country comes first," that he "can be a poet or mystic after." Stephen replies that "Ireland is the old sow that eats her farrow." (Ibid.)

Lynch represents the bodily, even gross, attitudes towards life which regard poetry as worthless prattle. As Lynch finally says,

> -- What do you mean . . . by prating about beauty and the imagination in this miserable God-forsaken island? No wonder the artist retired within or behind his handiwork after having perpetrated this country. (215)

But it is to Lynch that Stephen feels he must explain his aesthetic theory, to counter the force of despair and hopelessness. He argues for the static quality of aesthetic work, its being above the kinetic actions of desire or revulsion which result from lesser forms than real Aristotelian tragedy. The tragic emotions are terror and pity, which excite one to mental contemplation, not to action. Beauty, he goes on to say, is the union of wholeness, harmony, and the realization of these into one whole which is perceived by one in a moment of insight (epiphany: divine revelation). (212-3) He then goes on to explain how these concepts refer to literature: that there are various stages, the lyrical, epical and dramatic. The artist's personality corresponds to these phases:

> The personality of the artist, at first a cry or a cadence or a mood and then a fluid and lambent narrative, finally refines itself out of existence, impersonalises itself, so to speak. The esthetic image in the dramatic form is life purified in and reprojected from the human imagination. The mystery of esthetic like that of material creation is accomplished. The artist, like the God of the creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails. (215)

It is this image of the poet which Stephen strives to realize. It is the answer to the grossness of life about him, to the dispair of practical action doomed ever to defeat or to unmitigated base living without relief of ideal.

Cranly presents a harder image for Stephen to defeat: that of the seeming obligation to help others to suffer as little as possible, especially those, like mothers, who have suffered for us and love us in their ways. When Stephen tells him of his refusal to do his Easter duty and the sorrow that decision has caused his mother, Cranly suggests that it would cost Stephen very little to go through the forms to save his mother a little additional suffering. Though he continues to say he will not serve, Stephen admits a fear that the teachings of the Church might be right, rather than a full disbelief in them. But his feeling is so strong against Cranly's defense of mothers that he feels (245) that over this difference of opinion their friendship is coming to an end. When he tells Cranly that he must leave, Cranly points out to him that he should not feel that his doubts about the Church make an outlaw of him: the Church is many people, not firm stones of faith. And people naturally have doubts, differences of opinion, and even times of disbelief. However, Stephen feels he must leave in order to accomplish his life's aim: "To discover the mode of life or of art whereby /his/ spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom."(246) When Cranly questions how free a man can be when he dares not commit sacrilege, or rob, Stephen explains that it is not that he fears punishment for doing something for the wrong reasons, but that he refuses to serve something in which he does not believe:

> -- . . . I will not serve that which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland

> or my church: and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can, using for my defense the only arms I allow myself to use -- silence, exile, and cunning. (247)

Whatever he fears, he tells Cranly, it is not being alone, even to the extent of foregoing all friends, even Cranly himself.

It is significant, an obvious piece of Joycean irony, that whenever Stephen is faced with arguments outside the realm of the Church with which he disagrees, he disposes of them by means of religious arguments and rhetoric. Although he has refused Orders, he is, by apparent choice, a secular Jesuit. The image of Lucifer is a good one; for Stephen, whose mind has been sharpened by the teaching given him within the Church, uses that keen intelligence to point out the failings of the Church itself. His refusal to serve, which stems partly from the pride of a free individual in standing alone whatever the cost, also stems from a realization that the rigid boundaries of the Church dogma and theology would too constrict his soul and limit his creativity. His is the position, so common to intellectuals and Protestants, that matters of faith and spiritual growth must be resolved by the individual to the best of his ability. This, as has been seen, is the heart of the religious beliefs of most of Cary's characters.

And like Cary's characters, who can show great heroism as well as arrogance and pride in their professions and deeds of freedom, Stephen can be seen as both heroic, in standing up and declaring his misgivings, and arrogant, in

claiming for himself the insight not granted to most men. However, this arrogance seems a small and necessary price to pay for the freedom which men must have to realize their potential as men. The correct view of the free man, in Cary and Joyce, would be a synthesis which allows one to declare him neither an unerring hero nor a proud fool; rather, a complex, living, struggling human being, aware of his limitations and through that awareness striving towards the freedom which he can gain in creativity.

Both Joyce's artist and Cary's are engaged in a full-scale battle against the forces which limit freedom: Stephen "tries to express himself in some mode of life or of art as freely as he can," using only the "arms" of "silence, exile, and cunning." Gulley Jimson and Chester Nimmo use cunning, too, and although they do not use deliberate exile to achieve their art, they are aware that isolation is a fact of man's existence, the limitations of which require the utmost energy to overcome. Stephen is, it seems, a less capable social being than Gulley or Chester, who can sway others to their needs, manipulate, lie and steal. Stephen does not serve the Church, but he allows the ideas and ideals of Church thinking to limit his activities outside that Church. It might be said that his actions and poetic power, to the extent that he can act and create, derive solely from the teachings and doctrines of the very body which he has sworn not to serve. He is a man trained to serve at one table, dressed in the livery of that house, who has no other clothes to wear and nowhere else to go and

who nonetheless will not do anything other than hover in the shadows, mumbling against those who serve, mixing aimlessly with the hangers-on of the house. Gulley, on the other hand, derives his power of action from the dynamic need to create and his acceptance of the realities about him; his art flows from his dynamic insight into life. The first is cursed with an intellectualized attitude and approach to a life to which he will not give allegiance, and which therefore poisons his living; while the second is so thoroughly embued with the creative power of life that his life and art both implement each other. Cary's artist is free because he allows his innate freedom through creativity to burst out in every way possible, especially his painting; Joyce's artist seeks desperately for a freedom which must be snatched from the nets of institutions and philosophies which thrive on the hearts and souls of men: his freedom is aesthetic, not active -- fleeting, like the flight of a sea-bird caught between the lightening-rent winds of the stormy air and the lashing waves of the sea in which so many seem to drown before they even stretch their wings in first flight.

VII. ULYSSES

In several ways Ulysses[72] can be seen as a continuation of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: not only does it continue the portrait of Stephen Dedalus, but Leopold Bloom can be viewed as something of the Artist as an Older Man. In no way is Bloom meant, however, to be the indication of things to come for Stephen himself: they are poles apart in more than their ages -- also in their basic approaches to life. The book can be read in a variety of ways -- as a parallel to The Odyssey, parallel to the Hamlet story (in some ways), and a tying of Ireland to the myths and traditions of ancient Greece and Israel. But it is also a continuation of the view of Dublin life in Dubliners and Portrait. Although Stephen Dedalus is one of the central characters, he is not the principle figure; Bloom figures in the largest sections, and the final soliloquy is given to Molly, Bloom's wife. Together these three form a composite character, a mythic Irishman, in whom the various opposites with which Joyce has been preoccupied in Ulysses are dynamically balanced. Yet, paradoxically, each of these characters is also alienated from the Ireland around them: Stephen, as has been pointed out, feels the alienation of an artist striving to free himself from paralyzing influences which have his land enthralled; Bloom, a Jew, is repeatedly reminded of his separateness, not only in religion and origin, but in way of thinking and acting; and Molly, whose female nature would be at home

anywhere, is Spanish, perhaps akin by nature to Ireland more than the two men but still separate by reason of her foreign birth. The theme of isolation is, in this way, made central to the book by having Ireland seen primarily through "alien" eyes (for instance, Stephen, Irish by birth, wants to "Hellenize" Ireland). Bloom and his wife are representative of opposing attitudes toward life -- the pseudo-scientific and the earthy, among others -- which tend to balance the rigidly intellectual and philosophical approach which characterizes Stephen. And although the relation of Bloom and Stephen is most important to the theme of freedom in the book, there are numerous other people -- many from Dubliners, representing practically every level and aspect of life in the city -- who by their talk, actions, and mere presence indicate the infinite variety and changeability of everyday life. It is this vastness of scope dedicated to the events of one day -- June 16, 1904 -- that helps to create the effect of the minutia, the fullness and flow, of life. But one of the points made by the novel is that, no matter how much things seem to change, there is a stasis, too, in people and events: although Bloom and Stephen and Molly and all the others in Dublin are effected by the events of "Bloomsday," they are much the same at the end of it as at the beginning; and although a child was born and a man died and was buried, these cycles are the same which have gone on before and will continue. The basic elements of life are unchanging:

it is the ways in which they can be put together that are infinite and in which man can exercise some apparent degree of freedom. Man is free when, as Stephen suggests at the end of Portrait, he can gain enough objectivity with regard to the conventions and institutions of everyday life to see these vast cycles and yet understand that there can be freedom within them.

Stephen is seen still chained to the problems and hangups which he was trying to cast off in Portrait; the primary difference is that he has been to Paris, his intended exile, and found the nets extended even there. And the guilt which he had felt at refusing to do his Easter duty has been compounded by his more recent refusal to pray at his mother's bedside as she lay dying. It seems that the strength of wing with which he meant to take flight as a poet as Portrait closed has been sapped by this increasing sense of guilt. But, there is also indication that Stephen has gained greater insight into the complexity of the problem confronting him: mere exile from the external forces seeking to bind him is not enough, for he must "kill the priest and king" within himself, too.

Bloom, with whom the reader spends more time, is also suffering from hangups, but of a different kind than those facing Stephen. He is not a "nay-sayer," but rather a "maybe-sayer." He lives on the surface, surrounding himself with "facts," mostly pseudo-scientific, with which he seeks to solve any and all problems which confront him. But the

reader is soon aware that Bloom suffers from an inability to commit himself: he is ambivalent, so capable of seeing two sides (if not more) to any issue that he can seldom act effectively in his own or anyone else's behalf. He knows his wife is having an affair, but since he himself cannot satisfy her, he feels the justice of her looking elsewhere for her "wifely due." He himself, though, takes refuge in an epistolary affair, by which means he can salve his masculine feelings of injustice at being cuckolded without venturing into the unsure grounds of physical infidelity. It might be said that Bloom, as he feels himself increasingly cut off from the conjugal completeness of relations with his wife, lives more and more within the confines of his mind, indulging in fantasies and adventures of sight, turning in upon himself.

It is his meetings with Stephen during the day which suggest the possibility (though not a probability) of a revitalization of Bloom through the influence of Stephen's mind and of Stephen by the influence of Bloom's warmth and material practicality. The third side of the triangle is Molly, the earthy female who, like Sara Monday in Cary's first trilogy, serves apparently to domesticate the artist (if she can catch him) and tone down his wildness. She is a nest-maker, the symbol of reproductive creativity, in general; though it is Molly's particular hang-up that she refuses at present to procreate. /This type of stifling of natural creativity is a major theme in Ulysses, symbolized

by the parallel in The Odyssey of the killing of the Oxen of the Sun.[737]

The theme of wandering is central to the novel: both Stephen and Bloom wander through Dublin, almost meet a number of times, meet and separate several times, and finally go back to Bloom's house together toward the end of the book. This can be seen as not only the parallel of the wanderings of Ulysses and of Telemachus but a smaller, limited version of Stephen's (and everyman's) search for "the mode of life or of art whereby his spirit could express itself in unfettered freedom." If the wanderings are more limited in geographical scope that Ulysses' ten-years' adventures or even Stephen's short exile to Paris, they are more apparently intense in mental and spiritual terms. Both men suffer through the various forms of their fears and hopes, frustrations and small victories in terms which make them clear, if not fully understandable, to the reader. An important reason for the concentration upon Bloom is that, being more socially oriented than Stephen, the effects of society on him are clearer than in the mind of Stephen. And since several of the later sections (primarily the "Catachism") make evident the differences and similarities between Stephen and Bloom, Stephen's own attitudes and relations to the society of Dublin are made somewhat clearer.

The book opens with Stephen being needled by Buck Mulligan, who like Lynch later, is seen to be one of Stephen's false friends, using him, mocking him, but

contributing nothing. Just as Lynch creeps away and leaves Stephen when he is about to be set upon (if that is the right word) in the nighttown episode, so Mulligan, having gotten the key to the tower rented with Stephen's money, leaves him without a place to sleep. Mulligan is the successful entrepreneur: a witty, mocking parasite who feeds not only on Stephen's money but on his mind and feelings. He bullies Stephen by harping on the idea that Stephen caused his mother's death by refusing to kneel and pray for her. This and such jibes as calling him "Kinch, you fearful Jesuit," make so much impression on Stephen that he thinks of himself repeatedly as Kinch, the blade, and sees visions of his mother accusing him, haunting him throughout the day and night. The climactic scene in nighttown comes when his mother appears to him and insists that he repent; whereupon Stephen, drunk and fearful and yet angry, too, smashes the whorehouse chandalier, invoking Lucifer with the cry of "Non serviam!"

The theme of Shakespeare's Hamlet is almost an obsession with Stephen. He has developed a theory, partly in seriousness, partly in mockery at the whole practice of textual and biographical criticism, by which he proves that Shakespeare represented in his plays, especially Hamlet, the miseries he felt over the unfaithfulness of his wife Ann (whom Stephen even goes on to suggest was adulterous with William's brother Richard). Since Stephen thinks of himself in Hamlet-terms, from time to time, the incestuous

and unfaithful Gertrude is, in his version of the play, meant to stand for the mother who betrayed him for the Church. But the varieties to which such parallels may be taken are so numerous that Joyce produces irony as well as agony in Stephen's thoughts: for the ghost which appears to Stephen, his mother's, is related to the ghost of Hamlet's father, and so on. And she is obviously meant to parallel several if not many other ideas: the vampire, which is conjured up in nighttown as one of the participants of the French black mass; which might also be related to the "bat-like soul" of the Irish woman of whom Davin tells Stephen in Portrait. The infinite possibility of parallel is one of the aspects of Ulysses which gives the effect of the multitudinous variety and possibility of real life. And the resultant confusion of idea and image at times, the blending of one idea-symbol into another, shows the changeability and fluidity with which one must cope in life.

The theme of Hamlet's father's ghost becomes in many ways a unifying symbol: it, unlike the guilt-provoking ghost of Stephen's mother, is the bringer of freedom. Not only does it bring the secret of the artist's paternity, but, in the sense of Stephen's personal search, it symbolizes the link with Dedalus the Artificer, from whom Stephen can learn how "to fly" (i. e., gain his poetic wings). This repeated image is one of the numerous foreshadowings of Stephen's final meeting with Bloom-in-search-of-a-son. The ambivalence of the world is, of course, amply reflected

in the fact that it sends no real father to Stephen or son to Bloom; and the paradox is reflected in Stephen's reiterated reference to the one who "pours poison in the porches of my ear": the same ghost-image which symbolizes his sought-after paternity. All things are or contain both good and evil.

Another theme which Ulysses presents is that of identity. It is difficult to be sure with whom one is dealing, because Bloom may be or become or resemble Ulysses, Everyman, Polonius, or any (or all) of a variety of other figures depending upon the episode and situation. His false identity used for the purpose of corresponding with Martha Clifford (and who knows if that is really her name?) is Henry Flower: but this is not a complete change, because Bloom equals Flower, just as Bloom's father's original name, Virag, means flower in Hungarian. By the same token, Stephen may be Telemachus looking for his father Ulysses-Bloom; then become Hamlet grieving over the worthlessness of women in general and mothers in specific; then William Shakespeare, wronged by Ann, together with Bloom as they gaze into a mirror in a fantasy in nighttown.

The first section, in the Tower, shows the relationship of Stephen to Mulligan and Haines, preparing the way for the major themes of the novel: death; sea and water; Greekness, Irishness, Jewness, and the interrelation of these; and identity. After the second section, which is involved with the school at which Stephen teaches history,

is the Proteus section, in which Stephen envisions symbols of his life. These three sections, which present Stephen to the reader, are then followed by the middle portion of the book, fourteen sections dealing primarily with Bloom's wanderings. The final and eighteenth section of the book is Molly Bloom's soliloquy which counters the nay- and maybe-saying of Stephen and Bloom with Molly's own more vital "yes" to life.

In the school section, Stephen refers to Vico, the philosopher who taught that history runs in recurrent cycles -- a preparation for the cycles presented in Ulysses. As before with Mulligan and Haines, almost everything that Stephen says is fraught with symbol: when Phyrrus is defined as the Latin form of pier, he calls the pier a disappointed bridge. This not only continues the jesting tone of his earlier conversations (which the school children cannot understand), but it suggests failure to get across the water, the idea of falling into water and drowning, in which terms he repeatedly thinks of his mother's death, his own failings, and the suffering of his family. When he, as the poetic and figurative son of Dedalus the Artificer falls, he becomes Icarus, the proud and doomed. And this fate of the fall of pride, like the fall of Lucifer but into a watery death, seems ingrained in Stephen's mind as his inevitable fate.

The phrase agenbite of inwit recurs. It is Stephen's deliberate translation of remorse of conscience from the

Latinate form to less familiar but more graphic Anglo Saxon forms. The ghoul-like gnawing of guilt within his mind, provoked by the memory of his mother's reproach, returns in various images, including the ghoul who gnaws at his heart and fox in the riddle with which Stephen puzzles his students. Not only does the fox bury "his grandmother," but, as Stephen adds later, he probably killed her. He is the crafty fox who killed his mother.

The paper on hoof and mouth disease which Mr. Deasy, the school principal, gives Stephen to get published is itself symbolic of the disease of Ireland: the dying of the Oxen of the Sun, procreative life and artistic creativity stifled by various methods of birth control. And during his talk to Stephen, Mr. Deasy brings up such things as monetary responsibility (at which Stephen is a failure), anti-Semitism (which prepares the way for Bloom), and faithless wives (which prepares for Molly, but also stands for Stephen's mother, and all women).

The next section, the Proteus episode, involves Stephen walking alone on the beach, not involved in conversation with anyone, totally withdrawn into his thoughts. He walks, seeing and hearing various things which stimulate his inner monologue. He sees women collecting shells or other booty from the beach: their midwife's bag brings connotations of birth and still birth and afterbirth with navel-cords to his mind. Navel cords remind him of the repeated idea of navel, center of life, which Mulligan had spoken of:

center of human life, symbol of the God-center of all life, of the universe ("Edenville," Kinch calling by way of the mystic omphallos-line; p. 38). When Stephen's mind runs free, as it does here, associations crop up with any and all periods of his life: "Madeline the mare" leads to the galloping rhythms of "a catalectic tetrameter of iambs" and "decline the mare." This last idea is seen in Portrait when Father Dolan tries to get Stephen's class to decline the plural of the noun mare, which indirectly led to Stephen's getting unjustly pandied. This, as so many random bits of thought throughout Ulysses, is referred to again and again, notably in the Circe or nighttown section, when Stephen fantasizes Father Dolan, ready to pandy again the lazy, idle schemer (whose sins shows in his eyes, as does his courage, and his whole soul).

There is a sense that man is, in each individual and seemingly different manifestation, simply a repetition of what has gone before and what will come after. Stephen seeks to discover his distinctness within the larger mass, just as he refuses to serve as one of the anonymous many within the body of the Church. Once he has discovered his potential through the process of inseeking and meditation, perhaps he can then function properly as a part of mankind and the world.

Finding himself on the way to Aunt Sara's, Stephen thinks of his "consubstantial father's voice," remembering the overheard words denigrating his mother's people, who

are Italian (which seems to be one of the reasons that Stephen is found later to know the language). Part of the stress on Stephen is the lack he feels of a suitable father-figure, a position which Bloom later seems to feel that he may be able to some extent to fill. And although it is Dedalus the Artificer whom Stephen seeks, Bloom is more of a father-figure to Stephen than his "real," or consubstantial, father, with whom he feels no kinship at all. In many ways Bloom's superficial knowledge and inventiveness are in at least vague line with Stephen's dreams of Dedalus the Artificer: just as ancient Dedalus invented, so Bloom's active mind invents and flies. It is this kinship to active minds and imaginations which, especially in the sense of freedom similar to Cary's, joins the younger and older man together.

Another aspect of the ever-changing world, the Protean freedom of Stephen's world, are the changes of language. The variability of language is a theme of the book: its shades of meaning enrich men's lives, but also tend to isolate them by increasing the possibilities of misunderstanding. The Eolus section, as well as the hospital (Oxen of the Sun) episode, shows the changes of style, evolving from gentility towards jazziness in headlines, or from Saxon simplicity and Latinate turgidity towards the streamlined but wild expressions of argot. Here however, Stephen's expressions run the gamut from highly intellectual to obscene and commonplace, mixing and blending ideas into an almost infinite possibility.

This is but one of the many aspects of artistic freedom with which the book is concerned. Even if Stephen is hampered in his efforts to be a creative and published poet, he is free to create (as are Bloom, Molly, and in fact the whole of Dublin) everything and anything which he wishes, either in unspoken fantasy, conversation or, as in the wild Circe section, fantasy which seems reality. Stephen's meeting with his mother in the nighttown Brothel is as real to him as anything that happens to him during the day; it is the climax of his emotional strife with his guilt feelings.

His thoughts turn when he sights the Pigeonhouse to memories of Paris, of "The Song of the Joking Jesus" (which he and Mulligan sang for Haines earlier), and Kevin Egan, whose status as a "wild goose" in exile connects him in Stephen's mind with pigeons. This leads to memories of his call back home to attend his dying mother: the net which caught him even in Paris and dragged him home again into bondage (though he had never really gotten free, he later realizes). The image of birds, so indicative of free flight in Portrait, has now become associated with so many paradoxical ideas that it, like Stephen's life as a whole, is no longer clear. "Le pigeon" in the humorous song is a blasphemous image of the Holy Spirit, with which Stephen alternately mocks himself, the secular Jesuit, and the Church, and womankind and almost everything else which he once held sacred. In the song the pigeon is responsible for putting Mary "dans cette fichue position" -- an image of

the marital interloper, one which recurs throughout the book. Even Kevin Egan, who seems to cut a poor figure as a "wild goose," suffers, like Menelaus (whom he seems to parallel somewhat), from the problems of having an unfaithful wife.

But one of the problems of the wild goose exiles is that Ireland herself is unfaithful, "the old sow that eats her farrow"; and Stephen thinks of the various betrayed leaders who have had to escape, disguised from the very people for whom they had given up all else (43). It is the need for disguises that brings on many of the Protean changes which appear, especially in regard to Stephen and Bloom. But everyone indulges in the pastime of roles and poses: Mulligan, for instance, is so successful because he can put different shapes on and off at will. Stephen, in search of a permanent and lasting identity, a heritage and sonship, is less willing to float from one shape to another. He, as the catechism tells us later, hates aquacity of thought or word, as well as water in its physical manifestations.

The refusal to serve is linked in Stephen's mind with his inability to save his mother, drowning in the sea of death (46). Later (50) he thinks of The Tempest and of drowning again, of "a seachange" of a live man by the "mildest of all deaths known to man" into a "bag of corpsegas sopping in foul brine." This is to him the most horrible of all possible deaths, and the imagery with which he sees death is usually in terms of drowning. The section ends with

Stephen continuing his wanderings towards the Ship pub (which he fails to reach) where Mulligan wants to meet him at noon. The last image, appropriately, is "a threemaster, . . . silently moving, a silent ship." (51)

Throughout the rest of the book, Bloom sees Stephen fleetingly several times, during the course of his daily business as an add-collector. The sections of the book deal with such large themes as death, identity, sterility and uncreativity, natural creativity, dream-fantasy, and return. Molly's soliloquy produces an effect of affirmation, a positive note after the frustration and negation of the previous sections.

Perhaps most important in the Eolus section is the appearance of Stephen's only creative effort during the course of the day (or, as far as one can tell, since his return to Ireland): "A Pisgah Sight of Palestine or the Parable of the Plums." Presented as a joke, it however ties the theme of sterility central to Dubliners (representing Stephen's own artistic paralysis) to Ulysses (the work ten years hence). Tied together whimsically are the old sterile women, the sexual image of the "one-handled adulterer," and the plumseeds which the women toss down to the unfertile streets of Dublin. Yet, these images, growing slowly from the seeds of thoughts in Stephen's mind, cause him to muse: "Dublin. I have much, much, to learn. . . ," and to say: " -- I have a vision too." (144) The suggestion is that if Stephen can once get free of the burdens of guilt he

will find a wealth of material for his writing in the sights and life of Dublin. However, the virgins of the parable are typical of the sterile part of Dublin life which Ulysses presents under the image of the killing of the Oxen of the Sun: infertility, non-reproductivity, and all the various forms of paralysis which come from a freely chosen uncreative course in life. The image of the two old women, too afraid to look down at the city (the present) or up at the statue of Nelson (symbol of the past), sitting on the tower (symbol itself of masculine sexuality), afraid it will fall, and sowing the streets below with sterile plum-pits -- all this is part and parcel of the sterility which Mulligan (in the hospital section) calls "copulation without population," the denial of life.

The theme of change, so central to Ulysses, is one of the key similarities to Cary's theme of freedom. Stephen, in the library with A. E., theorizes about the ineluctible change of matter, telling himself first that, due to the change of molecules in all things, the "I" who borrowed from A. E. five months ago cannot be the "I" which exists now. But, trapped by the logic of his mind, he must admit: "I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory because under ever-changing forms." (189) This paradox of change within continuity prepares one for the stasis of sorts with which the book ends, a balance between Stephen, Bloom, and Molly which will both last and instantly pass away into something else.

Man's search for freedom through self-realization is one of the themes of Ulysses. One of many summaries of this idea is given in Stephen's statement, in explaining Shakespeare, that:

> Every life is many days, day after day. We walk through ourselves, meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love. But always meeting ourselves. (213)

It is just such a day, emblematic of the whole of life, which the novel shows. Identities flow, change, resolve and fade again; and just as Cary says about freedom, nothing can be fixed permanently, lest it die. The process of eternal change and movement which brought Stephen and Bloom together is part of an ebb and flow, a cycle of life, in which nothing is ever the same twice. But in which the movement of life begets life in its turn. The similarity to Cary's multitudinous give-and-take of free life is striking. In both worlds the artist tries to gain his freedom and his creative inspiration out of the very dynamics of life's fulness.

The theme of freedom in Ulysses is less positive than that of Portrait. Whereas the latter leads the young man through his various crises to the declaration of independence into creative freedom, Ulysses shows a multitude of people immeshed in a multitude of ways -- including the erstwhile poetic freeman. Ultimately, however, Joyce indicates that the apparent freedom of escape is not the real answer: one is only free when one faces the causes and effects of the bondage and paralysis. This is close to Cary's belief in acceptance of the limitations of self and surroundings as the basis for freedom.

Perhaps one of the central differences, if it can be counted as such, between Cary's freedom and that of Joyce is the sensitivity, the almost womanishness, of Joyce's artist. Stephen has not the fortitude, the willingness to keep on which characterizes Gulley Jimson, Chester Nimmo and the other male creative free men. His introspection -- even his futility -- seem closer to the contemplative stalemate which Tom Wilcher reaches in life. Yet, while Wilcher is an old man whose vision is turned towards the unproductive past, Stephen is young and is gradually turning his vision away from his own guilt towards the myriad artistic possibilities of the present. The artist, in Joyce's scheme as well as Cary's, must be able to live fully in the present, capable of accepting life, good and bad, happiness and injustice, in order to create. Whereas Stephen talks in terms of one "great work," it seems obvious that he may develop towards the idea which Gulley embodies: that one's work can never be "finished" until one is dead. Stephen has learned Cary's lesson: that real freedom is not lack of restraint, but the creative power to realize the potentials of one's soul.

VIII. THE HEART OF THE MATTER (1948)[74]

Although Greene's world differs markedly from that of Joyce and Cary, all share the use of a moral standard. That of Cary is predicated on the belief that every man can, by ceaseless striving, produce a free world viable to the potentials which he can realize within himself. Joyce's world aims at the ending of spiritual paralysis, the unburdening of the individual's soul of the weight of convention, guilt and all unproductive ways of thought and life. Both of these men show worlds almost unbounded in their possibility, open to the artist-free man confident and steadfast enough to his vision to cultivate the soil.

Greene's world is somewhat different: it is a world in which the isolation of the individual paralyzes him, defeats his efforts at creativity -- or even acceptance of his world -- until he opens the channels to productive life through intimate relations with another human being. While the love of a dedicated woman (if not more than one), and the aid and comfort of friends, is important to Cary's artists -- perhaps even vital; to Greene's men and women it is the one single basis of creative life. Joyce's artist is more dependent on the communion of a kindred spirit than the love of a woman; but the image of Molly represents the natural renewal which may come to the artist through the love of a spirit capable of a natural affirmation of life.

Greene's characters are trapped by false pride, the "original sin" -- trapped into patterns of thought or

action which increase their isolation from others until a crisis occurs which forces them back on whatever faith or hope they can muster. Scobie suffers the injustices of an unloveable wife and professional ingratitude; yet the more he suffers, the farther from others he gets until he falls into his love affair with Helen, precipitating his doom. Bendrix allows his jealous hatred of his former mistress and her husband to lead him into bitter thoughts and actions, cutting him off from the communication and companionship he desperately needs until, in a sense, it is too late. Fowler, driven by his feeling of justice, causes the death of the one man to whom he could talk, a man who, although naive and politically dangerous, had considered him his best friend. In spite of these errors, most of Greene's central characters are sincerely striving to do their best; yet, being trapped within themselves, cut off by the very fact of their individual personalities, they are tempted into wrong choices which ultimately destroy them. It is only love which tempers their dooms, especially the self-abnegating love for others, which sets them free, somewhat paralleling the creative freedom of Cary's system.

The question which arises repeatedly for Scobie, the man torn between duty and sentiment, between wife and mistress, is whether he is capable of love for anyone, himself included. His wife, Louise, suggests that he looks upon her as merely an impediment, that what he really wants is peace in responsibility for no one. (60) This

seems true: in his dreams Scobie repeatedly sees himself alone with his servant Ali in un-peopled meadows, peacefully walking onward. (82). And it seems fair to suggest that death might bring peace from worldly troubles to most people; yet the death which Scobie finally chooses is one which he is sure will put peace eternally out of his reach. The decision to accept this means of solving what he believes to be problems of those he loves is therefore all the more a self-sacrifice.

In Scobie's dilemma the choice involves ethical responsibility. His freedom seems somewhat limited because he is so strongly drawn towards the course of action he follows: self-sacrifice for Helen and Louise. However, at almost every step of his story Scobie seems to have the alternative of doing the "normal" thing: accepting defeat and going on with life anyway. If his choices seem wrong in terms of social mores or religious doctrine, they are right, Scobie believes, in terms of the needs of the people for whom he feels responsible. The freedom which he has is to choose the more complex "right" over the easier way. He is not so much a prisoner of any outside laws or forces as of his sensitivity and his beliefs: he pities those who fail, who need help, and his whole life is given to trying to make his needy loved ones happy. When he considers the problem of religious doctrine, which teaches that he should leave Helen because he is married to another woman, he comes to the conclusion that God must understand. If

he, Scobie, pities the misery of his fellow men, how much more must God, with His perfect knowledge, at "the heart of the matter," pity. (128) Such knowledge would make life unbearable, he decides; perhaps this awareness is part of the reason for Scobie's suicide.

When Louise discovers, with the aid of Wilson, the agent who helps put pressure on Scobie, that his death was apparently suicide, not a heart attack, she tells Father Rank her disappointment. Her husband, she feels, has damned himself forever. She can see no reason, therefore, to pray, since nothing could change. Father Rank angrily reproves her, saying that she is wrong to limit God's mercy to what is understood within the limits of the Church. He says that, in spite of what he did, Scobie seemed to have "'really loved God,'" (306) though he admits that he may not have loved anyone else. He points out, too, that Scobie must have chosen "damnation" because "'He never had any trust in mercy -- except for other people.'" This is in keeping with Scobie's own thoughts much earlier, that "There was only one person in the world who was unpitiable -- himself." (192)

It is the fact that he blames himself for everything -- for what Louise has become, since he feels that he molded her character; for Helen's position of dependence upon him -- that explains his feelings of extreme responsibility. His marriage, loveless as it is, is based, he feels, on "his terrible private vow that she should be happy," made when he married her.

> Despair is the price one pays for setting oneself an impossible aim. It is, one is told, the unforgivable sin, but it is a sin the corrupt or evil man never practices. He always has hope. He never reaches the freezing point of knowing absolute failure. Only the man of good will carries always in his heart this capacity for damnation. (61)

This idea is central to the story, for **Scobie** repeatedly meets seemingly impossible situations with the blind faith that, somehow, he will find a solution because he has to. And the reason he feels he must is that the happiness of another person is at stake.

That this feeling is more widespread in **Scobie's** actions than merely with respect to his wife and lover is seen in his kind treatment of Yusef long before he is in need of that man's help, despite the approbrium attached to any contact with Syrians in general and Yusef in particular. And his decision not to report the letter smuggled by the captain of the Esperanca, which leads the way to the spiraling involvement of **Scobie** in illegal affairs, is based on concern for the suffering of another human being, caught up in matters which would certainly convict him without the presence of real guilt. **Scobie** considers his action as being worse than one motivated by bribery, which he had assiduously avoided.

> /Other officials/ had been corruped by money, and he had been corrupted by sentiment. Sentiment was the more dangerous, because you couldn't name its price. A man open to bribes was to be relied upon below a certain figure, but sentiment might uncoil in the heart at a name, a photograph, even a smell remembered. (55)

But sentiment is too light a word for what **Scobie** exhibits towards others. It is much more. As he tells Helen, he

is motivated by a desire to see that others suffer as little as possible. Love to him means feeling so strongly responsible for another that one cannot have any peace if that other "'may be in pain, unhappy, in want.'" (167)

That this way of living leads to Scobie's troubles is evident. But the alternative is one which he feels would make life more wretched. At one point he tries to explain further his ideas of what love is.

> "It's a mistake to mix up the ideas of happiness and love," Scobie said with desperate pedantry as though if he could turn the whole situation into a text-book case -- as they had turned Pemberton -- peace might return to both of them, a kind of resignation. (230)

And in trying to explain why, in spite of his belief in the doctrines of the Church, he continues to go against them: ". . . then, against all the teaching of the Church, one has the conviction that love -- any kind of love -- does deserve a bit of mercy."(231) Although he questions at various times whether he is really loving -- "was it just a feeling of pity and responsibility?" (248) -- it is this suggestion of 'a bit of mercy" which alone tones down the awful finality of what Scobie believes he is doing -- what he does do: killing not only his physical body but his eternal soul. When he decides he must take communion unabsolved, to reassure Louise, he makes a lesser but still very serious transgression against his faith. But he prays: "'O God, I offer up my damnation to you. Take it. Use it for them,' and was aware of the pale papery taste of his eternal sentence on the tongue." (250)

It is certainly this "damnation," together with the death of Ali, whom he loved perhaps more than anyone else -- a death for which he is partially to blame -- which makes the step into suicide simpler for Scobie. He has, through his part in the killing of Ali, failed the one person whom he loved who made no demands on him in return; by extension, he fears that to go on living would surely expose his other loved ones -- or ones dependent on him, if nothing else -- to unnecessary misery and suffering.

The main distinction between this presentation of the efforts of a human to find his way and that which Cary presents is that Cary's free men would choose to suffer, and let others suffer, <u>any</u> sort of life rather than voluntarily end it. A dead man, Cary feels, is the least free, and while Greene does not seem to suggest otherwise, Scobie is made to be sympathetic and intelligent -- or at least deeply considerate -- while choosing lines of action detrimental to his continued existence. He is, to be sure, a "just man," and one feels that he is as good as he knows how; but is his choice moral in terms of the framework which Greene implies? Does he, as seems indicated by the subsequent actions of the women, merely abrogate his responsibility to them, letting his hypersensitive feelings blind him to more valid choices open to him? The fact is that the answer to these questions is not as easily arrived at as it would be in Cary's work. This suggests that, for all the latter's apparent lack of authorial bias, Cary makes his judgments clearer than Greene does.

By extrapolating from the other novels, however, it may be fair to suggest that Greene means one to see Scobie's actions as the unfortunate moves of a man whose sentiments outweigh his judgment, whose pride ultimately cuts him off from those meaningful relationships through which he might have gained freedom enough to go on living. Together with this, however, is the fact that Scobie is also hemmed in by the pride and prejudice of others, by their deliberate malice and gratuitous minunderstanding: to this extent he is trapped, set up for the final wrong choice which will end his life ironically, unnecessarily.

In this novel and The End of the Affair the special moral framework of Catholicism operates. The question arises, what is its relation to the overall framework? In the present book one sees, ironically, that the religious framework is false in the sense that it fails to give aid to Scobie in his time of need; but at the same time it -- through Father Rank -- gives Louise a much more valid view of Scobie's death than she can manage by herself. On the one side the Church framework is the too-solid form of doctrines and ritual which have little to do with the basic matter of free life, the relationships between man and man (or woman). On the other, it is the reservoir of faith and guidance which, in The End of the Affair, seems to guide Sarah towards God's love in spite of everything she does or wants. Perhaps the Church was invalid for Scobie; perhaps he was merely incapable of taking what the Church offered. The exact judgment is not given by Greene.

It seems clear, in the light of the other novels, that religion has its truest form, most valid for man, when it stems from or teaches that love for others which has been mentioned above. **Scobie** says that perhaps any kind of love will earn one at least a little mercy from God. This seems to be one of Greene's beliefs.

This idea is not far from that which Cary presents in The Captive and the Free: Syson is more captive in his blind acceptance of Anglican forms than Preedy in his fluid and open "faith church," in spite of the fact that Syson seems a more righteous man in the usual sense. Preedy is seeking God through love of his fellow men, though he is one of the first to admit that he is largely a failure. It is better to try sincerely and fail grievously, like Preedy, than, like Syson at first, not to try at all, remaining safe in the old forms and beliefs. **Scobie**, for all his failure, is a man of imagination, one who strives to go beyond the accepted bounds, those bounds which seem to keep Father Rank and the Church back, paralyzing them. Yet it seems clear, too, that Greene would feel a man like Syson, once awakened to the need of others, more moral and free in the helping of one injured child than Preedy, with his highhanded treatment of Alice, striving towards no matter what great goals of human freedom.

IX. THE END OF THE AFFAIR (1951)[75]

This book, which deals with a writer's efforts to discover the reasons for the end of his affair with a beautiful married woman, deals not so much with man's creative freedom as with convolutions through which love of God goes to reach men's hearts. The narrator, the writer Maurice Bendrix, is an atheist who, like Thomas Fowler in The Quiet American, enjoys disabusing the naive of their illusions. But in this book he appears less sympathetically than Fowler, for the woman involved is much more sensitive, finally more obviously hurt by Bendrix' jealous and selfish ways than Phuong ever seemed to be. Yet like Fowler, whose primary actions seemed directed towards destruction to protect a sort of status quo, Bendrix seeks a stasis by hastening his love affair to its end when he realizes that it cannot last. Paradoxically, she leaves him first; and after two years he sets out to discover the reason. His discovery is so shocking that he finds it hard to accept: that, having prayed to a God in whose existence she did not believe and apparently having received her wish, she had vowed to give up her lover.

It is only in reading her diary, stolen for him by a detective, that Bendrix realizes that she had prayed because she thought he was dead, that it was for his life and happiness that she had been willing to give up their affair. This strikes him at first as nonsense: that she should sacrifice their happiness together to a silly vow to a nonexistent God. Later, however, after her death (partially

as a result of his insistence on renewing their affair), he finds himself obsessed by Sarah's conversion, by the "coincidences" which continue to crop up in connection with her, and with his own similar feelings toward "God if he exists."

This book is more directly concerned with the question of faith and love than the other two. And through these comes freedom, freedom from jealousy, fear of loneliness and pride which demands revenge. Freedom which means an ability to act without regard for self.

Bendrix, however, does not consider himself -- or most people -- really free: it is only the "saints" (of whom perhaps Sarah is one) who manage to exercise free will; the rest must be shoved around like recalcitrant characters in a book. It is only through Sarah that he finally glimpses the possibility for freedom, only after she becomes "saintly."

The book is meant, Bendrix tells us, as a record of hate more than of love. (10) But by the end of the book he decides that the hate has gotten mislaid -- at least hatred of Sarah or her husband, Henry. What remains is either self-hatred, for having allowed the little love he did share with Sarah to be poisoned by jealousy and distrust, or hatred of God, for having won her from him. One of the shocks which Bendrix receives after Sarah's death is learning that, not only did she start to convert to Catholicism but she had been secretly baptised a Catholic at the age of two. He fears that somehow God's influence lurked in her all those years and that she really loved Him during that time Bendrix

thought she loved him. This would mean not only that he had not had all her love to himself then, but that his "rival" had won her from the very beginning.

This image -- of a man jealous of God -- serves to set the stage for Bendrix' own conversion, an implication with which the book ends. For one of the paradoxes is that Sarah found love of God through hatred; and Bendrix finds himself falling into the same pattern. This relationship is one which Bendrix sees long before he understands what is happening to Sarah. He dislikes the affected gentleness that Henry shows towards his wife; the hate and disgust he had shown her at times must have been more welcome because these emotions showed that "At least to me she was a person in her own right, not part of a home, like a bit of porcelain, to be handled with care." (11) He says also that "Hatred seems to operate the same glands as love; it even produces the same actions." (19) For instance, he tells himself that his main reason for wanting to see Sarah after two years is the hope that they can begin again and that this time he can break things off. Perhaps that will free him of her.(20) At this time, however, he also believes that her death would free him, by taking away the possibilities of love which he misses. (2) The first he never gets the chance to do, the latter proves untrue. But it seems unlikely that he could have derived any lasting "cure" by leaving Sarah; he admits that he himself rushed the affair to an end as soon as he saw it would someday die: "It was as though our love were a small

creature caught in a trap and bleeding to death; I had to shut my eyes and wring its neck." (26) And her death only brings the realization of lost memories, the feeling that a part of himself had ceased to be and that his own death had begun. (118)

Typical of the hidden clues which Greene delights in giving his reader is the fact that, very early in his narrative, Bendrix says of Sarah that she was "a born Catholic," having an ability to let "remorse die with the act." (40) The fact that she may in fact have been a Catholic of sorts, and therefore tied to this incomprehensible God whom she loved more than him, is a source of great pain to Bendrix at first. She could, even without a formal faith, react to her own sins as if she had gone to confession and been absolved by an actual priest.

This is Bendrix' idea, at least. She herself seems to have felt that there was no hope for her anyway, somewhat the way Scobie finally thought of himself; and she therefore tried her best to make her loved ones happy. Far from his jealous idea that she cared little at all for him, she seems to have loved Bendrix so much that it was extremely painful for her to keep her vow. It was, however, almost like the answer to her prayers for guidance that circumstances kept her from leaving Henry when she felt it was no longer possible to keep from Bendrix. (How much of a coincidence that her staying is the direct result of Bendrix' revelations to Henry, motivated by jealousy and hatred? Feelings which turn out -- too late -- to have been misdirected and unfounded.)

It is hard to think of a character in Cary's work who compares to Bendrix. Like Fowler, he does not seem capable of "creating a free world" for himself; rather, he depends on the security of love which he found with Sarah -- at least while she was there -- and dreams of death (57) as a more lasting security when love cannot be depended on. Yet it is Sarah, not himself, whom Bendrix kills: his insistence on seeing her again, when she asks him not to come, drives her out in a cold storm. This exposure, when she was already sick, hastens her death. (105 ff and 114 ff) And, as pointed out earlier, he destroyed the security he found in love by suspicion and distrust, and by a deliberate will to kill what he believed to be waning love.

Sarah, on the other hand, keeps giving of herself, even when she is most in need of help. Not only does she try to comfort Bendrix when he chases her to covert in the church, letting him ramble on about his loneliness and need while she is, in fact, dying (109); but at the time when she most wants to disbelieve in God so she can break her vow and return to Bendrix, she turns her thoughts instead to helping Smythe feel necessary. (90). She finds herself praying "to the God he was promising to cure me of, Let me be of use to him." (Ibid.) That, ultimately, seems to be her prayer with regard to everyone. One of her last diary entries is that God give Bendrix peace as He has given it to her. (104)

It is perhaps in this respect that Greene would find Cary's freedom most destructive: that it allows one person

to use another in the process of creating freedom. There is, finally, less of a sense of responsibility towards others, or of guilt for failing in this respect, in Cary's work than in Greene's moral system.

Although he thinks this prayer, at least, unanswered, Bendrix seems more at peace by the last of the novel than before; the hate, with which the book was to deal, "has got mislaid," he admits. (111) In his vow at novel's end to hate God for taking both Sarah's love and her person from him, he seems to be on his way, through the very process of deep emotion, to finding God through hate -- which will eventually turn to love as it did for Sarah. He forsees this when he thinks at one time that he must not hate strongly, as Richard Smythe did, lest such hate turn to love. (117)

Part of his fear of Sarah's Catholicism is due to the fact that Bendrix feels such a conversion, a belief in resurrection, would put Sarah into the hands of God, her "lover," for eternity; and jealousy makes him want to prevent this if possible. This is why he talks Henry out of burial, feeling that cremation will somehow make this impossible. (117 and 133-4) But even for Bendrix, she remains alive: not only is he haunted, like Henry, by mementoes of her, but miracles seem to happen to those who loved her. Parkis' boy dreams she comes to him and is cured (155), Smythe is cured of his facial mark by a lock of her hair (164), and even Bendrix' prayer that he be rescued from a senseless date with an innocent girl, seems answered. (138-9) When he lashes out to Father Crompton,

the priest to whom Sarah had gone shortly before her death, trying to free himself by believing badly of her, the priest pities him for his "pain." (157) Bendrix recognizes again the love-hate connection in himself, recalling Sarah's words: "'O God, if I could really hate you, what would that mean?'" (158-159) It means that he could perhaps learn to love God, too. But he fears that such love would mean the loss of everything: his work, even himself. "I'd cease to be Bendrix. Sarah, I'm afraid." (159) And although his resolve, when he hears of the supposed "miracles," is to destroy the journal, he cannot do it; her prayer for peace strikes from him the admission that he believes she "lives" even now and that God exists. He insists, however, that he hates Him, that his infirmity will not be "cured" as easily as were those of young Parkis and Smythe. Yet as he goes off with Henry for a drink, praying to God: "I'm too tired and old to learn to love. Leave me alone forever." (167) -- the implication is both that he is gaining peace gradually and that he is, with Henry, beginning to "learn to love" God.

This relationship with Henry, the changing of hatred into affection, is the creative act upon which Bendrix' only freedom can be said to be based. Even in the defeatist terms with which he leaves, one can see the possibility for responsible love, learned finally from Sarah's saint-like actions and attitudes. And love, as indicated by Bendrix' fear of losing himself, can become a means of freeing one from the pride and personal anxieties which entrap one within himself, making

life hell. Cary has called love, in Blakean terms, "the fall into freedom," indicating just this ability of love to bring one out of oneself into the free world. Thus, Bendrix' relationship to Henry, however unconsciously it is accepted, seems to be a basis for potential deep shared appreciation of Sarah's memory, a means by which the two men can draw together in friendship due to her. And Bendrix, especially, since he once hated so strongly, may escape from self-concern into the creative freedom of human love.

X. THE QUIET AMERICAN (1955)[76]

In this book the basic problem revolves around moral choices unwillingly faced by Fowler, a cynical British journalist in Vietnam. Fowler's principal choice is whether to remain apart from opinion, merely reporting facts as he feels a good reporter must; or become engagé and take sides in the struggles he sees around him, especially that involving Pyle, the American "diplomat."

Although Pyle's love for Phuong, Fowler's mistress, creates obvious personal tensions for Fowler, this is not the cause of the "moment of emotion" in which the reporter finally becomes involved. Rather it is seeing the death and destruction caused by Pyle's naive political views, and by perceiving Pyle's inability to understand that individual human life is more important than vague ideals. The "national democracy" of Pyle's hero York Harding is to be achieved by arming a "Third Force" against both the colonial French and the Communists; but it is innocent women and children who are the first victims. Fowler finally finds this suffering too much to observe objectively and he agrees to aid in setting a trap for Pyle. Phrases such as Pyle's that the innocents have "'died for democracy'" force Fowler to break his resolve not to become engagé.

Pyle, Fowler believes, is a person to whom abstract ideas -- Freedom, Democracy, Love -- mean more than do the feelings and lives of real people. One of the implications which Greene makes is that Fowler, for all his cynicism, is

more sensitive to the feelings of others than is Pyle. Even the suggestion, towards the end of the book, that Fowler has been wrong in his condemnation of certain people is evidence of his depth of feeling; for it is Fowler himself who recognizes what may have been lack of insight. Pyle goes on unchanged even when the blood of his victims is fresh on his shoes.

The title comes from the phrase, used by Fowler, Phuong, and even Vigot, the chief of sureté, to characterize Pyle: "A quiet American." This designation becomes ironic in the light of the damage which Pyle does behind the cover of his "quietness." Fowler tells Vigot that he considered Pyle "a good chap in his way. Serious. Not one of those noisy bastards at the Continental." (9) -- But one of the ironies of the story is that the "noisiest bastard" among the Americans at the Continental, Granger, is the one whom Fowler comes to see he has wronged in thought; and a much less dangerous man than Pyle, for all the latter's good intentions.

Although Granger seems self-centered, usually drunk and officious, he is capable of great suffering for the sake of another (in this case, his son). Pyle, however, is a man "determined . . . to do good, not to any individual person, but to a country, a continent, a world." (11) It is clear that Fowler, if not Greene himself, agrees with certain of Cary's characters that great harm can be caused by the untrammelled efforts of "'the innocent and the good.'" (12) It is because they believe in the absolutes which have no real place in human affairs and cannot understand the complexities

of actual human actions and motives. It is ironic that Pyle's very way of abstracting the deaths of his victims is echoed by his boss after his own death: that he died "'in the cause of Democracy.'" (23) It is ironic, too, that both his boss and Phuong, who had left Fowler for the security of marriage promised by Pyle, seemed ready to forget him sooner than Fowler. It makes him wonder if perhaps he was the only one who "really cared for Pyle." (15)

As in Scobie's thinking, there is a repeated death-wish in Fowler's concept of life. Fowler believes that, next to death, which gives peace for all time, non-commitment is the best answer. Death becomes more frequent a theme when he believes he may lose Phuong to Pyle; and it is the reason for his return to the North, where the danger of death is more prevalent, when Phuong does go away. But unlike Scobie, Fowler cannot take his own life, either to give himself peace or to assure that of others. He merely takes fewer precautions against death, permitting fate or God, if there is one, to dispose of him if the chance occurs. His decision to help dispose of Pyle falls into the same pattern: he plays as passive a role as he can, allowing any benevolent Spirits there may be to intervene to save Pyle. If God exists, he reasons, He must have the power to intervene and "alter the future." (175) But, since this does not happen, the implication is that either Fowler was right to help kill Pyle or that there is not a God in a world where man is trapped by senseless forces. Fowler's action, in that case, would help to restore

the modicum of sense that exists under the usual movement of the forces, while Pyle's "guiltless insanity" (157) upset things temporarily.

There is finally, a great difference between Cary's idea of the conscious effort by which one may construct a viable free world and Greene's implication that man is caught -- trapped -- by his pride, emotions and even Fate into choices which can lead to pain, suffering, perhaps death -- or may lead to freedom through love, involvement in another's life which carries one out of oneself. "'One has to take sides -- if one is to remain human,'" (168) Fowler is told by one of the Communists; perhaps Greene intends one to see that it is only through the acceptance of such responsibility for one's fellow humans that one can be free. But, with such responsibility goes, if not guilt, at least regret; Fowler is aware that, for all their differences, Pyle was perhaps the only man he could have talked to. (182-3) One has the feeling that, although he might like to believe that people could live freely without making choices which doomed them, Greene feels this to be essentially counter to the reality of life. He feels it necessary to show men trapped into making a commitment which may endanger them -- or set them free, perhaps; while Cary's best creations live in an almost mysterious open ground apart from such total commitment to other individuals.

It is interesting to note that, in Greene's moral framework, it is definitely better to remain objectively

apart from commitment than to dedicate oneself to the wrong side. In Cary's framework, this is also true, but the emphasis is put on those who are able to energetically involve themselves in a sincere effort towards construction of "a free world." Cary does not concern himself with those who, for whatever reason, might not see anything towards which to work. Both Pyle and Jim Latter seem to dedicate themselves sincerely to the wrong thing; but even in his moment of engagement Fowler is not a Chester Nimmo. This is due, however, to the fact, noted earlier, that Greene does not, as Cary does, extend his moral framework into the spheres of social and political involvement, except to show how such action can become abstracted as it does for Pyle. Latter and Pyle both manage to think in large terms which leave no room for actual human life and freedom.

By taking action to protect the actual people around him from the abstract ideas of Pyle, Fowler makes a move which, paradoxically, must be seen as creative in Greene's terms: he sacrifices his preference for objective "peace" to the need he feels for protecting human life. Paradoxically, too, the human being with whom he feels the closest relationship after the ordeal is not Phuong, who comes back to him, but Pyle. He feels regret, when he thinks of the young man's death, that there was no one "to whom I could say that I was sorry." (183)

CONCLUSION

Greene's people are cursed with the sin of pride -- not overt, boasting pride, but the silent pride which keeps a man locked inside himself when he needs to try to communicate with others. This cuts him off from the freedom and constructive possibilities of love and companionship with his fellow men. Love is the key: it is the force which breaks down the barriers which separate men and make them helpless. Creation in this world lies in the realms which may be opened by love if one can force himself to the abnegation necessary to love.

Joyce's men, on the other hand, are more directed towards creativity in the unified sense of all actions, with artistic endeavour being a focus for and means of understanding all other aspects of life. The emphasis is on the efforts which the individual must make to free himself from the paralyzing influences of institutional forces such as politics, church and family. The artist relies greatly on his efforts to find aesthetic concepts for life and art to achieve freedom; but Joyce also presents other men, like Bloom, whose seeking is of a more natural kind. Yet Joyce's people are looking, as are Greene's, for love and companionship, for kindred spirits with which to communicate and free their souls.

Cary, too, uses the concept of love to foster freedom; but it is less important a part of the artist's creative background. The relationship between two people, so important in Greene's world, is only the beginning of

Cary's ; and Joyce's aesthetic insight, while necessary to the functioning artist in Cary's scheme, is useless without the boundless energy and flexibility of vision which must accompany it.

In putting the human situation within a moral system, in which each person is forced to choose -- freely -- and then suffer the consequences of that choice, each of these writers shares a deep insight into the difficulties, as well as the glories, which human freedom can bring. Although some critics[77] argue that Cary has failed to qualify as a good modern novelist because his moral system overpowers his characters, it remains that each of these writers has, to greater or lesser degrees, decided upon a moral scheme of life and then "set their characters free" within it. That their choices involve mistakes as well as successes, evil as well as good, are some of the paradoxes of human freedom.

NOTES

[1]Andrew Wright, Joyce Cary: A Preface to his Novels (London, 1958); Charles G. Hoffmann, Joyce Cary: The Comedy of Freedom (University of Pittsburgh, 1964); and John J. Kelleher, "The Theme of Freedom in the Novels of Joyce Cary" (PhD. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1964) refer to Cary's suggestion that his African novels might have been collectively titled "There's a war on."

[2]Joyce Cary, Aissa Saved (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[3]Wright, p. 59; also Kelleher, pp. 50-51.

[4]Ibid., Wright.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Hoffmann, pp. 14-15: Aissa's sacrifice is her salvation, her "sanctification" into a child-like joy.

[7]Hereafter, all references to the novel under discussion will be given in parentheses following the quotation.

[8]Kelleher, p. 55, points out that the results of the riot are themselves the elements for greater diversity; i. e., greater strife, greater change -- hence, greater freedom.

[9]Wright, p. 78.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Joyce Cary, An American Visitor (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[12]Kelleher, pp. 58-59, sees Bewsher as a figure doomed because he opposed the freedom of the Birri, isolating them. (But Bewsher is not a Jim Latter, wrongly "protecting" his "nature's gentlemen" from the evils of civilization; he merely wants to try to strengthen the Birri first, lest they be swept away on the tides of change.) He admits, however (p. 60), that Bewsher is Cary's "first full-scale portrayal of the free man."

[13]Ibid., pp. 57-58. Kelleher sees Marie as the frame of the book, going from her naive ideas of "freedom as lack of restraint" for "the noble savage" to a loss of faith which, in turn, is restored through devotion to and love for Bewsher.

[14]Ibid., 62. Kelleher suggests that Cary uses here a method of characterization similar to the interlocking narratives of the trilogies: Marie and Cottee present their views of Bewsher which, together with what one sees of

Bewsher's actions and personal feelings, give the reader a complex personality to judge.

[15]Joyce Cary, The African Witch (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[16]Hoffmann, p. 31. Elizabeth symbolizes Louis' inescapable ties to ju-ju.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Wright, pp. 60-61, compares Elizabeth's rhetorical power with that of Chester Nimmo. Both are, in spirit, "spellbinders."

[19]Joyce Cary, Mister Johnson (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[20]Kelleher, pp. 73-74; Wright, p. 61. Johnson himself is Cary's theme, "the embodiment, in primitive form, of the will to freedom, the power of creation."

[21]Kelleher, p. 73, makes a similar point.

[22]Ibid., p. 75. Kelleher considers Benjamin and Ajalai the "chorus," whose comments help to put Johnson's actions into perspective.

[23]Ibid., p. 77. Johnson "rescues them from a life of boredom and despondency."

[24]Ibid. [25]Ibid., p. 74. [26]Ibid., p. 77.

[27]Hoffmann, p. 1.

[28]Joyce Cary, Castle Corner (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[29]Joyce Cary, The Moonlight (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[30]Cary, A Fearful Joy (Carfax Edition, London, 1952).

[31]Cary, Charley is My Darling (Carfax Edition, London, 1951).

[32]Cary, A House of Children (Carfax Edition, London, 1951).

[33]Wright, p. 32.

[34]Kelleher, p. 93, agrees that this book is "haphazard in construction," but sees it nonetheless as a good portrayal

of the forces of change in the British empire. Wright, p. 67, calls it too diffuse a work to be rightly considered a novel.

[35]Wright, pp. 31-32. [36]Ibid., p. 31.

[37]Ibid., p. 63. Wright sees both Charley and Johnson as types of the creative imagination in a child-like and simple mind. Kelleher, pp. 79-80, points out that Charley shares Johnson's obliviousness to the past and future. This will be seen to be a trait common to most of Cary's free men.

[38]Hoffmann, p. 109, agrees with this, saying, however, that "Rose is as much a victim of that tyranny as she is herself an example of it." She holds herself to the same rigid law as she applies to the others: the sanctity of the family comes before all personal concerns.

[39]Kelleher, pp. 95-97, suggests that Amanda's child will be the "miracle" which is necessary to produce a synthesis between conflicting Victorian and modern ideals in Amanda's life.

[40]Ibid., pp. 81-82. Kelleher emphasizes the universal isolation of individuals which makes misunderstanding inevitable and which traps one within a welter of inexpressable feelings. (See also Wright, p. 64, and Hoffmann, p. 57.)

[41]Ibid., p. 85. Kelleher argues that Evelyn is shown developing out of the childhood community into the perceptions of his individual isolation, a sense of identity which will project itself into his career as a writer. (Yet Cary does not make this perception so clear that one sees Evelyn as the embodiment of a budding creative freedom.)

[42]Hoffmann, p. 66, calls all of "Cary's most creative personalities" children, "whatever their chronological ages. . . ." He points out that there is, in a Gulley Jimson or a Chester Nimmo, the same child-like ability to wonder at the world around them.

[43]Cary, Herself Surprised (Carfax Edition, London, 1951).

[44]Kelleher, p. 110, points out that the truth in Cary's scheme about any person must be decided after weighing the many available facts, the various different versions of events and personalities. The multitudinous facets of truth, and the limitations of human understanding, which this suggtests are part of Cary's theme of freedom out of change and variety.

[45]Hazard Adams, "The Three Speakers of Joyce Cary," Modern Fiction Studies V (Summer 1959), 108-120.

[46]Kelleher, p. 114, divides Sara into the natural female, who seeks freedom in marriage and family by whatever means is necessary, and the thinking woman, who self-consciously applies the moral judgments of society to her actions. This latter woman is only a surface manifestation: it is the natural woman who is capable of freedom in total acceptance of life.

[47]Ibid., pp. 119-120. Kelleher discusses the conflict of the natural female drive to domesticate the creative male.

[48]Ibid., p. 114. Sara's "surprise" is at the undeniable drives of her female creative nature; not at her "sins."

[49]Wright, pp. 118-119, and Hoffmann, p. 71. Cary disagrees in terms: rather than call Sara "amoral," he says that her "'morals were the elementary morals of a primitive woman, of nature herself, which do not change.'" /Cary, "The Way a Novel Gets Written" Harper's CC (Feb. 1950), p. 92./ And yet, there is little difference between "amoral," which implies a natural instinct for life, and the term "elementary morals . . . of nature herself . . .": both imply a conduct separate from the codes and institutionalized behaviour of society.

[50]Cary, To Be a Pilgrim (Carfax Edition, London, 1951).

[51]Both Wright and Hoffmann see Wilcher as "free" in spirit even if he is imprisoned by his past to the extent of being unable to act. But no matter how fanciful his thought, Wilcher does not have the creative freedom and acceptance of life which make Sara or Gulley free.

Hoffmann, p. 84, does point out what he calls Wilcher's "parasitism" on the creativity of others, however, "while he had no purpose of his own." He suggests that it is only Sara's love which gives his life meaning, just as it was his love for his sister Lucy which gave him purpose years before.

Kelleher, p. 124, believes that it is the ghosts of Wilcher's past which give him "something of the feeling of freedom. . . ."

[52]Hoffmann, p. 85, refers to Cary's unpublished note: "'Freedom, as creation,' must be 'guarded by wisdom.'" This, he points out, is Wilcher's relation to the artist: he can understand the past, as neither Gulley nor Sara can, and his wisdom might, or should, balance the recklessness of Gulley's life-style. That it does not, seems beside the point.

[53]Wright, p. 124, agrees about the importance of Wilcher's ability to understand the past.

[54]Cary, The Horse's Mouth (Carfax Edition, London, 1951).

[55]Hoffmann, p. 87, emphasizes this point: the rigidity of society makes it misunderstand the artist, hounding him to his death; but, paradoxically, society needs the artist as well as his work, "for it is through the vision of the artist that society is taught new ways of seeing."

[56]Cary, Prisoner of Grace (Carfax Edition, London, 1954).

[57]Hoffmann, p. 130, notes Nina's discovery of the difference between apparent facts and the "truth" as it applies to free humans. (Wright, pp. 138 and 141, also emphasizes this realization as one of the necessary bases for freedom.)

[58]Wright, p. 139, considers Nina to be imprisoned between the two contrasting men; but although they form her "limits" of female activity, they are also her materials for free female creativity: "She stands between the two men, sometimes as mediator, but always as comforter to them both."

[59]Hoffmann, p. 136, stresses the balance which Nimmo attempts to achieve between artistic freedom and public responsibility; it is the resultant "grace" and flexibility which make him a "good man," as Nina understands. Jim's lack of these qualities make him, for all his sincerity, a madman.

[60]Wright, p. 142, refers to Cary's intension of portraying in Chester and Jim the irreconcilable tension in the world between the man "in favour of wangling as against shooting," and the man who "favours shooting to maintain his ideal of justice."

[61]Hoffmann, p. 127, notes Cary's purpose in making Nina quite different from Sara; Nina, for the purposes of the closely interlocking narratives of the trilogy, had to be "an intelligent and reflective narrating consciousness." Instead of Sara's easy-going self-centeredness, Nina had to be capable of deep insight into the man she tried to defend.

[62]Wright, pp. 138-139, speaks of the freedom achieved by Cary's free females as "less conscious, less directed" than that of the males; but nonetheless freedom for the realization of their capabilities.

[63]Cary, Except the Lord (New York, 1962).

[64]Wright, p. 147.

[65]Cary, Not Honour More (New York, 1955).

[66]Hoffmann, p. 150, suggests that Jim paradoxically lacks the "grace" to forgive human failings because he has never (to his way of thinking) sinned. In the Blakean terms of Cary's freedom, since he has not fallen, he is incapable of salvation -- here represented in forgiving and being forgiven. Jim's "honesty" is more evil in its inability to adjust to the actualities of life than all the dishonesty of Chester and Nina.

[67]Cary, The Captive and The Free, edited by Winifred Davin (New York, 1959).

[68]Hoffmann, p. 163, points out that Alice, like Sara and Nina, "is a prisoner of grace, captive of her responsibility as a woman but freed by her forgiveness and understanding. . . ."

[69]Ibid., pp. 158-159. Hoffmann suggests that all Cary's artists are involved with the problem of faith, each trying to create a world on the basis of insight which he hopes is valid, a free world.

[70]James Joyce, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (New York, 1964).

[71]Wright, p. 13.

[72]Joyce, Ulysses (New York, 1961).

[73]Stuart Gilbert, James Joyce's ULYSSES (New York, 1930). All references to section-titles come from this work.

[74]Graham Greene, The Heart of the Matter (New York, 1948).

[75]Greene, The End of the Affair (New York, 1955).

[76]Greene, The Quiet American (New York, 1957).

[77]Hoffmann, Notes 10 and 12 to Chapter III; and Frederick R. Karl, A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel (New York, 1962), pp. 132-133.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Hazard. "Blake and Gulley Jimson: English Symbolists," Critique, III (Spring-Fall 1959), 3-14.

----------. "The Three Speakers of Joyce Cary," Modern Fiction Studies, V (Summer 1959), 108-120.

----------. "Joyce Cary's Swimming Swan," American Scholar, XXIX (Spring 1960), 235-239.

Allen, Walter. The English Novel. New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1954.

Bloom, Robert. The Indeterminate World: A Study of the Novels of Joyce Cary. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.

Cary, Joyce. The African Witch. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

----------. Aissa Saved. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. An American Visitor. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. Art and Reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

----------. Britain and West Africa. London: Longmans, Green, 1946.

----------. The Captive and the Free. Edited Winifred Davin. New York: Harper, 1959.

----------. The Case for African Freedom. London: Secker and Warburg, 1944.

----------. Castle Corner. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. Charley is My Darling. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

----------. Except the Lord. New York: Universal Library, 1962.

----------. A Fearful Joy. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. Herself Surprised. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

Cary, Joyce. The Horse's Mouth. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

----------. A House of Children. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

----------. Mister Johnson. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. The Moonlight. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1952.

----------. Not Honour More. New York: Harper, 1955.

----------. Power in Men. Introduction by Hazard Adams. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1963.

----------. Prisoner of Grace. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1954.

----------. Process of Real Freedom. London: Michael Joseph, 1943.

----------. To Be a Pilgrim. Carfax Edition, London: Michael Joseph, 1951.

Case, Edward. "The Free World of Joyce Cary," Modern Age, III (Spring 1959), 115-124.

Gilbert, Stuart. James Joyce's ULYSSES. New York: Vintage Books, 1930.

Greene, Graham. The End of the Affair. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1955.

----------. The Heart of the Matter. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1948.

----------. The Quiet American. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1957.

Hoffmann, Charles G. Joyce Cary: The Comedy of Freedom. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Joyce, James. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Edited by Richard Ellmann. New York: The Viking Press, 1964.

----------. Ulysses. New York: The Modern Library, 1961.

Karl, Frederick R. The Contemporary English Novel. New York: The Noonday Press, 1962.

Kelleher, John Joseph. The Theme of Freedom in the Novels of Joyce Cary. PhD. Dissertation: The University of Pittsburgh, 1964.

Morris, William E. and Clifford A. Nault, Jr., Eds. Portraits of an Artist: A Casebook on James Joyce's A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1962.

O'Connor, William Van, Ed. Forms of Modern Fiction. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1948.

Wright, Andrew. Joyce Cary: A Preface to his Novels. London: Chatto and Windus, Ltd., 1958.