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CAMPBELL VS. HELLER: 
A NEW ANALYSIS OF THE 1978 ELECTION FOR SOUTH CAROLINA’S FOURTH DISTRICT

Jessica Foster

In popular memory and most published accounts, the 1978 election for South Carolina’s Fourth Congressional District represents “[t]he most serious incident of anti-Semitic intrusion in a South Carolina political campaign.”¹ According to historians such as Jack Bass and Diane Vecchio, Republican candidate Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. used anti-Semitic tactics to defeat his Jewish opponent, Democratic candidate Max M. Heller.² However, this narrative misrepresents Campbell’s campaign strategy and ignores the political and economic factors that influenced the election. Using electoral data and contemporary newspapers, this study seeks to re-contextualize the 1978 election within broader political trends. During a period when southern white conservatives were becoming disillu-

sioned with the Democratic Party, the Republicans saw an opportunity to challenge the open seat in the Fourth District. With an aggressive, well-funded campaign, Campbell successfully branded Heller as a big-spending liberal who raised taxes and opposed protective tariffs for the local textile industry. Campbell defeated Heller by 51,377 to 45,584 votes (52.1 to 46.2 percent), becoming the first Republican since Reconstruction to represent the Fourth District.³

Unfortunately, the political reasons for Heller’s defeat faded from memory almost immediately after the election, as Heller’s supporters speculated that he had lost due to anti-Semitism. Five days before the election, independent candidate Don W. Sprouse had declared that Heller was not qualified to represent the largely Christian district because he was Jewish.⁴ At the time, Campbell condemned the remarks and several readers wrote to the editor of The Greenville News to denounce Sprouse.⁵ After the election, however, Heller’s friends privately expressed their concern that voters had turned against him out of prejudice.⁶ His contacts in the Anti-Defamation League even suspected that Sprouse had acted as

⁵ For Campbell’s response, see Saunders, “Heller Unqualified.”
⁶ L.D. Johnson to Max and Trude Heller, Nov. 8, 1978, Box 1, Folder 6, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC. Beth Israel Sisterhood to Max Heller, Nov. 13, 1978, Box 1, Folder 8, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.
a “stalking horse” for Campbell. A few years later, in the March 28, 1983 edition of his political newsletter, Washington-based Democratic analyst Alan Baron alleged that Campbell was behind Sprouse’s attack. According to Baron, Campbell had commissioned a poll, which indicated that voters would respond negatively to the information that Heller was “a foreign-born Jew who did not believe Jesus Christ was the savior.” Campbell then allegedly shared the poll results with Sprouse, who brought up Heller’s religion while Campbell stayed clean. Neither Heller nor Campbell had released their polls to the press during the 1978 race. After Democratic activist Samuel Tenenbaum publicized Baron’s allegations during Campbell’s 1986 gubernatorial campaign, Campbell released his poll, which did contain two questions related to Heller’s Jewishness, but without Baron’s wording. At the same time, Democratic consultant Marvin Chernoff claimed that Campbell’s friend and associate, Republican politico Lee Atwater, had admitted to sharing the poll results with

---

7 Stuart Lewengrub to Max Heller, Nov. 22, 1978, Box 1, Folder 8, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC. Stuart Lewengrub to Max Heller, June 6, 1986, Box 1, Folder 8, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.

8 Alan Baron, *The Baron Report*, no. 173 (March 28, 1983): 2, Box 6, Folder 2, Max Moses Heller Collection, Acc. #2009-076, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.

9 Arthur J. Finkelstein & Associates, Poll, Box 6, Folder 1, Max Moses Heller Collection, Acc. #2009-076, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC. Question #22 asks which phrases best describe Max Heller and Carroll Campbell. There are six choices, including “A Christian man” and “Jewish.” Question #25 asks voters which personal qualities would make them more or less likely to vote for a candidate. Among the fifteen choices are “A Jewish immigrant” and “A native South Carolinian.”
Although the criticism subsided after Campbell’s election as governor, the controversy haunted him for the rest of his career. When Campbell emerged as a possible running mate for Bob Dole in the 1996 presidential race, Tenenbaum used his connections with the Anti-Defamation League to ensure that Campbell was not selected. In this way, the anti-Semitism allegations have come to dominate the memory of the 1978 election until the present day, so that the issues which the candidates actually debated have been forgotten. It is therefore important to return the election to its proper political context.

Campbell’s identification with the Republican Party should have placed him at a disadvantage in a historically Democratic state like South Carolina. Since Reconstruction the Democratic Party had created an unbeatable “juggernaut” that seemed able to perpetuate itself indefinitely. Southern Democrats had locked up the white vote by combining liberal spending policies with conservative positions on race, taxes, and unions. By contrast, the Republican Party represented the “waste, graft, and mismanagement” of Reconstruction and

---

13 Ibid., 57.
struggled to make inroads into the Democratic electorate.\textsuperscript{14} If Republicans contested seats at all, they fielded inexperienced candidates against a veteran Democrat. Incumbent Democrats were almost always reelected.\textsuperscript{15} For example, the retiring Fourth District representative, James R. Mann (D-S.C.), had been elected to five consecutive terms, often by large margins.\textsuperscript{16}

By 1978, however, many southern white conservatives no longer saw the Republican Party as a foreign enemy. Thirty years earlier, President Harry S. Truman had angered many racial conservatives when he began to advocate civil rights legislation.\textsuperscript{17} As the presidential candidate for the States’ Rights Party in 1948, Senator Strom Thurmond (D-S.C.) led a “psychological break from the national Democratic Party” in the South.\textsuperscript{18} White southerners who identified as Democrats declined from 78 percent in 1952 to 60 percent in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 48.
\item Black and Black, \textit{Rise of the Southern Republicans}, 207.
\item Bass and Devries, \textit{Transformation of Southern Politics}, 253.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
1960, while those who identified as Republicans rose from nine to 21 percent. Supported by a strong Republican organization in his home state of South Carolina, Thurmond formally switched his allegiance to the Republican Party in 1964 and openly campaigned for Barry Goldwater in the presidential race that year. Although he ultimately lost to Lyndon B. Johnson, Goldwater became the first Republican ever to sweep the Deep South, winning 55 percent of the southern white vote due to his opposition to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Fourth District was split between Goldwater in Greenville County and Johnson in Spartanburg County. In 1968 Richard Nixon attempted to realign whites into the Republican Party, but the candidacy of segregationist George Wallace limited Nixon’s impact to only 40 percent of the white vote. However, Nixon did win both Greenville and Spartanburg counties in the Fourth District. In 1970, during the desegregation of the Greenville school system, Republicans won in Greenville County in the races for governor, lieutenant governor, and the state House. Greenville native Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. was elected to the state House with 27,706 votes. Without Wallace to take away votes in 1972, Nixon defeated liberal Democrat George McGovern with a platform of law and order and economic conservatism. He won again in both counties of the Fourth District. That year, Republicans won

21 Ibid., 28; Black and Black, *Rise of the Southern Republicans*, 209.
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four-fifths of the total southern white vote.\textsuperscript{26} Campbell was reelected to the state House with a record-breaking 41,296 votes, while Thurmond won the U.S. Senate seat. Republicans also contested all six districts for the Greenville County Council and won five of them.\textsuperscript{27}

Nixon’s involvement in the Watergate scandal and Jimmy Carter’s election temporarily arrested Republican advancement in the South, but Carter’s lack of progress in fighting inflation increased disillusionment among Democrats. Watergate “severely embarrassed and discredited” the Republicans and by 1974 the percentage of white southerners who identified as Republicans had not increased from the 1960 level.\textsuperscript{28} Riding on a wave of resentment towards the establishment, Democratic outsider Charles D. “Pug” Ravenel presented a serious challenge to Republican James B. Edwards in the 1974 South Carolina governor’s race. Unfortunately for the Democrats, Ravenel was disqualified due to the residency requirement and the party nominated William Jennings Bryan Dorn, who lost narrowly to Edwards. Ravenel’s disqualification and refusal to endorse Dorn left many South Carolina Democrats bitter and the party in disarray.\textsuperscript{29} Democratic hopes rose when Jimmy Carter ran as a “centrist” outsider in the 1976 presidential election and won ten out of eleven southern states.\textsuperscript{30} However, as in 1964, the Fourth District was split, with Republican Gerald Ford winning Greenville County and Jimmy Carter capturing Spartanburg County.\textsuperscript{31} President Carter’s inability to solve economic issues soon disappointed

\textsuperscript{26} State Election Commission, \textit{Report} (1973), 572-573; Black and Black, \textit{Rise of Southern Republicans}, 210-211, 222.
\textsuperscript{28} Black and Black, \textit{Rise of Southern Republicans}, 210-211, 222.
\textsuperscript{29} Bass and Devries, \textit{Transformation of Southern Politics}, 270.
\textsuperscript{30} Black and Black, \textit{Rise of Southern Republicans}, 211.
many of his supporters among southern whites and conservative Christians. After starting his presidency with an approval rating of 66 percent (Feb. 4-7, 1977), Carter’s rating dropped to 42 percent by June 16-19, 1978 and to 39 percent in early August.

The one constant during this period of political transition had been Democratic Rep. Mann’s perennial reelection as the representative of the Fourth District. This changed in January 1978, when Mann resigned his seat amid a financial scandal. On January 2, 1978, Mann announced that he would not seek re-election for a sixth term. Although he did not explicitly state his reasons for stepping down, reporters speculated that his decision was related to accusations that he had used his congressional office staff to help a failing mail-order coin dealership, in which he was a principal financial backer. When the story first broke in spring 1977, Campbell was already being tapped as the Republican candidate to challenge Mann in 1978. He claimed that the story would not influence

---

34 Associated Press, “Rep. Mann Announces Plans to End Career,” *Index-Journal* (Greenwood, SC), Jan. 3, 1978. In February 1977, *The Washington Post* reported that, in violation of congressional rules, Mann had loaned $38,000 to Ben Gause of US Coin Co. in Greenville, SC and had used his Washington staff to perform services for Gause, such as affixing postage stamps to bills, ordering coins and bills, and shipping coins and bills from Washington to Greenville. Gause was found guilty of mail fraud for failing to fill nearly $250,000 in customer orders. This was particularly embarrassing for Mann, who served on the House Judiciary Committee and had gained national attention for his powerful speeches against Nixon during the televised impeachment proceedings. Rudy Maxa, “Rep. Mann Had Hill Aides Help Firm He Backed,” *Washington Post*, Feb. 27, 1977.
his decision to run against Mann, but he believed that the Republicans had “an outstanding opportunity” to win.\textsuperscript{35} The 1978 election became an even better opportunity for Republicans when Mann announced his retirement in January. Until then, Mann had been the “controlling influence” on the candidates because they had to orient their campaigns to challenge him as the formidable Democratic incumbent. When he withdrew from contention, the national Republican Party smelled blood in the water.\textsuperscript{36} This fit with their overall strategy for 1978: instead of challenging incumbent Democrats, the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee decided to concentrate its money and expertise on open seats. According to The State, the Committee was “pinning its hopes on Campbell.”\textsuperscript{37} If he won the Republican primary, Campbell would have “the full backing, including a huge financial commitment, of the national party.”\textsuperscript{38} Campbell easily secured this support by defeating Robert L. Watkins by 6,808 to 899 votes in the primary on June 13, 1978.\textsuperscript{39} His Democratic opponent would be Greenville mayor Max Heller, who had defeated Nick Theodore in a much closer contest by 25,295 to 22,319 votes.\textsuperscript{40}

In order to win Mann’s seat, Campbell needed to attract the district’s white conservatives who traditionally voted Democrat and would likely vote for Heller as Mann’s successor. Ordinarily, the lack of viable Republican opposition in open-seat contests in the South meant that a conservative

\begin{itemize}
\item[38] Julian, “‘Target District.’”
\item[39] State Election Commission, Report (1979), 50.
\item[40] Ibid., 42.
\end{itemize}
Democratic challenger could easily pick up the retiring incumbent’s conservative support.\textsuperscript{41} However, the Democratic Party as a whole had become more moderate in the 1970s due to the defection of many conservatives and the addition of newly registered black voters who were more liberal.\textsuperscript{42} While Democrats could still win as moderates, white voters preferred conservatives; therefore Republicans could defeat Democratic nominees who had failed to unite all wings of their party and/or who could be convincingly attacked as liberals or moderates.\textsuperscript{43} Republicans could win open seats with “aggressive and well-financed” campaigns, in which they combined positive messages about themselves with “slashing negative attacks against their Democratic opponents.” \textsuperscript{44} Campbell adopted precisely such a strategy against Heller.

Campbell’s main obstacle was Heller’s record as the popular mayor of Greenville, which he needed to convince

\end{document}


\textsuperscript{42} Ibid. While these defections should not be overestimated (only 30 percent of southern white conservatives identified as Republicans in 1976), they did produce a growing number of independent voters. (Most Democrats became independents rather than Republicans.) Between 1960 and 1976, the percentage of southern white conservatives identifying as independents increased from 18 percent to 31 percent. Black and Black, \textit{Rise of the Southern Republicans}, 211.

\textsuperscript{43} Black and Black, \textit{Rise of the Southern Republicans}, 82, 172-173. Many moderate white southerners remained Democrats: in 1968, only 15 percent were Republicans, while 55 percent were Democrats. The percentage of moderate white southerners who were Republicans increased to only 24 percent in 1980. That said, moderates did favor Republican presidents: Nixon (1972), Ford (1976), and Reagan (1980, 1984, and 1988). See Black and Black, \textit{Rise of the Southern Republicans}, 230.

\textsuperscript{44} Black and Black, \textit{Rise of the Southern Republicans}, 74, 84.
voters was that of a big-spending liberal, not a fiscal conservative. This was a difficult task. Heller’s August 1978 survey told him that voters viewed his mayoral record positively. “The voters are tired of waste and inefficiency in government. They’re looking for a good fiscal manager,” the survey report said. It recommended that he talk about “better management of tax dollars, cutting waste and inefficiency, and better planning to get the most from tax money.”45 Since Heller had a good track record, he “doesn’t need to be defensive about his record in office; he is not seen as a big spender. He should run on what he has done for fiscal management in Greenville and how he can do these same things in Congress.”46

Campbell found one way to portray Heller as a liberal by targeting the mayor’s use of federal grants to condemn private property and sell it to private developers. Campbell said he had “severe reservations” about this policy and considered it an “abuse” of the federal community development program.47 “There are many things that are done in the name of public good,” Campbell said. “But it doesn’t do much for the people who have to move out to have the land resold at one-third the value to developers who redevelop the land at a profit.”48 As an example, Campbell cited an urban redevelopment project where privately owned homes along Webster Street and Webster Alley, a low-income area, would be torn down and the residents relocated. The property would be resold at one-third the value to a private developer, who planned to build one thousand condominiums.49 Heller defended the

45 Peter D. Hart Research Associates, “A Survey of the Political Climate in the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina,” 23, Box 1, Folder 1, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.
46 Ibid.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
practice, saying that the federal community development money was used to eliminate slum housing in order to “give the residents the opportunity for more decent living conditions.”

All the property owners had been treated fairly in the Webster Street project, according to Heller. He said the project was part of an urban renewal program that included construction of a senior center, apartments for the elderly built by private investors, and the rebuilding of one of the oldest churches in the state, which had been destroyed by fire. When some Greenville city officials also defended the program, Campbell responded that he felt he was fighting not against an individual candidate, but against “a small power group pretty much aligned with the city of Greenville.” He declared: “If my campaign means I have to go against this downtown (Greenville) power group, then I’ll stand against them.”

Campbell labeled Heller as a “liberal” candidate who supported “big government spending” because the mayor had used federal money while also raising taxes. In March 1978, The Greenville News had reported that federal grants accounted for more than 40 percent of the city’s budget, up from only 1.3 percent in 1969. The city’s downtown revitalization project, which was considered crucial to Greenville’s economic future, was going to cost $25 million. Mayor Heller was instrumental in obtaining a $7.2 million grant from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development to finance the city’s part of the project (the other part would be financed by private businesses). The grant request equaled almost half

50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
54 Sally Smith, “City Woos Once-Shunned Grants,” Greenville News (Greenville, SC), March 6, 1978.
of the city’s annual budget. Campbell cited a March 1978 Clemson University study prepared for the state legislature, which found that Greenville city residents paid the highest percentage of their income to property taxes of all cities in the state. “I find it inconsistent that my opponent says on one hand he wants a tax cut and a reduction in federal spending, and on the other, he has increased the local use of federal grant money along with increasing local taxes,” Campbell said. City taxes had increased twice under Mayor Heller. According to Campbell, Greenville city residents now paid 7.92 percent of their income to city taxes, while the mean percentage for the state’s big cities was 5.02 percent and Spartanburg city residents paid only 4.6 percent. Because of the high taxes, Campbell said that about six percent of city residents had left Greenville. Campbell also claimed that, while Heller had reduced the number of city employees, he had “not told the public how many employees have been added under federal programs supported by their taxes.” In fact, Campbell said, the city bureaucracy had increased 70 percent, including eighty-nine non-essential federally funded employees.

Campbell cited Heller’s opposition to the Kemp-Roth tax cut proposal as further evidence that Heller would not help the taxpayers if elected to Congress. Endorsed by Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.) and Sen. William Roth (R-D.E.), the proposal would cut federal taxes by 33 percent over a three-year period. Kemp advocated supply-side economics, a theory which holds that cutting taxes will ultimately lead to higher government revenue because of economic growth. As a Republican, Campbell supported the proposal, while Heller believed that a

55 Ibid.
56 Saunders, “Campbell Rips Heller.”
57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
cut in federal spending should accompany the tax cut. In August, Campbell said that the tax cut would “encourage savings, bring about lower interest rates and create jobs.”\(^60\) He did not think the tax cut would cause inflation because it was not creating money; reduced revenues would force the federal government to cut spending. He contended that inflation pushed taxpayers into higher tax brackets, while their real income did not increase. “The point is that the federal government is making money from inflation,” he said, noting that government income increased 1.5 percent with every one percent increase in inflation.\(^61\) On the other hand, Heller believed that the proposal “sounded too liberal and could be highly inflationary.” “I won’t be part of a promise that can’t be kept,” he said.\(^62\) In August, Campbell claimed that Heller was “out of touch with the average taxpayer” in his opposition to the Kemp-Roth tax cut and challenged him to debate the issue. Heller did not answer the charges, saying, “I don’t intend to comment every time he issues a press release.”\(^63\) In an October 5 speech, Campbell implicitly referred to Heller when he said that criticism to Kemp-Roth usually came “from people who have backed big government spending programs their whole political careers.”\(^64\) Addressing “those who piously stand up and say we have to cut spending before we cut taxes,” Campbell said, “They haven’t offered any specific proposals, and I can only assume that they would vote against the four tax cut bills


\(^{61}\) Ibid.
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in Congress this year because none of them carry spending cuts."65

Campbell also attacked Heller on one of the most sensitive issues for the Fourth District: the failing textile industry. Approximately 58,000 people in the district depended on the textile industry for their livelihood. Mills Mill, one of Greenville’s oldest textile mills, reduced its work force by two hundred in 1977 before announcing in August 1978 that it would cease operations by the end of the month, cutting the remaining 136 jobs.66 Abney Mills closed six plants, including two in Greenville and four in Anderson County, with a loss of one thousand jobs. Burlington Industries closed Poe Mill in Greenville, with a loss of seven hundred jobs. In all, the mill closings resulted in more than two thousand jobs lost during 1977 and the first half of 1978.67 Mill owners cited tight labor conditions in the carded cotton yarn market, increased textile imports, and the estimated $3 billion cost of meeting the stricter Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OHSA) standard for the control of cotton dust in mills. Textile executives expected to see more closings once the new OHSA standard went into effect in September 1978.68

The problems in South Carolina’s Fourth District reflected a wider trend in the South. According to data from the Textile Workers Union of America (TWUA), there was a 17 percent loss of textile employment in the South from February 1951 to July 1958, chiefly due to foreign imports.69 The textile

65 Ibid.
industry was particularly susceptible to import competition because it relied on low-wage, unskilled labor, which made up a large part of the production cost. Between 1952 and 1958, one hundred and fifteen plants closed in eleven southern states, and 31,855 workers lost their jobs. By 1968, textile imports made up one-third of the U.S. balance of payments deficit. The country also entered a recession in the 1970s, when the post-World War II economic boom came to an end. Two hundred and forty-six more textile plants closed in the South between 1970 and 1979. The Multi-Fiber Agreement (MFA) of 1974, which allowed countries to enter into bilateral agreements to restrict textile and apparel trade, failed to stem the tide of imports. Textile leaders and politicians pressured President Carter to renew the MFA in 1977 and keep his promises to protect the industry. In an effort to stop the bleeding, Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) and Rep. Ken Holland (D-S.C.) sponsored a bill that would prohibit U.S. trade negotiators from reducing textile tariffs at the ongoing Multilateral Trade Negotiations. Congress passed the bill in September 1978, but it awaited the president’s signature. In October, Sen. Hollings met with Carter to urge him to sign the bill, but the president was noncommittal. Most of Carter’s aids, including U.S. trade representative Robert Strauss, believed that the bill was “a protectionist piece of legislation that would prevent American negotiators from extracting concessions from their trading partners.” They urged him to veto it.

---

70 Ibid., 46.
71 Ibid., 37.
72 Ibid., 46.
73 Ibid., 67.
74 Ibid., 69.
75 Ibid., 80-81.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
Heller attempted to work with the Carter administration on the textile issue. On August 3, 1978, he traveled to Washington to meet with David Rubinstein, assistant to the president’s advisor on domestic affairs. He laid out a seven-point plan to reduce the rate of inflation and create more jobs. The plan included a reduction of government regulations such as OHSA standards, special tax incentives to encourage businesses to promote exports, and an investment tax credit for any federally imposed expenditure for nonproductive equipment.78

“The textile industry is faced with having to put in almost $1 billion in equipment because of the brown lung situation,” Heller said. “There is no question in my mind that it is a legitimate problem…but the burden would be tremendous.” He said the proposals received “a very good response” and Rubinstein assured him his staff would look at them carefully.79

When Mills Mill announced its closing a few days later on August 8, Heller sent a telegram to President Carter, urging him to “take action that will stop this loss of jobs. The textile import situation is hurting too many lives and companies. Any reduction in tariffs would be disastrous.”80

By contrast, Campbell chose to criticize the Carter administration for not protecting the textile industry. While cheap foreign imports were “costing Americans jobs and closing our mills,” President Carter was using the textile industry as a “pawn” in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.81

79 Ibid.
80 Max Heller to President Carter, Aug. 8, 1978, telegram, Box 2, Folder 6, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.
81 “Campbell Says Flow of Cheap Foreign Imports Must Stop,” Greer Citizen (Greer, SC), Aug. 16, 1978, Box 3, Folder 1, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC; Karl Hill, “Campbell
bell said he was “appalled” that the administration had betrayed its “solemn promise not to bargain away the textile industry,” when textiles were “a part of our economy’s backbone.” 82 Campbell had written a section in the 1976 Republican platform, asking the Carter administration to extend the existing MFA instead of including textiles in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. 83 He believed that an extension would have allowed the United States to work on bilateral agreements with individual nations. Campbell argued that, by including textiles in the negotiations, the Carter administration was using the textile industry as “a bargaining chip” that would cost American jobs. 84 Like Heller, Campbell had sent a telegram to President Carter asking him to remove textiles from the negotiating table, but he did not receive a response. “I guess they throw them (telegrams) in the trash can,” said Campbell. 85

Campbell also linked Heller to the Carter administration, implying that Heller would not protect the district’s textile jobs in Congress. According to Campbell, Heller’s “friend” Robert Strauss proposed cutting tariffs on imports by an average of 60 percent during the next eight years. “This would cause the loss of 500,000 United States textile jobs, with a ripple effect in related industries creating losses totaling two million jobs by 1990,” Campbell said. “That’s what this administration is pushing for.” 86 Yet Heller had “shown support for administration policy” and recently urged that

---

82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
84 Ibid.
Strauss’s office be allowed to handle all negotiations concerning textile imports and tariffs.\(^{87}\) In spite of Heller’s vehement denials, Campbell continued to claim that Heller supported the textile tariff reductions. On November 5, two days before the election, Campbell took out a full-page advertisement entitled “The Piedmont Textile Worker: Can His Job Survive?” The ad says that “Heller’s friend” Strauss is “working full-time to reduce textile tariffs, which will eliminate textile jobs.”\(^{88}\) It shows how Carter has failed to protect American textile workers’ jobs from unfair imports. “The textile industry is vital to the people of South Carolina,” the ad says. “It is estimated that 5,000 jobs in the Greenville-Spartanburg district alone will be endangered unless the Hollings-Thurmond bill is signed.”\(^{89}\) The ad concludes: “We must have a foreign policy that puts America and American workers first…A vote for Carroll Campbell is a vote for American jobs.”\(^{90}\)

Heller generally showed reluctance to respond in kind to Campbell’s attacks, which allowed Campbell to control the narrative of the election. For example, in September, Campbell announced that Heller had switched positions on the tax cut issue. Their disagreement over the tax cut “was one of the major differences between myself and Max Heller,” Campbell said. “But I’m glad we got him over on our side.”\(^{91}\) Both Campbell and Heller reacted positively in October when the House voted to back a Senate plan calling for a massive tax cut if federal spending was restrained.\(^{92}\) Campbell referred implicitly to Heller when he said that the Senate bill “has even received support from some liberals who have been opposing

\(^{87}\) Ibid.

\(^{88}\) “The Piedmont Textile Worker: Can His Job Survive?”, Greenville News (Greenville, SC), Nov. 5, 1978.

\(^{89}\) Ibid. Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) also supported the bill.

\(^{90}\) Ibid.

\(^{91}\) Saunders, “Campbell Says Foe Now Favors Tax Cut.”

tax cuts of more than $20 billion. Obviously these liberals found it politically expedient to change tunes with the election so near.” Heller maintained that the Senate bill was “completely different” from the Kemp-Roth proposal, which he had earlier opposed. 93 Although they supposedly now agreed, Campbell still criticized Heller for not proposing any specific alternatives to cutting taxes. “It’s just a smoke screen – you make a very general statement about cutting taxes and spending but when, where, how are you going to cut taxes?” 94 Campbell attributed other positions to Heller. For instance, during an October 5 debate at a meeting of the Spartanburg Development Association, Campbell said, “I support tax credits for businesses who hire the structurally unemployed. I’m sorry Max opposed that.” 95 According to reporters, Heller jumped to his feet and exclaimed, “I didn’t say that.” “If you didn’t say that I stand corrected,” Campbell replied. “Don’t put words in my mouth,” Heller snapped. After Heller explained that he did not oppose the tax credits, Campbell said, “Well, I’m glad you cleared that up.” 96 Campbell also accused Heller of “waffling” because he opposed collective bargaining and striking by public employees yet supported a state-sponsored negotiating mechanism for public school teachers. 97 Heller complained that Campbell was “trying to put words in my mouth. And I am perfectly capable of speaking for myself.” 98 He explained that he did not believe public school teachers should strike, but they needed some kind of mechanism to negotiate their contracts. Campbell insisted that Heller had a “double standard” and was “playing with semantics.” 99

93 Ibid.
94 Ibid.
95 Saunders, “Heller, Campbell Debate.”
96 Ibid.
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid.
Campbell made a similar argument when he launched his attack on Heller’s use of federal money in Greenville. He claimed Heller had “vacillated on the issues” because he supported both government cutbacks and “big government spending” in his administration.\textsuperscript{100} “Saying one thing and doing the other is not the way to operate,” said Campbell. He accused Heller of using “one ruse or another” rather than taking a stand on the issues.\textsuperscript{101} Heller’s campaign did not immediately respond to Campbell's attack, while Campbell claimed that Heller had referred to him as a “parrot” that spouted off figures. Campbell repeated his accusation that Heller was avoiding the issues, but Heller told reporters, “I don’t think Mr. Campbell’s comments deserve a response.”\textsuperscript{102} Finally, Campbell created the impression that Heller was a political novice. “There is no time for on-the-job training with unchecked inflation, tremendous tax burdens and 58,000 textile jobs in the district at stake,” Campbell told Spartanburg voters. It was not enough to be a nice person and tell people that it is what is in your heart that counts. “People have got to know where you stand,” he said.\textsuperscript{103}

In the last few weeks of the campaign, Heller attempted to regain control over the electoral discourse, but he faced an uphill battle. In September, he hired Washington-based political consultant Mark Shields to help with advertising, but he did not begin television and radio ads until late October. By contrast, Campbell had already spent about $11,500
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on television advertising and about $2,100 on radio advertising between July and September.\textsuperscript{104} Campbell had also raised more money than Heller during the same three-month period. He started July with $12,089 on hand and added another $54,967 by the end of the quarter, for a total of $67,056.\textsuperscript{105} Much of this money likely came from Campbell’s fund-raising event with Ronald Reagan in late September. Hundreds of people attended the $50-a-person reception and $10-a-person barbecue, raising $18,000 to $20,000 for Campbell’s campaign.\textsuperscript{106} Meanwhile Heller began the quarter with no cash on hand and raised $47,054, which included his own $15,000 loan to the campaign and $32,054 in contributions.\textsuperscript{107}

On October 18, the same day that Campbell attacked Heller’s use of federal money and increase in taxes, Shields wrote to his candidate:

There can be little argument that Mr. Campbell is presently dominating the dialogue of this campaign. For entirely laudable reasons, you are reluctant to attack Campbell. But, in the absence of any press initiatives from your campaign, you are left in the position of either responding or not responding to Campbell’s attacks. And let us also note that Campbell has been shrewd enough to drop his two major political bombshells in the Spartanburg media market where half the undecided voters reside and your record as Mayor is not that widely known.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{107} Hill, “Campbell Topping Heller Financially.”
\textsuperscript{108} Mark Shields to Max Heller and John Rubin, “Free Media Effort for Last Three Weeks of Campaign,” Oct. 18, 1978, Box 1, Folder 2, Max Heller Collection, Acc. 2011-066, Special Collections and Archives, Furman University, Greenville, SC.
Shields advised Heller to campaign on his mayoral record “in an aggressive and imaginative way that underlines and emphasizes the very real differences between you and Campbell.”109 Heller’s team must “think and breathe press for the next three weeks.” At press conferences and other publicity events, Heller could speak about his record as mayor and refute Campbell’s claims, which were based on a “very royalist view of government.” Shields believed that most South Carolinians found this view “abhorrent and decidedly contrary to American tradition.”110

Following Shields’ advice, Heller issued press releases to answer Campbell’s accusations. Heller acknowledged that the number of state employees in Greenville had increased by 229 percent in the seven years since he became mayor, but the number of city employees decreased from 738 to 617 during the same period. Of the 108 federally paid employees, only nineteen would become full-time city employees if federal funding stopped.111 He also said that Campbell misunderstood the purpose of federal money, which was “to improve our community and enrich the lives of our people.”112 While federal money was indeed “the hard-earned tax dollars of the working men and women of South Carolina and the United States,” it was also an investment back into the community.113 Heller emphasized the positive results he had achieved for Greenville. He had reduced the city debt by almost half and increased the city surplus to $4.2 million. He had built playgrounds and community centers, paved roads, improved housing, increased street lighting, improved garbage collection, and strengthened law enforcement.114 Moreover,

109 Ibid.
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Heller said that Campbell’s statements about the increase in city taxes were “misleading.” The Clemson study included county taxes and school taxes and did not account for inflation. While the tax rate in the city had increased 18 percent since 1971, the inflation rate had increased 51 percent. “Those are facts,” Heller said. “Facts we can be proud of.” He also called Campbell’s statement about the city’s population decrease “grossly unfair” because the numbers did not tell “the whole story.” In fact, Heller said, the number of households in the city had increased even if the total population had declined. He concluded by dissociating himself from Robert Strauss on the textile issue.

Then suddenly, just as Heller was working to recover lost ground, independent candidate Don W. Sprouse interjected his religious views into the race. On November 2, five days before the election, Sprouse declared that Heller “has not made clear to the voters he is not a Christian and that there is a difference between Christians and Jews.” Referring to an October 25 debate, during which Heller had spoken about the common heritage and traditions of Christianity and Judaism, Sprouse said that he wanted to emphasize the difference between Heller and himself. “He cannot turn to Jesus Christ in time of need,” said Sprouse. “He doesn’t believe Jesus Christ has come yet.” As a non-Christian, Heller was “not as qualified to represent the Christian people of the district as a Christian congressman.” Sprouse’s remarks produced mixed reactions, with both the Heller and Campbell camps believing that they had suffered damage. Campbell’s press secretary Mike Ussery regarded Sprouse’s remarks as a “devastating”
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blow to Campbell’s campaign. Campbell worried that Sprouse would take away votes from him out of sympathy for Heller. Indeed, several people wrote to the editor of *The Greenville News*, denouncing Sprouse’s comments, while others wrote to Heller to express their disgust with Sprouse and their support for Heller. “I thought I’d lost the race because of that,” Campbell recalled in May 1986.

Contrary to Campbell’s fears, Sprouse did not receive enough votes to determine the outcome of the election. Campbell defeated Heller by a margin of 5,893 votes, while Sprouse received only 1,693 (1,126 in Greenville County and 567 in Spartanburg County). On the precinct level, the number of Sprouse’s votes sometimes exceeded the margin of Campbell’s victory, seemingly suggesting that Sprouse took these votes away from Heller. However, Sprouse had adopted an even more conservative stance than Campbell, for instance advocating a fifty percent tax cut, and therefore likely drew the votes from Campbell instead of Heller. At any rate, Sprouse received no more than thirty-seven votes in any one precinct. Most political observers predicted that Campbell would do well in Greenville County, and he did, winning by 32,061 to 27,273 votes (a margin of 4,788). But Campbell also took half of the precincts in the city of Greenville, which indicated that at least some of Heller’s mayoral constituents had become dissatisfied with his performance. On October 31, Campbell had campaigned in Heller’s “back yard,” visiting merchants and salespeople along Main Street in downtown Greenville. They complained to him about the construction and blocking of Main Street as part of the downtown redevelopment program and pledged their votes to him. “You won’t have any


trouble down this street,” said one merchant. In perhaps the biggest shock of the night, Campbell won the traditionally Democratic county of Spartanburg by 19,316 to 18,211 votes (a margin of 1,105). “We’re amazed, floored by Spartanburg County,” said Ussery. “Our whole strategy had been predicated all along on losing big in Spartanburg County.”

Campbell was ecstatic. “I took Spartanburg County,” he shouted to his supporters after the returns came in. Heller’s team was likewise in shock. “I’m stunned,” said John Rubin, Heller’s campaign manager. “Everything had said we were okay.”

It seems that Heller’s reliance on his mayoral record and good character had lulled his supporters into a sense of complacency.

While we do not have demographic data for the November election, Heller’s August 1978 survey indicates that there was fertile ground for Campbell to plant seeds of doubt. For example, Heller did not receive as much support as a Democrat should have from younger voters and blue-collar workers, the latter mainly Spartanburg residents. Forty-nine percent of voters aged 18-34 said they supported Heller strongly or with some reservations, while 40 percent supported Campbell, and 11 percent were undecided. Forty-four percent of blue-collar whites supported Heller strongly or with some reservations, while 38 percent supported Campbell, which was

---
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impressive for a Republican, and 18 percent were undecided. Campbell also had 38 percent support among middle-income white voters, which was the group most concerned about government spending.\textsuperscript{129} Forty-six percent of Spartanburg County voters supported Heller strongly or with some reservations, 25 percent supported Campbell, and 29 percent were undecided.\textsuperscript{130} Conservative voters made up 42 percent of the sample electorate, and 38 percent of these said they would vote for Campbell. Undecided voters comprised 20 percent of the sample electorate and over half of them lived in Spartanburg County. The survey report recommended that Heller target these older, low-informational voters.\textsuperscript{131} When asked to respond to the statement, “Max Heller would be too much of a big spending liberal,” fifty percent of voters disagreed, but 34 percent were not sure.\textsuperscript{132} When asked to respond to the statement, “Max Heller has done a good job of holding down government spending in Greenville,” fifty-one percent of all voters agreed, while 41 percent were not sure. More concerning, only 35 percent of Spartanburg County voters agreed with this statement, while 62 percent were not sure. Among undecided voters, thirty-three percent agreed, with 62 percent not sure.\textsuperscript{133} The numbers indicated that “these voters will have to be sold on the job that Max Heller has done as mayor and will do as congressman.”\textsuperscript{134} Campbell’s aggressive strategy prevented that from happening.

As we have seen, the open seat in South Carolina’s Fourth District and the general disillusionment of conservatives with the Democratic Party provided an ideal opportunity for the Republican Party in the 1978 election. With the full
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support of his party, State Sen. Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. challenged the popular mayor of Greenville, Max M. Heller, for the seat. The two candidates fought a closely contested race, debating issues such as government spending, federal tax cuts, and textile tariffs. In order to win crucial conservative votes, Campbell frequently labeled Heller as a liberal who raised city taxes, spent federal money, and opposed tariffs to protect the local textile industry. He also criticized Heller’s political inexperience and lack of specific proposals. With Heller reluctant to strike back, Campbell dominated the narrative of the election with his own interpretation of Heller’s views. At the last minute, independent candidate Don Sprouse attempted to “expose” Heller’s Jewish beliefs to the Christian voters. Sprouse received more rebukes than votes for his trouble, while Campbell’s strategy paid off at the polls on election day. It was undoubtedly a painful loss for Heller and his supporters. Unfortunately, the political reasons for his defeat have been largely forgotten, as historians and journalists have chosen to focus on the unsubstantiated allegations that Campbell used Sprouse as a “stalking horse” against Heller. As a result, a great deal of important political history has been lost. The 1978 election took place during a time when South Carolina was transitioning from a solidly Democratic to a two-party state. Campbell’s victory represented a milestone for the Republican Party in its mission to become the new party of conservatism in the South.
POETRY AS EUCHARIST:
SUBLATING SPIRITUAL ALIENATION IN
HÖLDERLIN’S “BROD UND WEIN”

Andrew Golla

T. E. Hulme, in his essay “Romanticism and Classicism,” famously defines Romanticism as “spilt religion,” or the overflow of human religiosity into categories not meant to contain it.\(^1\) He renders Romantic spirituality as an oblique and uncanny resurgence of deity worship over and against the ideological drive of rationalism, which, rather than eradicating religion, merely repressed it; and in this way, Hulme makes of Romanticism something almost traumatic.\(^2\) Spilt religion becomes the doom of the agnostic, who, unable to fully assimilate the existence of the divine into her selfhood, reenacts spirituality through naturalism and humanism—deprived of her God, she worships herself.\(^3\)

Hulme’s surface claim—that the humans of literary Romanticism reach vainly for the clouds while the humans of literary Classicism tread appropriately on the ground—may thus be more nuanced by his underlying claim—that the traumatized relationship between the Romantic and her religiosity shaped the Romantic lyric.\(^4\) Thomas Pfau, in his book *Romantic Moods: Paranoia, Trauma, and Melancholy, 1790-1840*, treats this speculated relationship between Romanticism and trauma more fully. He presents trauma as one of three essential “moods” shaping Romantic poetry, a sort of “psycho-historic


\(^3\) Hulme, 114-115.

\(^4\) Ibid., 113-116.
climate” giving birth to conscious thought and literary discourse.\(^5\) Contrary to more general connotations of the word, which refer to changing emotional states, “mood” here denotes a matrix of holistic experience anterior to conscious thought determined by the historical-situatedness of one’s being-in-the-world.\(^6\) Pfau suggests that because mood, as the unknown shaper of thought, “sediments” itself into discrete discourse formations, analyzing the formal characteristics of a given literary period could yield a greater insight into the very historical reality—at the time entirely opaque—from which its authors read and wrote.\(^7\)

Within the context of such a mood theory, “trauma” (taken in the Freudian sense) describes the unique relationship that arises between history, consciousness, and text when “a past so catastrophic at the time of its original occurrence…preclude[s] its conscious assimilation by the subject.”\(^8\) Because mood, as anterior to consciousness, also gives form to consciousness, the topography of poetic voice develops as a response to—and a protection from—Gedächtnisspuren, or memory traces, of a past trauma.\(^9\) Pfau understands the conscious self to be “belated,” capable only of recalling object-structures distilled from an inaccessible history,\(^10\) and he argues that disturbances in the poetic voice embody an innate dissonance that cannot be known as propositional content but can be “awakened” in aesthetic form.\(^11\) He therefore views lyric disturbances as constitutive of Romanticism’s engagement with the traumatized reality of modernity.

---
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In this essay, I will explore the intersection of Hulme’s concept of an essentially traumatized Romantic religiosity and Pfau’s work with lyric structures and mood theory in order to articulate the effects of historical trauma on the poetry of Friedrich Hölderlin. Specifically, I argue that Hölderlin’s elegy “Brod und Wein” reflects a lyric embodiment of Hölderlin’s belatedness to the spiritual trauma of modernity—when the subject becomes alienated from the now seemingly-antiquated religious traditions that once facilitated her individual experience of the divine presence. Hölderlin reconstitutes the substance of organized religion in an aesthetic medium in order to affect feelings of transcendence no longer directly accessible through outside religious practice. He conceives of poetry not as a means for enacting “spilt religion” but as a way to virtually access the divine while simultaneously calling attention to its absence.

In making this argument, I will focus primarily on the way in which Hölderlin isolates and reincorporates elements of Christianity and Greek paganism within “Brod und Wein” to create a new mythology. In this mythos, Hölderlin positions the poet as priest in an intermediate epoch between the past, when the gods and humanity lived together in bliss, and the future, when the absconded divinities will come again. Formally, he uses binary structures to establish states of alienation between present and past, divine and profane—and yet, the voice of “Brod und Wein” admits a certain tonal ambivalence, allowing its binary figures to kaleidoscope into each other, transgress their intrinsic separation, and ultimately become the grounds of a kind of syncretic unity. Therefore, in the first section, I will analyze the binary structures underlying the poem’s narrative, typified by the moon as “Schattenbild unserer Erde.” In the second section, I will analyze lyric syncretisms, such as the figures of Father Æther and his Son. Finally,

I will conclude with a few thoughts on the relationship between the formal characteristics of “Brod und Wein” and Hölderlin’s views on spirituality and poetry. Because poetic language allows for a syncretic sublation of binary alienation, it is capable of embodying and articulating the modern subject’s traumatic separation from her historical religious nature while also providing a vehicle for the affective reunification of the divine presence and the self. Just as, internal to the poem, the bread and wine function as sacraments for “weak vessels” which signify and perpetuate the divine presence on earth from the present to the eschaton, external to the poem, poetic language is the bread and wine, signifying a form of religious existence lost to the modern subject while also perpetuating religiosity through aesthetic affect until whenever (if ever) the modern subject is reconciled to her innate spirituality.13

**“Schattenbild unserer erde”:**
**Binary, Liminality, and Alienation**

“Brod und Wein” is, primarily, a mythical narrative poem. Traceable throughout the narrative, however, is a complex of undergirding binaries onto which Hölderlin’s mythos is mapped. The poem opens with a quiet overture to the sleeping earth: the day is done, the markets are empty, the working-men are heading home, and “all around, the city rests.”14 From the very beginning, Hölderlin situates his world in twilight, established along both a temporal (the hour passing, day giving way to night) and a photic axis (shadows; the light of the

---

14 Hölderlin, 1-6.
sun giving way to the light of the moon). In so doing, he introduces two binary oppositions, which I will call past vs. future and day vs. night. The liminality of the speaker will prove to be an essential feature of Hölderlin’s elegy—situated in the in-between and the passing-to-and-fro, the speaker must arbitrate between two opposing realities, in turns either becoming or fading away, and the perpetual tug-of-war alienates the speaker from his or her present, embodied context, which never fully crystalizes. Notice, therefore, that though “the city rests,” “the fountains,/ springing constantly fresh, rustle the fragrant beds,” and “now too, a soft wind rises, riffling the wood’s highest branches.” The city, forever settling, never quite settles.

This latent agitation serves as a harbinger for the coming moon, which dawns at the end of the first stanza:

Sieh! und das Schattenbild unserer Erde, der Mond Kommet geheim nun auch; die Schwärmerische, dieNacht kommt, Voll mit Sternen und wohl wenig bekümmert um uns, Glänzt die Erstaunende dort, die Fremdlingin unter den Menschen Über Gebirgshöhn traurig und prächtig herauf.

Look! and mysterious, the shadow-world of our Earth, the moon, Rises with it; and Night, the fanciful dreamer, rises, Full of stars: little concerned, so it would seem, about us, There, the amazing, she gleams, stranger to all our people, Moving splendid and sad over the mountain peaks.

---

15 Ibid., 11.  
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The impact of the moon’s arrival shatters the poem into new binaries. First, the rising of the moon at night is a moon-dawn reminiscent of an inverse sunrise, and so the moon becomes an anti-sun, shining its light on an anti-day: moon vs. sun. This anti-day is “Night, the fanciful dreamer,” which, in contrast to the bustling productivity the workingmen have just left behind, is the domain of music, of lovers and lone troubadours: capitalist labor vs. artistic labor. But not only is the moon an anti-sun, ushering in an anti-day, but it is an anti-earth, a “stranger to all our people” hanging round and beautiful over the mountain peaks—the very emblem of heavens vs. earth.

The next two stanzas expand the zones these binaries loosely demarcate into mythic proportions. Here, the poet speaker wrestles with his or her relationship to the goddess Night and to the High God, Father Æther. Which is to say, the temporal and photic setting of the poem’s narrative takes on theological relevance—for the rest of the poem, the speaker stands firmly in the domain of Night and only ventures beyond it through memory or future projection. The Night is “die Hocherhabene,” the “Sublime One” or “the Raised-on-High,” underscoring her distance from the earth and its inhabitants; she gives gifts, but she is unpredictable (“Even the wisest has no cognizance of her works”), and though she is worshipped, “her self-spirit exists fully, eternally free.” Night contrasts with the High God, to whom belong “thought-filled daylight,” “clear eyes,” and “faithful men” as well as the “holy inebriation,” “free-flowing word,” and “brimming cups” that Night must concede to grant.

The appearance of these two opposing figures inaugurates two more binaries which will be, arguably, the most im-

18 Ibid., 6-9. Note that the title “die Schwärmerische” invokes the complex resonances of Schwärmeri.
19 Ibid., 17-18.
20 Ibid., 19-22
21 Ibid., 22-36.
portant for the poem as it progresses: asleep vs. awake and divine presence vs. divine absence. Hölderlin suggests that the speaker-poet’s alienation from his or her present context arose concomitant with the deprivation of the present of its moral weight and spiritual significance. He characterizes the speaker as a roamer awake in the Night, and a fitful dreamer. For although the speaker remembers the stories of the past, when the gods descended to earth and the divine presence indwelled humanity, he or she remembers them in questions, relentless wos that underscore the speaker’s alienation from the sunny past even as it, narrated, begins to dawn:

Also ist wahr, was einst wir in der Jugend gehört?
Festlicher Saal! der Boden ist Meer! und Tische die Berge
Wahrlich zu einzigem Brauche vor Alters gebaut!
Aber die Thronen, wo? die Tempel, und wo die Ge-
fäße,
Wo mit Nektar gefüllt, Göttern zu Lust der Gesang?
Wo, wo leuchten sie denn, die fernhintertreffenden-
Sprüche?
Delphi schlummert und wo tönet das große Geschick?
Wo ist das schnelle? wo brichts, allgegenwärtigen
Glücks voll
Donnernd aus heiterer Luft über die Augen herein?

Is it then true, what they told us once in our youth?
Festal hall, whose floor is the sea and whose tables
mountains,
Truly constructed for one use only in far-gone days!
But the thrones, where are they, the temples, and
where are the vessels,
Where the delight of gods, brimming with nectar, the
song?
Where do the oracles gleam, striking far into the
distance?
Delphi slumbers; where does the weighty destiny sound? Where is the Swiftest? Where, filled with omnipresence of fortune, Thundering, does it break in, out of clear air, on our eyes?22

The speaker, has, tragically, “come too late;” he or she repeats stories as if they were memories, fixated on conscious-constructs and haunted by the traces of a time when the divine presence was traumatically ripped away from him or her.23 Now, the speaker lives amidst “weak vessels,” unfit to receive the gods as they once did, and although echoes of the gods’ blessed day linger, all but Night have absconded—Night who, sublime, unknowable, and utterly foreign, forever reminds the speaker of his or her alienation from the divine presence rather than stands in for it.24 “Meanwhile it seems to me often,” the speaker laments,

Besser zu schlafen, wie so ohne Genossen zu sein, 
So zu harren und was zu tun indes und zu sagen, 
Weiß ich nicht und wozu Dichter in dürftiger Zeit?

...better to sleep than as now to be so companionless, waiting like this; and what’s to do and to say in the meantime I do not know, and what poets are for when times are hard.25

---

22 Hölderlin, 55-64.
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“Der oberste gott”: 
Religious Syncretism and Poetic Voice

Having thus identified in the binary understructure of Hölderlin’s narration the poet-speaker’s traumatic alienation from the divine presence that once informed humanity’s spirituality, subjectivity, and significance, this essay will now turn its attention to the narrative’s overstructure, or the poetic language that gives Hölderlin’s mythos a form and a voice in which to be embodied. For despite the acute binariness of the speaker’s alienated reality, his or her poetic voice curiously fails to distinguish between certain otherwise-demarcated dualities. Rather, the lyric of “Brod und Wein” is characteristically ambiguous and ambivalent—seemingly-opposed categories shift and blur into each other, leading to various forms of figured syncretism. Two such instances will be explored here.

First, like any good mythologist, Hölderlin populates his elegy with a pantheon of divinities, two of which—Night and Father Æther—have already been introduced. In the beginning, these gods are explicitly identified with the gods of Greek paganism. For example, in connection with the gods the speaker references Ancient Greek geography, mentioning “Thebes,” “Delphi,” and the “Olympian lands.”

Father Æther is identified with the heavens and with thunder, typical attributes of Zeus, and in other places with wine and drunken revelry, characteristics of the god Dionysus. These and other strains of Greek religion run counter to the explicitly-Christian imagery that enters towards the poem’s end. In Stanza IX, the speaker envisions a kind of Parousia, when the Son, elsewhere referred to as “a quiet genius, heavenly/comforter, who proclaimed the end of days and was gone,” will restore the divine presence to humanity. Moreover, the Son leaves the bread

26 Hölderlin, 51-62.
27 See, for example, Hölderlin, 138.
28 Ibid., 125-139; 155-160.
and wine “as a sign they had been here, once, and again would come”—a clear allusion to the Christian Eucharist.  

Critically, however, the elements of these two religions—the religion of Western antiquity and the religion of Western modernity—are not clearly distinguished from each other, but are rather kneaded together in Hölderlin’s lyric voice. At times, the gods are referred to with titles reminiscent of both traditions, such as “God in the Highest.” Other times, one character is described using figural language oscillating between two identities, as if stuck in superposition. Father Æther, for example, is in one stanza referred to as “thundering,” referencing Zeus and his lightning-bolts, and in another stanza as “the god slow of thunder,” referencing the Christian God who is “slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.” The Son, too, appears as a Christ figure, the Son of the High God, and a Dionysian figure, giver of bread and wine. In both of these examples, Hölderlin brings to bear the power and flexibility of figural language to give form to a dynamically-shifting mythology. He breaks down two giants of Western religiosity into their essential elements and then reconstitutes those elements in poetic form, thereby creating an entirely new, syncretic spirituality sublating both of them.

A similar effect is at play in Hölderlin’s use of verb tense. Though at first glance past vs. present seems an inviolable dichotomy in the understructure of “Brod und Wein,” emphasizing the insuperable alienation of the speaker in his or her twilight present from the beatitude of the divine past, in the poetic overstructure, there are instances throughout the elegy when time and tense desynchronize, as if the lyric voice has lost track of what it is speaking about. Perhaps the most noticeable of such instances would be in Stanzas V-VI. Here,

\[\text{Ibid., 125-142.}\]
\[\text{Hölderlin, 23.}\]
\[\text{Jonah 4:2.}\]
\[\text{Hölderlin, 125-142; 153-160.}\]
the poet-speaker recounts the story of the gods’ arrival in present tense:

Unempfunden kommen sie erst, es streben entgegen
Ihnen die Kinder, zu hell kommt, zu blendend das Glück,
und es scheut sie der Mensch, kaum weiß zu sagen ein Halbgott
Wer mit Namen sie sind, die mit den Gaben ihn nahn.…

Unperceived they are, as they first come; eagerly children
Jostle to meet them; yet too bright, too dazzling the joy
And men shun them; hardly even a demi-god knows
How he shall tell by name those that approach him with gifts.33

Notice, also, that the stanza ends with three repetitions of nun—the immediacy of the divine presence as imagined/re-membered takes command of the lyric voice, demanding a very present-tense narration for this strictly past event. But midway through Stanza VI, the present-ness of the speaker’s present-tense breaks down concomitant with the collapse of his or her vision of posterity before the harshness of present absence and alienation.

The dramatic breakdown is signaled by the disjunction of an interjecting hyphen:

Fest und Edel, sie gehn über Gestaden empor—
Aber wo sind sie? wo blühn die Bekannten, die Kro-

nen des Festes?

33 Ibid., 73-76.
Thebe welkt und Athen; rauschen die Waffen nicht mehr
In Olympia, nicht die goldnen Wagen des Kampfspiels,
Und bekränzen sich denn nimmer die Schiffe Corinths?
Warum schweigen auch sie, die alten heiligen Theater?
Warum freut sich denn nicht der geweihte Tanz?
Warum zeichnet, wie sonst, die Stirne des Mannes ein Gott nicht,
Drückt den Stempel, wie sonst, nicht dem Getroffenen auf?

Strong and noble, they rise high over coast and cliff –
Yes, but where? And the familiar, flowering crowns of the feast-day?
Thebes and Athens, both, wilt. Do weapons no more
Ring in Olympia? Nor the golden chariots in combat?
And the Corinthian ships: are they now bare of the wreath?
Why are even they silent, the ancient holy theatres?
Why can the sacred dance no more stand up and rejoice?
Why no more does a god set his mark on a man’s forehead,
Print the stamp as before, die-like, on him who is struck? 34

The present of the present intrudes upon the present of the past like a projector screen swallowing up a burning piece of film reel, and the sharp turn from declarative to interrogative 

34 Hölderlin, 98-106.
tive sentences, adding a sense of panic to the lyric voice, signals the stirrings of memory traces as the speaker nears the event of his or her religious trauma: nun, nun, nun gives way to wo, wo, wo. Yet as with the High God, Hölderlin’s poetic language attempts to absorb the impact of past vs. present using the present-tense. The result is another lyric syncretism, albeit a much more fragile one, constantly threatening to burst under the centrifugal force of two irreconcilable temporalities.

“Brod und wein”: The Spiritual Role of the Poet

What then can we say to Hulme’s claim that Romanticism is “spilt religion?”

Certainly the running-together of all manners of liquid in a massive table-top spill seems at first glance a fitting metaphor for Hölderlin’s frequent syncretisms—but under the surface (or rather, above and below the surface), the tensions between form and content speak to a deeper-set religious trauma. If the binary understructure of “Brod und Wein” can be understood as a formal awakening of the speaker-poet’s alienation from the divine presence within modernity, then it represents the initial residue of a traumatic mood shaping the poet’s voice. Lyric shifts and disturbances further indicate an awakened trauma in the poetic overstructure, where the speaker attempts to assimilate disparate religious symbols and imagery into a kind of cohesive whole. Since the speaker, as a modern subject, has been traumatically sundered from his or her spiritual being, he or she is compelled to repeat this sundering in novel ways, breaking with old religious traditions and creating new ones through lyric poetry. And while repeating and recombining the detritus of Western religious history does create a kind of cohesively-syncretic mythology, because these efforts, as conscious efforts, still come posterior to the speaker’s being-in-trauma—because the speaker’s efforts are by necessity belated—repetition cannot

---

35 Hulme, 115.
restore true unity to the speaker, it can only affect it. The lyric voice’s syncretism merely sublates, rather than eradicates, the tension between the poem’s underlying dualities. And so one should rather say that, in the case of Hölderlin, Romanticism is not a “spilt religion” but a wounded one.

Nevertheless, Hölderlin offers “Brod und Wein”—and poetry more broadly—as a sacrament for the modern subject in the interim, producing, like the Eucharist’s bread and wine, divine presence even as it draws attention to divine absence. The unique shape of religiosity in Romantic poetry bespeaks the struggle of a generation of modern artists to make sense of the traumatic effects of Enlightenment rationalism on Western spirituality. For Hölderlin, at least, the role of the poet is to be a priest of the wine god and the fate of the poet is to wake fitfully in a world fast asleep. “Darum,” he writes,

denken wir auch dabei der Himmlischen, die sonst
Da gewesen und die kehren in richtiger Zeit.
Darum singen auch mit Ernst, die Sänger, den Weingott
Und nicht eitel erdacht tönet dem Alten das Lob.

Therefore with these our thoughts turn to the heavenly, those who
Once were here and in their own due time will return.
Therefore do poets, too, solemnly sing of the wine-god,
And no idly composed praise sounds to the ancient one.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{36} Hölderlin, 149-152.
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**Beowulf’s Missing Mother:**

**Beowulf’s Relationships with Family, Women, and His Own Gender**

Jillian Hoffman

The various roles, successes, and failures of the mothers in *Beowulf* have been discussed at length, particularly as they relate to gender and politics. But there’s an elephant in the room. The mother who is left out of all these discussions—and who is almost completely left out of the poem itself—is Beowulf’s mother. Scholars have entirely ignored the issue of Beowulf’s missing mother. Indeed, it is difficult to elaborate upon a character about whom there is so little information without traipsing into the messy territory of speculation—which probably accounts for most scholars’ hesitance to venture into the matter. Her looming absence, however, does not have to be explained in order for its significance to the poem and to Beowulf himself to be recognized. Beowulf has complex attitudes regarding family, women, and his own gender expression, and these issues can all potentially be attributed back to his lack of a mother.

In numerous ways throughout the poem, Beowulf rejects the idea of family and actively chooses not to be personally involved with a family unit. One overt rejection of the family is his slaying of the monster family unit, Grendel and Grendel’s mother, Grendel’s mother being the second unnamed mother in the poem. But his statements come in subtler fashions as well, such as in his rejection of Hygd’s offer of the throne. The most important rejection of the family comes with Beowulf’s decision not to get married or have children. In this particular denial, Beowulf does not turn any woman into a
mother by impregnating her, and he also eliminates the need for a female counterpart by personally taking on the political role in which such a counterpart would function. Beowulf’s fight with Grendel’s mother and his embodiment of female roles bring into question his gender and masculinity, and he can ultimately be viewed as an androgynous character.

The five identified mothers of Beowulf—Modthryth, Grendel’s mother, Hildeburh, Hygd, and Wealhtheow—serve both plot-level and thematic purposes. Grendel’s mother is the most prominent of these figures (although she is unnamed, ironically) because of her battle with Beowulf and its implications. Hygd and Wealhtheow are both queens and faithfully fulfill their social and political duties, and they both have sons. Wealhtheow, notably, influences Beowulf, and she is the only woman in the poem with dialogue. Modthryth and Hildeburh are also queens, but they appear only in peripheral stories that serve as thematic bolsters to the poem’s meanings. Mary Dockray-Miller says that “the mothers of Beowulf engage in a number of performances, most designed to mother their children…they desire to protect, nurture, and teach their children.”1 Dockray-Miller goes on to argue that Wealhtheow is the only one in the poem who succeeds as a mother,2 based on the criteria listed above. This argument, however, relies upon Dockray-Miller’s distinct and controversial interpretation of the text which states that Wealhtheow, in one of her famous speeches, does not defend her sons’ right to rule the kingdom, but suggests her nephew Hrothulf should be king instead of either of her sons. Though it could be a perilous political strategy, Wealhtheow’s intention would be to protect her sons from danger by keeping them from ascending to the throne.3

2 Dockray-Miller, 78.
3 Dockray-Miller, 111.
Whether or not one accepts this particular aspect of Dockray-Miller’s reading, it is clear that Beowulf is a critical figure in the successes and failures of the main plot’s three mothers. In her attempt to keep her son from the throne, Hygd offers Beowulf the kingship. Wealththeow recruits Beowulf to be an ally to her sons and nephew in the future when she and her husband are gone. Finally, Beowulf is the one who renders Grendel’s mother a failure by killing her son, whom she fails to protect. Beowulf is deeply intertwined with the affairs of the mothers of the poem, but he has no involvement with or interest in his own mother, and Beowulf’s mother is not present to fulfill her duties as a mother.

The only mention of Beowulf’s mother comes from Hrothgar after Beowulf slays Grendel:

Lo, what woman could say,  
whosoever has borne such a son  
into the race of men, if she still lives,  
that the God of Old was good to her  
in childbearing.⁴ (Beowulf lines 942-6)

This remark indicates that at least Hrothgar does not know who Beowulf’s mother is, and the statement is one full of uncertainty and questions. Beowulf’s father, Ecgtheow, was a legendary man, and there is no obvious reason why his wife should be unknown or unnamed, or why it should be a mystery as to whether she is alive or not. The poem places a substantial emphasis on lineage and marital relationships—characters are often even identified by their familial relationships, as when Beowulf is referred to as “son of Ecgtheow.” So, while Beowulf’s mother is not a present force in the poem, it is plausible to imagine her name being mentioned in the context of Beowulf’s family identity. But, as Dockray-Miller points out, the

poem neglects matrilineage more than once. Hygelac, for example, has a daughter (who is unnamed in the poem), and Hygd is never directly identified as being her mother—“the unnamed daughter is called only Hygelac’s in the text.” In his article “Names in Beowulf and Anglo-Saxon English,” Tom Shippey points out that Beowulf contains roughly seventy Old English “personal names” (60). There is a plethora of peripheral, unimportant characters whom the poet bothered to name, so why not the hero’s mother? A pattern begins to emerge, though, when Grendel’s mother, Hygelac’s daughter, and Beowulf’s mother are considered together. The poet seems to neglect matrilineage and female family members to the point of neglecting to name them in these three cases. Dockray-Miller goes so far as to say that “the mothers who populate Old English poetry reveal the metaphorical propensities of texts that try to make them disappear after they reproduce, to ‘occlude’ their maternity.” Beowulf’s unnamed mother, about whom it is not known if she is alive or dead, is certainly an extreme case of occluded maternity due to the glaring lack of information given about her.

Beowulf’s fight with Grendel’s mother must be examined closely, because this is Beowulf’s most intimate encounter with a mother—and an unnamed one at that. Grendel’s mother’s identity is solely in her status as a mother. Despite this, there is lively scholarly work that contends that Grendel’s mother is actually a masculine or androgynous figure in the poem. Many scholars, such as M. Wendy Hennequin, invoke Judith Butler’s concept of gender performance to interrogate Grendel’s mother’s masculine behavior and descriptions. Butler defines gender as “an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of

5 Dockray-Miller, 100.
7 Dockray-Miller, 76.
Grendel’s mother “crosses gender lines and performs the functions of warrior, avenger, and king, all generally associated only with men,” and it is because of these gender transgressions—not some inherent physical qualities—that she is ultimately viewed as monstrous. Jane Chance examines the mix of epithets used to describe Grendel’s mother and also comments on Grendel’s mother’s transgressions, saying, “It seems clear from these epithets that Grendel’s Mother inverts the Germanic roles of the mother and queen, or lady...[And] unlike most mothers and queens, she fights her own battles.”

But even considering her masculine performance, it is Grendel’s mother’s identity as a mother that ultimately drives and defines her. Dockray-Miller says that the “monster-mother” figure “must endure the death of her child and the realization of her failure to mother her son—to protect him.” Dockray-Miller asserts that the mothers of the poem “engage in a number of performances...they desire to protect, nurture, and teach their children, and in the heroic world of Beowulf, the protective aspect of maternal performance becomes paramount.”

If one were to consider Beowulf’s mother in the context of Dockray-Miller’s criteria for a successful mother, she would have to be considered a failure, for having failed to protect Beowulf from danger by his becoming a warrior. It is an interesting intersection that Beowulf, an unprotected son, comes to battle a mother who failed to protect her own son.

---

11 Dockray-Miller, 89.
12 Dockray-Miller, 77-8.
Beowulf’s battle with Grendel’s mother is much more difficult for him than his fight with Grendel. Grendel’s mother pulls Beowulf from the open water to her “battle-hall,” where the two are protected from the water and can fight. As he strikes Grendel’s mother’s head with Unferth’s sword, Hrunting:

[He] discover[s] then
that the battle-flame [will] not bite,
or wound her fatally – but the edge fail[s]
the man in his need; it had endured many
hand-to-hand meetings, often sheared through helmets,
fated war-garments. It [is] the first time
that the fame of that precious treasure [has] failed.14

The sword, a phallic symbol, fails to pierce Grendel’s mother: this failure of Beowulf’s sword suggests that Beowulf is impotent during his encounter with Grendel’s mother. His impotency threatens to be his downfall, when, after the sword’s failure, Grendel’s mother manages to pin Beowulf to the ground and attain a position on top of him. Scholars have long disagreed about the exact translation of ofsittan, the word used to describe Grendel’s mother’s action in gaining power over Beowulf. Many have translated it to “sit upon,” which carries sexual inuendo, but Fred C. Robinson says that based on other instances in Anglo-Saxon literature where ofsittan appears, there is no evidence to suggest that it literally means “to sit upon.”15 E.L. Risden, however, argues that even if Robinson’s suggested translation of “set upon” is accepted over “to sit upon,” “the punning suggestion of ‘sat on’ remains, with its

13 Beowulf line 1513.
14 Beowulf lines 1522-8.
incongruous sexual undertones.”

“[T]he Anglo-Saxons [use the term] weapnedmann, ‘weaponed-person,’ as a common means of designating a male person,”

so the failure of Beowulf’s weapon threatens his literal definition as a man. Dana M. Oswald reinforces this idea, saying that “the possession of weapons is closely related to one’s gender and identity—and particularly to masculine identity.”

When Beowulf fights Grendel, he fights only with his bare hands and rather easily defeats Grendel. When he faces Grendel’s mother and has to use a weapon—the use of which designates a person as a man—he flounders and his weapon fails. Finally Beowulf regains a position of power and sees “among the armor a victorious blade, / ancient giant-sword strong in its edges, / worthy in battles; it [is] the best of weapons.”

Beowulf grabs this sword, “[strikes] in fury / so that it [catches] [Grendel’s mother] hard in the neck, / [breaks] her bone-rings,” and beheads her. After this deadly strike, the sword dissolves: “Then the sword [begins], / that blade, to dissolve away in battle-icicles / from the war-blood; it [is] a great wonder / that it [melts] entirely.”

So, after his own sword fails, Beowulf has to use another man’s sword to kill Grendel’s mother, and then his borrowed sword (a phallic symbol) dissolves. Oswald says “the masculine authority by which Beowulf lends his fight with Grendel’s mother is not his own, but rather is external,

19 Beowulf lines 1557-9.
20 Beowulf lines 1565-7.
21 Beowulf lines 1605-8.
imbued in the sword, not the man. In taking up this item, Beowulf is bound to succeed, but it is the sword’s virility, not his own, that grants him victory.”\textsuperscript{22} This, again, paints Beowulf to be an impotent man, because even as he is able to stab her, his sword loses its integrity and dissolves once it has entered her body.

Not only do these moments emasculate Beowulf by putting him underneath a female with physical power over him, the Oedipal coloring of these moments in the fight cannot be ignored. Beowulf is a young man without a mother having a sexually charged interaction with a mother who has just lost her son. In no way is this a suggestion that Grendel’s mother is Beowulf’s literal mother, but she does appear to be a stand-in for the mother figure he lacks. This point is complicated by the fact that Beowulf and Grendel’s mother actually share some key traits. Hennequin illustrates their similarities: “[Grendel’s mother] shows enormous strength, fights effectively after ruling for fifty years, and can survive in and under the water.”\textsuperscript{23} But Beowulf also does all of these things. He has an unmatched strength, he rules for fifty years and is still a capable fighter, and he performs impressive feats in and under the water. Again, this is not an argument that the two are literally related, but it does bolster the idea that Grendel’s mother is a viable mother figure with whom Beowulf has a sexually charged interaction. Beowulf killing Grendel and Grendel’s mother has implications for his complex relationship to family as well. With Grendel’s mother acting here as a tainted mother figure for Beowulf, he is in a sense symbolically killing his mother. In Beowulf’s success killing Grendel and Grendel’s mother, he obliterates an entire (small) family. Here, Beowulf has more than an aversion to family, he actively seeks to destroy it, and he succeeds.

\textsuperscript{22} Oswald, 99.
\textsuperscript{23} Hennequin, 513.
In the poem, it is the women who are ultimately most concerned with the matter of succession, and they are willing to circumvent traditional customs of succession in order to set up a future that they see as the most secure for their people. Stacy S. Klein articulates the ways in which the two prominent queens in the poem, Hygd and Wealhtheow, focus on succession and the issues of their sons’ kingships. Neither Queen is entirely supportive of their sons’ claims to the throne—Wealhtheow cites her sons’ youth as a hindrance to their leadership ability, and Hygd does not believe that her son has the strength to defend his kingdom.\(^{24}\) Both women turn to Beowulf in the issues of succession. After Hygelac’s death, Hygd “offer[s] [Beowulf] the hoard and kingdom / [because]…she [does] not trust / that her son could hold the ancestral seat / against foreign hosts.”\(^{25}\) Beowulf rejects this offer to be king of the Geats apparently because Hygd and Hygelac’s son, the rightful heir, is still alive, and Beowulf does not want to usurp power. Beowulf passes on an important political opportunity because of unnecessary modesty or a resistance to being included in a family—Hygd, her son, and her daughter are all still alive. In the two cases of Wealhtheow and Hygd, mothers are willing to entrust Beowulf with the safety of their kingdoms. Wealhtheow asks Beowulf to be a faithful ally to her sons when they eventually rule, and Hygd, as mentioned above, literally offers Beowulf the throne over her own son. Beowulf does agree to be a friend to Wealhtheow’s sons in the future, because this amount of involvement does not make him “part of the family” in a symbolic or literal way. But Hygd’s offer would insert Beowulf into the spot where the genealogical heir to the throne would sit, and this essentially renders him as part of the royal family’s bloodline. Beowulf becoming king would also provide him with a symbolic mother—Hygd.

\(^{24}\) Klein, 117.

\(^{25}\) *Beowulf* lines 2369-72.
Beowulf rejects Hygd’s offer to literally join the family, but he wholeheartedly embraces the symbolic family that he finds with Hrothgar and cherishes the familial relationship he has with Hygelac. Beowulf is repeatedly able and willing to make strong, familial-like bonds with men throughout the poem. Before going to fight Grendel’s mother, Beowulf gives a speech in which he addresses Hrothgar and says: “if ever in your service I should / lose my life, that you would always be / like a father to me when I have gone forth.”26 Beowulf is more than willing to give up his life in service of Hrothgar. When Beowulf later addresses Hygelac, he tells him “Still all my joys / are fixed on you alone; I have few / close kinsmen, my Hygelac, except for you.”27 It appears that Beowulf is more comfortable with and embracing of close relationships with men than with women—both in the political and personal senses. Homosocial bonding is incredibly prominent in Anglo-Saxon literature. In Albrecht Classen’s essay in the book Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age, he discusses how friendships work in heroic literature. He says that “heroic epics regularly refer to fundamental values closely associated with friendship, but these basically imply military values, such as trust, constancy, reliability, etc.”28 It is critical for men, especially kings and warriors, to make strong homosocial bonds, because those bonds ensure they will have allies during future conflicts.

Not only does Beowulf privilege men and male relationships, he actively distances himself from women, figuratively and literally. Klein says that Beowulf tends to divide the world into binaries, and he “outlines two possible responses to violence—the one interiorized and associated with femininity

26 Beowulf lines 1477-9.
27 Beowulf lines 2149-51.
28 Albrecht Classen, Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse, ed. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge, (De Gruyter, Inc., 2011), 430.
and military loss (mourning), and the other exteriorized and associated with masculinity and military glory (seeking vengeance).” 29 One example of the first response to violence is Hildeburh’s response to the deaths of her son and brother. She embodies the archetype of the wailing Geatish woman, stricken with grief. She is described as a “sad lady,” 30 and when her son and brother are cremated during their joint funeral, “the lady [sings] / a sad lament.” 31 Hrothgar’s response to Æschere’s death is a more complex case. Hrothgar, a king, is emasculated in his reaction—he laments Æschere’s passing in a dramatic speech. Klein says that this response illustrates that Hrothgar is an “aged and impotent [man].” 32 Beowulf spurns Hrothgar’s response and tells him: “Sorrow not, wise one! It is always better / to avenge one’s friend than to mourn overmuch.” 33 Beowulf is embracing what he sees as a masculine persona and distancing himself from an emasculated, feminized affect.

The other binary that Beowulf embraces is that which divides military/political life from domestic life. Klein goes so far as to say that not only is domestic life feminine and military/political life masculine, but that one’s involvement in military activity and conquest actually defines one’s gender more than any biological sexual difference. 34 She says: “…sexual difference did not simply reside in power but in a highly specific form of power, namely, military power as it was manifested in the roles both men and women played in the constant aggression that was intrinsic to Anglo-Saxon culture, even during times of relative peace.” 35 Thus, a person in their

29 Klein, 114.
30 Beowulf line 1075.
31 Beowulf lines 1117-8.
32 Klein, 114.
33 Beowulf lines 1384-5.
34 Klein, 92.
35 Klein, 92.
role as a fighter or commander is defined as a “man,” while a person who takes on peace-weaving is defined as a “woman.” This idea is in dialogue with Judith Butler’s ideas of cultures inscribing the body with meaning, with much of that meaning relating to gender.36 A body performing a culturally significant role of fighting is understood as a man’s body, for example. Society both teaches these distinctions and reinforces them in practice. Women are defined by their domestic positions as mothers, but they also play a crucial role in the warring process by being cup-passers and peace-weavers between peoples. When Beowulf neglects to take a wife, he not only rejects entry into the domestic sphere of marriage, he makes a statement that a woman cannot be effective in her roles of being a cup-pass or a political peace-weaver through marriage.

Since Beowulf has no wife, he has to function in the political roles that would traditionally be filled by his queen. The main roles played by Anglo-Saxon queens in literature are that of the peace-weaver and the cup-pass in the mead hall. Women were often used as pawns in marriages between unfriendly tribes of people—a marriage of a royal woman from one group with a royal man from another is used as a means of weaving peace between two peoples. Hildeburh is one of these peace-weaving brides in Beowulf. Her marriage does not succeed in maintaining peace between her original peoples and those she married into, and both her brother and son are casualties of their conflict. Perhaps because of examples like this, Beowulf does not seem to believe that these peace-weaving marriages can be successful. When discussing Hrothgar’s daughter’s upcoming marriage with Ingeld of the Heathobards, Beowulf says: “But seldom anywhere / after the death of a prince does the deadly spear rest / for even a brief while, though the bride be good!”37 Stacy Klein may actually agree with Beowulf on this point. She cites J.M. Wallace-Hadrill

36 Butler, 13.
37 Beowulf lines 2029-31.
when she says that war and peace were seen not as completely separate concepts, but as two poles on the same spectrum—peace can only exist out of war. Klein goes on to say: “…Beowulf’s projected future for Freawaru is perhaps not all that surprising. In a society in which peace is only effected through war and war is defined as the rightful domain of men, weaving peace through female bodies would seem to be theoretically impossible.” Beowulf may not have faith in the ability of women to enact peace for this reason, and he appears, by his assumption of and success in the role of peace-weaver, to believe that he can do it better. Beowulf rules his kingdom for fifty years without any major conflicts, thereby succeeding in weaving peace among nations. Beowulf, a man, is able to do this because his male body belongs in the sphere of war, and peace being an aspect of war, only a male person can be successful in its upholding, even though the role traditionally falls on women.

Nonetheless, Beowulf’s success keeping peace complicates his gender identity. He performs a feminine task in spite of his male body. Being a peace-weaver is one of the defining roles a queen plays in her life, and by acting in the role of a woman, Beowulf is compromising his masculine gender. Judith Butler says that repeated behaviors that are coded as gendered construct and reinforce gender norms and identities. Using this logic, Beowulf is performing traditional femininity and therefore embodying a feminine gender. It is the disparity between his gendered actions and his sexual body that lead to conflict in his gender expression. Robert Morey takes this argument a few steps further in his article “Beowulf’s Androgynous Heroism.” Morey says that Beowulf was actually feminized as a peace-weaver at the beginning of the poem when he slays Grendel: “By cleansing Heorot of the curse of the race

---

38 Klein, 100.
39 Klein, 100.
of Grendel, Beowulf achieves a trusted friendship-bond between the Geats and the Danes similar to what would have been expected if he had been exchanged between the two nations as the commodified bride.”

He cites Beowulf’s deep bond with Hrothgar as evidence that their relationship is more promising for peace than any intertribal marriage. He says that “Beowulf serves in the structural role of a good bride, shuttled from one nation to another, laying a foundation for shared peace.”

But while Beowulf is ensuring peace between nations, he is doing so through violent acts of war, such as killing Grendel and his mother. Violence and battle are male territory, and Beowulf fighting with violence is him acting out his masculine gender. Even though there are points where this masculinity is compromised, such as when he is fighting Grendel’s mother and his sword fails, Beowulf succeeds in slaying Grendel and his mother, and because of this success in battle, it must be concluded that Beowulf is acting at least as a masculine peace-weaver, not a feminine peace-weaver. What truly does render Beowulf androgynous, however, is his performance as a peace-weaver later in his life when he is wifeless. Beowulf is able to maintain peace among nations for all fifty years of his tenure as King, and it is not “until / in the dark nights a dragon [begins] his reign, / who guarded his hoard in the high heaths / and the steep stone barrows” that that peace is broken. The awakening of the dragon is not a failure of Beowulf’s and does not interfere with his status as a successful peace-weaver or leader.

The other important role that queens play is that of the passer of the mead cup among the men in the mead hall. This action builds community and loyalty among the king’s retainers and is crucial for his success in battle. Wealththeow plays the role of the cup-passers in Hecrot during celebratory feasts.

41 Morey, 493.
42 *Beowulf* lines 2210-3.
During one of her speeches, she tells Beowulf to “take this cup,” and by doing this she is weaving peace between her husband, Hrothgar, and Beowulf, a man who is clearly an important ally to the King. Klein says that “by passing the cup first to her husband, and subsequently offering drinks to the rest of the men, the queen reiterated social hierarchies within the hall, thus staving off potential challenges to royal leadership.” Without a queen to fulfill this role, Beowulf has to pass the mead cup himself, and somehow he fails at this, because all except one of his men do not follow him and help him fight the dragon. Wiglaf, the only man to fight the dragon with Beowulf, scolds the other fighters for their cowardice:

Wiglaf spoke, said to his companions
many true words – he was mournful at heart –
'I remember the time that we took mead together,
when we made promises to our prince
in the beer-hall…

There is thus evidence that Beowulf has attempted to build comradery and loyalty among his men in the mead hall by sharing drinks. But this attempt has clearly failed. Unlike in his success as a peace-weaver, Beowulf fails to adequately practice the tradition of cup-passing. In this way, his attempted androgyny is unsuccessful. Assuming a woman could have been more successful as a cup-pass, as the poem suggests, Beowulf’s failure to take a wife to act as cup-pass indirectly leads to the downfall of his kingdom and the untimely end of his life.

Clare A. Lees asserts: “The warrior is the subject of the heroic literature, which emphasizes the male aristocratic groupings of kin and comitatus, and is notable for its reticence

43 *Beowulf* line 1169.
44 Klein, 115.
45 *Beowulf* lines 2631-5.
about matters of women, family, and sexuality.”⁴⁶ Beowulf never marries, therefore he never has children, thereby dismissing the importance of having a family. Putting the question of marrying for love aside, as it does not seem to be a prominent or even relevant factor to the marriages in Beowulf, not marrying or reproducing deprives Beowulf of political benefits and security for his empire. “When Beowulf dies without leaving a son to serve as his successor,” Klein says, “he sets in motion grave anxiety about the Geatish future.”⁴⁷ As he lies dying, he conveys to Wiglaf his regret for not having a son:

‘Now I should wish to give my war gear
to my son, if there had been such,
flesh of my flesh, if fate had granted me
any heir.’⁴⁸

Considering Beowulf is the king of the Geats, it is hard to imagine a reason why he would have been inhibited from choosing a wife, marrying, and having children. As the king, he would have had his choice of women. Perhaps it was not his choice to forego getting married and having children. Beowulf, after all, appears to be at least metaphorically impotent when his sword fails; it is only when he uses another man’s sword that he is able to slay Grendel’s mother. It is plausible, then, that Beowulf does not have children because he physically cannot or because his masculinity is so metaphorically damaged. Beowulf fails to become a parent. In this way, he fails to fulfill his role as a man to have an heir to take over after his death, and he fails in his assumption of women’s roles

---

⁴⁷ Klein, 116.
⁴⁸ Beowulf lines 2729-32.
by failing to become a mother, a defining element of womanhood.

Beowulf’s missing mother unfortunately cannot be explained. In a poem that has so many diverse mothers playing important roles and highlighting key themes, Beowulf’s mother’s absence is felt even more keenly. What is clear, though, is that the fact that Beowulf’s mother is missing is part of a larger pattern of disparities in representations of women in the poem. Some women go unnamed, some influence the futures of their kingdom, some wail and mourn the deaths of their loved ones, and some are monsters. All of these mothers’ performances as mothers, women, and queens raise important questions about women’s roles in society and what happens when women defy their gender expectations. For some, like Grendel’s mother and Modthryth, being violent causes one to be portrayed in the poem not only as unfeminine, but as monstrous. Beowulf also has bizarre gender transgressions that can be linked to his rejection of family and perhaps even physical abnormalities. When he does come in contact with mothers and women in the poem, his behavior changes. He appears to have an aversion to women, and by choosing not to get married, either because of a type of impotence or a lack of desire to have a female counterpart, he and his kingdom falter. His complicated relationship with women and gender carries the hints of discomfort with the situation regarding his missing mother. The underlying circumstances and explanations of that situation may remain mysterious, but it seems unquestionable that the absence of his mother has greatly affected the hero of Beowulf.

The absent mother is a trope throughout literature—from fairy tales to gothic novels. Cinderella, in the Grimm fairy tale, loses her biological mother, and the subsequent hardships she endures under the tyranny of her step-mother and -sisters can all be attributed to the initial loss of her mother. Gothic author Mary Shelley is well-known for exploring the effects that a missing or ineffective mother can have
on children. And it is widely discussed in psychological discourse that having an absent or problematic parent can greatly harm a child’s healthy development. It is a much more common occurrence in literature, however, for a child character to be missing a parent of the same sex, and this leads one to question the lack of exploration of the effects of a male child missing his female parent, for example. Lacking a parent of the opposite sex and gender would undoubtedly affect the child, and since parents are some of children’s primary authorities on gender, it would not be at all surprising that a child lacking an opposite-gendered parent would have a different or incomplete understanding of their own gender identity and performance. As Dockray-Miller says, one of a mother’s primary jobs in Beowulf is to teach her children, and Beowulf’s mother fails to educate her son about family, women’s roles in society, and gender. On a literary and a human level, it is not at all hard to believe that Beowulf’s missing mother influenced his psyche, his behavior, and his relationship with gender. Beowulf’s missing mother deserves critical attention because of the many ways in which Beowulf is altered by her absence.
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HOMOEROTIC VAMPIRISM IN “GOBLIN MARKET” AND CARMILLA

Rebecca Little

Stories of vampirism have always been inherently erotic. The image of a mysterious, dark and brooding figure preying on youthful innocence captivates its audience, seducing them into stories about the alluring creatures whose beauty is enticing and otherworldly. Vampires have also been linked to sexual perversions and deviance, such as homosexuality. This idea of vampires has persisted for over a century, with many tracing the origins of the popular vampire to “The Vampyre” (1816) by John William Polidori. A slew of famous vampire works in the Victorian era followed, such as Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu’s novella Carmilla (1872) and Bram Stoker’s Dracula (1897). Even more prominent than literal vampirism was the inclusion of figurative vampirism, such as in the long poem “Goblin Market” (1862) coincidentally written by Polidori’s niece, Christina Georgina Rossetti. In both cases, vampirism serves as a metaphor for homosexual desire, imbuing the texts with a monstrous tone. Not only that, but many of these relationships also turned out to be incestuous. Both “Goblin Market” and Carmilla are known for their incestuous, homosexual undertones, and the literal and figurative vampirism employed only serve to enhance these further; this shift from figurative to literal coincides with changes to the naming and regulation of homosexuality in Victorian society, as described by Foucault in The History of Sexuality.

Lizzie and Laura from “Goblin Market” serve as an example for homoerotic vampirism despite not being literal vampires or being in an open homosexual relationship. The
text makes it clear that Laura and Lizzie have more than a typical sister relationship, and the sexual language Rossetti uses only furthers this conclusion. “Goblin Market” is a tale decrying heterosexual desire and eating “the forbidden fruit.” However, it takes a different approach to the homosexual. Lizzie and Laura live together by themselves, perfectly domestic in every way. When Laura hears the cries of the goblins selling their luscious fruit, she indulges and consumes some after her sister warns against it. She drinks their liquids in a very erotic manner after using a lock of her hair to pay, a metaphor for her virginity. She:

suck’d their fruit globes fair or red:
Sweeter than honey from the rock,
Stronger than man-rejoicing wine,
Clearer than water flow’d that juice;
She never tasted such before,
How should it cloy with length of use?
She suck’d and suck’d and suck’d the more
Fruits which that unknown orchard bore;
She sucked until her lips were sore;¹

The scene in question portrays Laura as a ravenous creature akin to a vampire, sucking the juice from the fruits. The liquid starts as sweet honey, before changing to an intoxicating wine before finally transforming into water, or basic sustenance Laura needs to survive. She begins as curious, to riding a high, to addicted to the substance. Rossetti builds on the mythos Polidori established, and “the implications of pleasure, pain, sucking and enervation suggest some sort of

vampirism, however muted and altered.” By consuming the fluids, Laura has transformed into a vampire.

She has also become impure in the process, tasting the forbidden fruit and gaining heterosexual awareness. Like Adam and Eve, she receives knowledge from the fruit she ingests, if only of a more bodily variety. Having tasted the fruit, and losing her purity in the process, she longs for it. However, now that Laura has tasted the produce, the goblins are no longer interested in selling her their wares, and she can no longer hear their call, while Lizzie still can. The goblins want nothing to do with the girl whose virtue they sullied, which seemingly warns against heterosexual premarital sex. Female sexual desirability is expendable while male sexual desirability is durable and increasing in power with activity. Laura slowly wastes away, the fruit having sapped her of her youth and innocence. Lizzie is able to do nothing but look on in horror as her beloved sister deteriorates.

Lizzie’s refusal to participate in heterosexual activity by rejecting the goblins’ fruits marks the majority of the next passage. Lizzie decides to get more fruit from the goblins to heal her sister, without partaking in any herself. While the fruits are luscious and tempting, the goblin men themselves are decidedly less so. John H. Flannigan notes, “the only men in the poem are goblins who appear in various animal shapes, from cats to wombats, and who coo like doves.” These animals are associated with the phallus, and they are meant to be revolting to both Lizzie and the reader. The goblins are said to be “leering” at each other at one point, creating the image of repulsive lustfulness (Rossetti l. 93), and “their looks were evil” (Rossetti l. 397). Their animalistic nature is revolting and

4 Morill, “Twilight is not Good for Maidens,” 5.
uncivilized. When the goblins invite Lizzie to have some of the fruit, she replies, “Thank you, but one waits/ at home alone for me” (Rossetti l. 383-384), obviously referring to her sister. She is not interested in heterosexual activity, and she desires to return to her sister. The goblins then try to force her to eat the produce, attempting to open her mouth, but she stands resolute. They attack her in a scene resembling a sexual assault:

Though the goblins cuff’d and caught her,
Coax’d and fought her,
Bullied and besought her,
Scratch’d her, pinch’d her black as ink,
Kick’d and knock’d her,
Maul’d and mock’d her, (Rossetti 424-429)

The above scene occurs as the goblins are trying to shove their liquids down her throat, a reference to semen. Lizzie never gives in and finally they abandon their “fruitless” endeavor. She stumbles home, calling to Laura:

“Did you miss me?
Come and kiss me.
Never mind my bruises,
Hug me, kiss me, suck my juices
Squeez’d from goblin fruits for you,
Goblin pulp and goblin dew.
Eat me, drink me, love me;
Laura, make much of me;” (Rossetti l. 465-472)

Lizzie begs Laura to kiss her and drink her nectars, similar to a vampire sucking blood. Vampires suck the life force from the innocent youth in order to maintain their own youthful vitality so that they never age. Laura’s loss of the goblin fruits has aged her beyond her years, making her hair turn gray and her body become less vital, which she can only gain back if she sucks the juice off of Lizzie’s body. There is also “the idea of the vampire as a specter of the dead that feeds
upon its own family.”⁵ Lizzie asks Laura to eat her and drink her and love her, tying consumption with desire and sexuality, as well as family. This merges sexuality with nurture and sustenance, such as a mother breastfeeding, which ties breasts and sexuality with nourishment. Laura later, “Kissed and kissed her with a hungry mouth” (Rossetti l. 492). She is consuming the liquid off the skin of her sister, shifting a familial relationship into that of a sexual nature. Sucking, a word commonly associated with the vampire myth, is used heavily throughout the story, the juice being used as a substitute for blood, as it is the “blood” of the fruit.⁶ Laura regains her youth after sucking the blood off of her sister’s body, a vampire feeding off of her lover.

Consumption of the juices is eroticized, but incorporation of the nutrients is curative. In Victorian society, there was a correlation between love and digestion, with phrenologist Orson Squire Fowler writing, “All can eat several times more, and digest it, too, when in Love than when not.”⁷ Love supposedly made food taste better and cured digestive illnesses. Women especially were supposed to prepare food for their family with love. This transfers to Lizzie’s gathering of the fruit for Laura. The way Laura eats the fruit is suggestive, and it ties emotional and erotic desire to consumption and sustenance. Theoretically, a vampire is someone who feeds off the life others, which is exactly what Laura does where she sucks the pulp off of Lizzie’s body. She is then able to digest
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the fruit. The fruit Lizzie offers Laura through love cures her of her illness.

However, the fruit does not taste as it once did. “It was wormwood on her tongue” (Rossetti l. 494). As the fruit is equivalent to heterosexuality, Laura is unable to stomach the thought of it any longer. Laura can no longer participate in heterosexual desire. What once was delicious and so alluring is now vile and disgusting. She “loathed the feast” (Rosetti l. 495) but continues to gorge herself anyways, despite not enjoying it at all. The fruit not only serves as a metaphor for heterosexual relations, but also for liquids, such as semen. After this consumption, Laura heals and she and Lizzie stay living together until they are ready to partake in heterosexual society by marrying and having children, her vampirism having been cured. Even after marrying, heterosexuality is healthy and desirable within the context of matrimony, production of children, and maintenance of family networks. Laura and Lizzie are still able to maintain their relationship after marriage and children; as their performative heteronormativity being fulfilled, their aberrant sexuality is overlooked. The goblin men separate Lizzie and Laura; marriage and children would presumably knit them closer together in some ways as they share experiences of motherhood and their children develop bonds of their own.

This may speak to the idea of compulsory heterosexuality and feeling the need to pretend one is heterosexual by not acknowledging their private homosexual activities. In the seventeenth century, before the Victorian era, homosexuality was virtually commonplace, but discussion surrounding it was not. Historiographer and philosopher Michel Foucault argues that in the prior era, “Sexual practices had little need of secrecy; words were said without undue reticence, and things were done without too much concealment; one had a tolerant
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familiarity with the illicit.”¹⁹ However, the Victorians began to regulate sexuality by labelling it in medical as well as religious contexts and forbidding anything other than the reproductive heterosexual relationship. Homosexuals had previously not been labelled, instead just participating in acts of sodomy. The homosexual label became its own identity, transforming the aberrant sexuality into a deviant person, “less as a habitual sin than as a singular nature.”¹⁰ Laura and Lizzie never label their relationship and are comfortable with that as it does not consume their identities. They are later able to participate in heterosexual society with no one being the wiser. Yet the same cannot be said of those in *Carmilla*.

*Carmilla*, written nearly 15 years after “Goblin Market,” demonstrates a shift in attitudes about homosexuality that took place in the mid-nineteenth century. Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu’s *Carmilla* begins with another character named Laura, this time the daughter of a widowed nobleman. Laura’s life changes when Carmilla is introduced by way of a carriage accident; her father agrees to let Carmilla stay with them. Laura is conscious of “a love growing into adoration, and also of abhorrence” (Le Fanu 29) for Carmilla. She both admires and reviles Carmilla, although she is not sure why she feels the latter. This is later made clear upon the reveal of Carmilla’s vampirism, but Laura becomes uncomfortable even before then because of Carmilla’s intensely intimate actions, saying, “It was like the ardour of a lover; it embarrassed me; it was hateful yet overpowering” (Le Fanu 30). Laura finds this kind of love between two women to be unnatural. Carmilla is a monster because she is queer; her vampirism corresponds with increasing regulation of sexuality occurring within the Victorian age. Laura recognizes the taboo of homosexuality without
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giving it a name, although she still finds herself with a homo-
sexual attraction. Carmilla goes on to say, “You are mine, you
shall be mine, you and I are one forever” (Le Fanu 30). She
constantly kisses and hugs Laura, holding her hands or lean-
ing against her. When Laura asks her if she’s ever been in love,
 presumedly with a man, Carmilla only replies with, “I have
been in love with no one, and never shall unless it is with you”
(Le Fanu 40). She is never ashamed of her homoerotic desire,
which only adds to her monstrousness, especially in the Vic-
torian era. It is the absence of shame about sexuality – not only
homoerotic attraction, but female sexual desire in general –
that makes Carmilla monstrous. Victorian women were al-
ways expected to be somewhat embarrassed by sexual desire,
if not to condemn it outright, even within the sanctioned arena
of heterosexual marriage. Being utterly unashamed of her de-
sire for another woman, and for having desire in the first place
is what makes Carmilla a monster rather than only her literal
vampirism. Even a fallen woman in the Victorian era, even a
so-called “invert,” was expected to be self-conscious about her
non-normative behavior, as Amy Leal argues, “Carmilla’s pas-
11
sion for Laura not only threatens her life, but also the power
structure of Victorian society.”

Laura’s initial impulse to Carmilla’s behavior is to ask
if they were related, trying to justify the familiarity with which
Carmilla treats her. Carmilla later reveals they are related
through Laura’s mother’s family, the Karnsteins, of which
there are supposedly none left to bear the name, after Laura
finds a picture bearing Carmilla’s likeness under the name of
Laura’s ancestor, Mircalla. In a twist of sorts, Carmilla is then
discovered to have been Mircalla the whole time, an immortal
vampire. Laura is Mircalla’s descendant, with whom she has
attempted to engage in an incestuous homosexual relationship,
and “By having Carmilla seduce only her own maternal
Karnstein descendants, Le Fanu makes vampirism, incest, and

11 Leal, “Unnameable Desires in Le Fanu’s Carmilla,” 38.
homosexuality resonate metaphorically as well as onomastically in his text: each involve a lusting for one's own kind.”¹² Carmilla attempts to turn two of her descendants, Laura and Bertha. Neither attempt succeeds. She forms a relationship with Laura, gaining her admiration, before she transforms and bites Laura in the breast and the neck, two body parts heavily associated with sex. The bites are sensual in nature, “as if a hand was drawn softly along my cheek and neck. Sometimes it was as if warm lips kissed me, and longer and longer and more lovingly as they reached my throat, but there the caress fixed itself” (Le Fanu 51-52). Carmilla’s wish to have a beloved companion in her undead state is expressed most in her remark to Laura: “But to die as lovers may – to die together, so that they may live together” (Le Fanu 37). In the end of the story, when Carmilla is stabbed in the heart with a stake, the violent reassertion of patriarchal order is set in place with her death. The stake is phallic shaped and confirms heterosexuality as the dominant and morally correct sexuality. However, even after Carmilla’s demise, Laura is unable to forget her, saying, “and to this hour the image of Carmilla returns to memory with ambiguous alternations--sometimes the playful, languid, beautiful girl; sometimes the writhing fiend I saw in the ruined church; and often from a reverie I have started, fancying I heard the light step of Carmilla at the drawing room” (Le Fanu 69), illustrating the lingering and haunting effect Carmilla had on her psyche and sexuality.

“Goblin Market” and *Carmilla* are known for their homoerotic and incestuous undertones, and both the literal and figurative vampirism used only develop these further; this shift from metaphorical to literal coincides with changes to the labeling and control of homosexuality in Victorian society, as described by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality*. Both of these works show the move of homosexuality towards being

¹² Ibid., 38-39.
regarded as a societal taboo as Victorian culture placed guidelines on acceptable sexualities, and there is the restoration of traditional order. However, “Goblin Market” accomplishes this through nurturing in Lizzie’s nourishing Laura back to health, and *Carmilla* through violence in Carmilla’s death. The vampirism served as a symbol of the abnormal and unacceptable; anyone who partook in sodomy was subsequently branded with the connotation of the monstrous and unnatural.

It is interesting to note that Rossetti, a female author, takes a gentler and more maternal approach in a text centered exclusively around women, while Le Fanu takes a more “bloody” approach to return traditional heterosexuality in a text not exclusively focused on females but also men. This shift mirrors the one between the two time periods. These literary works not only document, but may have also contributed to these changes in attitude.
Works Cited


A REAPPROPRIATION OF HEGEL:
IS SITT'LICHKEIT ALL IT’S
CRACKED UP TO BE?

Thomas Moore

All too often, Hegel is falsely characterized. For some, he is precisely what his philosophical adversary Arthur Schopenhauer said: a “shallow, witless charlatan” whose “wretched sophisms” and “senseless twaddle of proofs” are the pinnacle of “sham philosophy.”¹ For others, he is the predecessor to totalitarianism, the forerunner of German fascism, who was able to not only anticipate, but justify state oppression of critics and the underprivileged.² Yet despite these charges, Georg F. W. Hegel is still taken seriously by academia today; his great texts, still studied and discussed, frequently enter into dialogue with the deliberations over state-building today. Crucial to understanding both his perplexity and his appeal is the political philosophy he articulates in his 1821 work Elements of the Philosophy of Right, which attempts to lay the groundwork for a conception of an ethical life that allows people within the State to find freedom and liberation in a way that avoids hindering others, and elevates peoples’ status in an objective, rational way. In

this paper, I will examine Hegel’s political thought in an effort to vindicate him from false accusations and provide a better frame for engagement with his work.

Rooted in an incomplete understanding and of his formulation of the state, the charge that Hegel’s political thought is totalitarian is false; nevertheless, as his words may strike contemporary readers as perplexing — or outright alarming — an exploration of his thought is necessary to vindicate him. In his 1821 work, *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, Hegel asserts the following:

Similarly, in the state, as the objectivity of the concept of reason, legal responsibility [*die gerichtliche Zurechnung*] must not stop at what the individual considers to be in conformity with his reason or otherwise, or at his subjective insight into rightness or wrongness, good or evil, or at what he may require in order to satisfy his conviction.3

For Hegel, since the state is objective form of the concept of reason, the legal responsibility it has to its citizens is not contingent on what certain individuals within society see as reasonable. If the state truly is reason made manifest, those who object to the rational laws set forth by the state are acting irrationally. To some, this model appears to imply that social critics and reformers are irrational and should be regarded as irrelevant, as they are failing to live up to moral living.

A challenging question can be raised here: if critics of the state are failing to live up to proper moral living, what should we make of reformers like Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi? On this model, they seem to be an obstacle to society’s well-being. Should we think Hegel is opposed to them? Or, is he able to countenance reformers’ immanent critique of the state they inhabit? In this paper, I will
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argue that Hegel can support social critiques and that Sittlichkeit — his conception of ethical life — actually requires social reformers to promote moral progress and uphold the welfare of society. Ideally, I will offer a way to salvage Hegel’s thought from being falsely appropriated by totalitarian thinkers, and demonstrate how Hegel is more welcoming to the idea of social reform as a rational action — and moral duty — than the purely duty-based slavishness to the state with which he is often associated.

I shall advance my argument in steps. First, I shall examine what Hegel’s view appears to be and explain the basic concepts necessary to understanding his political philosophy with regards to state building and social responsibility. In particular, this section will show how Hegel resolves concepts that typically seem in tension with one another, revealing them to be complementary, rather than antithetical. Next, I will propose the endeavors and critiques of great moral exemplars as challenges to framing Hegel as a social justice advocate. Following that, I shall demonstrate how Hegel actually does not disregard social reformers as irrational, irrelevant beings, but instead requires them for developing the state to its full potential. Penultimately, I shall consider objections to my defense of Hegel. Finally, I shall respond to those objections and conclude that people who hold social reformers in high esteem can take Hegel and Sittlichkeit seriously, and regard his political thought as a route to objective freedom that supports social justice reforms.

Hegel’s apparent view in Philosophy of Right is that dissidents and social reformers are irrational beings who are not at home in their communities because they do not act in accordance with the standards of their state. Vindicating Hegel of this charge — and making sense of his thought in general — requires a proper examination of what he means by Sittlichkeit. Sittlichkeit is essentially the idea that each respective person is who he/she is only because of the society that created him/her and which preserves and fosters his/her
identity. Hegel posits that all people are not purely individual, autonomous beings. Man is a political animal; always situated in a community, our identities are constituted by the state we are born into. Each state has history and tradition behind it; the cultural aspects and societal norms of our society shape its people as they develop. As Hegel puts it, “Since the determinations of ethics constitute the concept of freedom, they are the substantiality or universal essence of individuals, who are related to them merely as accidents. Whether the individual exists or not is a matter of indifference to objective ethical life.” Consequently, Hegel argues that we find individual contentment and freedom when we conform to societal standards.

Since the state we are born into is what gives us our identity, Hegel proposes that we are forever indebted to the state; accordingly, the state deserves some gratitude. By fulfilling our obligations, both to our fellow-citizens and the state that protects us, we manifest two of life’s most important tasks: building identity through others and giving meaning to our existence. “All these substantial determinations,” Hegel writes, “are duties which are binding on the will of the individual, as subjective and inherently undetermined — or
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determined in a particular way — is distinct from them and consequently stands in a relationship to them as his own substantial being.”¹¹ Without duties to fulfill, without rational norms to uphold, without others to serve and help, people stand not only unfulfilled, but undetermined; one’s being is wrapped up in others who give it meaning, and it is through service that we build relationships and cultivate purpose. Because we owe the state payment for it granting us life and the ability to shape our identity, we must necessarily conform with its norms.¹² Since the norms that have been actualized are rational (for they are actual), for a person in a state not to conform with that society’s standards is to act irrationally.¹³

For Hegel, complete freedom is found by actualizing one’s individuality through the other, which is in turn actualized by fulfilling the objective standards posited by the rational state which constitutes him/her.¹⁴ “The right of individuals to their subjective determination to freedom,” he writes, “is fulfilled insofar as they belong to ethical actuality.”¹⁵ On this understanding, freedom is not the libertarian ability to do as one pleases: to be objective, freedom and independence must have rational meaning. Hegel points out that if you act irrationally or egotistically, you are not free — you are chained, either to the shadow cast by ignorance that veils your mind, the selfish passions of your heart, or the appetitive desires of your gut.¹⁶ For instance, if you choose to smoke cigarettes but then become addicted, you are not actually free to choose if you want to smoke them —
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you are simply fettered to the nicotine, and must satisfy your body’s chemical cravings.

Yet bodily desires are not the only ways individual freedom is lost to subjectivity: decisions that seem rational but are bound up with arbitrary whims also result in bondage. For example, people who conform to social norms to be accepted are arbitrarily dependent on others for self-worth; they miss the mark of objective social independence. Thus, following arbitrary subjective standards to actualize your interests is actually denying your individuality, and by extension, your freedom. The true way to actualize your freedom and act independently is to act in accordance with rational standards that have been actualized by the rational state which constitutes you. Although to some duty appears to restrict our natural desires, Hegel concludes that “in duty the individual finds his liberation . . . from mere natural impulse . . . In duty the individual acquires his substantive freedom.”

As pointed out by the scholar Tanja Stahler, the world we are born into predates us and acts as a “meaningful context...determined by senses, atmospheres, and ideals.” Illustrating this fact, British philosopher F. H. Bradley observes that as a child grows up in the world, he does not think of himself as a separate entity; he develops with the world around him, and his identity matures as develops through his friendships, relationships, interests, and experiences. The language he learns to communicate with his community has been passed down by generations of ancestors, and the definitions express the same sentiments and ideas that his ancestors posited. His/her soul feels emotion when the symbols of his/her culture prompt it. Society thus makes its members feel that their identity is determined by

17 Hegel, Elements of the Philosophy of Right, 192.
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serving in that community. Noted scholar Peter Singer provides a helpful example of what the state and society at large thus require of its members. A member of a community is like a body’s limbs: the limbs act in accordance with what the brain commands. The brain is responding to the heart which sustains it. Arms and legs do not have brains in themselves and cannot decide for themselves what they desire. The limbs’ serve the stomach in various ways, and in turn the stomach keeps the heart pumping and brain rationalizing.20

Since it is the state we are born into that constitutes our identity and existence, the standards and laws of the state are the only ways we can truly express our individuality. If the state is rational, we can only be rational beings if we act in accordance with the standards of the state. Thus, the laws of the state are actually a form of freedom. We would not be who we are without the spirit of the rational state; accordingly, to act contrary to that is to act erroneously or subjectively. As Hegel articulates,

The fact that the ethical sphere is the system of these determinations of the Idea constitutes its rationality. In this way, the ethical sphere is freedom...whose moments...govern the lives of individuals. In these individuals — who are accidental to them — these powers have their representation [Vorstellung], phenomenal shape [erscheinende Gestalt], and actuality.21

Sittlichkeit describes how a citizen can know his/her duties because social existence constitutes and determines right behavior.22 These duties will be rational when they are “actual” and not merely “abstract.” Effectively, one can only

21 Hegel, Elements of the Philosophy of Right, 190.
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act freely when he/she is totally sure he/she is acting rationally: in other words, acting in accordance with the values set by the rational state.\textsuperscript{23} For Hegel, “Ethical life is the Idea of Freedom as the living good which has its knowledge and volition in self-consciousness, and its actuality through self-conscious action.” \textsuperscript{24} The individual’s sureness demands justification by the rational state, which in turn requires the subjective will of the individual to be in tune with it. Thus, the rational state needs to provide objective freedom that the self-conscious subject can understand what is right and voluntarily approve of it. \textsuperscript{25} Hegel sees individual satisfaction and freedom unified when they conform to the “social ethos of an organic community.”\textsuperscript{26}

However, if going against the standards set by the rational state or criticizing the ruling regime is acting irrationally, how are we to make sense of social critics and reformers through a Hegelian lens? Dissidents like Aleksander Solzhenitsyn and activists like Rev. King seem problematic, nay, even an \textit{obstacle} on Hegel’s model. To extend Singer’s analogy, it seems that humanitarian advocates like Mahatma Gandhi and Frederick Douglass are actually biting the hand that feeds them by acting in their own self-interest. In the same vein, a number of states throughout history have clearly suppressed freedom on grounds they claimed to be “rational.” The United States denied blacks the right to vote in 1960 in “the interest of the nation as a whole.”\textsuperscript{27} The Soviet Union denied people basic health care and living necessities “in the
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interest of the community.” 28 None of these significant discriminatory legislative acts executed by states — all executed in the name of the common good — help Hegel’s case. If we approach the historical reality with Hegel’s description of the rational state, it seems easy to justify actions taken by governments that actually deny human dignity.

Given such events, it is no wonder that Rev. King said in his I Have A Dream speech, “One hundred years later the life of the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land...there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights.”29 In this speech, King not only admits that his people do not feel “at home” in their society, but advocates for political criticism for an indefinite time period. But might Hegel view these lines as damning evidence of Rev. King obstructing the strength of the rational state?

Hegel lays out the foundations for the possibility of immanent critique in the requirements he sets for political structures to be rational. Political structures are only rational when they allow for three things: individuals must be able to pursue their interests, feel at home within their communities, and freely express their rational existence. Additionally, a rational state must possess certain qualities: it must have laws and institutions that secure basic life necessities, and its subjects must be able to voluntarily support the laws and understand the reasoning behind them.30

For a state to be rational, it must have laws that allow individuals to pursue their interests.31 Recall Singer's original body analogy. One’s legs may not guide his/her brain, but both

30 Hegel, Elements of the Philosophy of Right, 221.
31 Ibid, 77.
need each other. Without the brain, the legs will die off, for they will have no direction, and thus no function to perform. In a hostile environment, without legs, the brain could die. The brain does not simply ignore the pain its nervous system feels when a leg is injured; rather, the pain signals the brain that something must be done to protect the leg from danger. It is a reciprocal relationship.

Building off that analogy, I contend that the government actually needs to hear the voices of certain reformers because they can warn the government of impending danger, and allow the government to advance forward in society. Without the peaceful protests of Rev. King, America may not have benefited from African-American brain trusts like the economist Thomas Sowell, the physicist Neil DeGrasse Tyson, and the Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall. Additionally, such brain trusts might want to support the U.S. because, in some ways, it made possible their successes: by providing quality educational access, developing their identities through relationships they had, and giving them meaning through virtuous service, the country, for all its faults, ultimately allowed them to flourish. Following that, if society does not have laws in place that allow for individuals to freely pursue their interests without hindrance, it will not progress, as it will not meet the output standards it is capable of. By increasing suffrage universally, more groups are able to express their interests, which should eventually allow the groups to fulfill duties and make contributions to the state at maximum capacity.

Thus, we can now see that all the requirements Hegel sets forth for a state to be rational actually complement each other: Hegel is not concerned with freedom to do as one arbitrarily chooses; he is concerned with freedom to act rationally in a way that actualizes your freedom as an

---

individual.\textsuperscript{33} Subjects in a state must be able to pursue the interests that are rational to have so that they can express their rational existence, which for Hegel is living freely.\textsuperscript{34} It is through the state that one develops an identity, one must further pay debt to the State by serving it and understanding that whatever duty they are voluntarily fulfilling for the State under its laws are reasonable.\textsuperscript{35} But for citizens to perform their civic duties, they must have health-care access, quality living conditions, and a route to success unhindered by political discrimination. Hence, Rev. King proclaims, “We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and hotels of the cities! We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro’s basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one.”\textsuperscript{36} In the previous quotations is King’s contention that his people \textit{will} be satisfied once they have fair lodging and equal access to opportunities. Therefore, if the United States does manage to genuinely secure those standards for the disenfranchised, the disenfranchised will naturally understand the laws as rational.

But for all of this to occur, the state must first meet all the requirements. Since in the United States not everyone has equal access to health care benefits, employment and educational opportunities, or even legislative representation, the state is not rational in a Hegelian sense of the term. As a result, immanent critique by social reformers are actually \textit{required} for the state to progress at all. Therefore, while Hegel’s totally rational state may not need immanent critique, no state is rational until it has fulfilled its obligations to the society that sustains it.\textsuperscript{37} In other words, until the rational state has reached its ultimate goal, it’s \textit{telos}, it must openly

\textsuperscript{33} Hegel, \textit{Elements of the Philosophy of Right}, 41.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid, 77.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 191.
\textsuperscript{36} King, Martin L., Jr. “I Have a Dream.” Speech, 3.
\textsuperscript{37} Hegel, \textit{Elements of the Philosophy of Right}, 272.
encourage immanent critique. The end of history is only reached when all the requirements have been totally fulfilled.\textsuperscript{38}

As such, I contend that social reformers are not actually irrational according to Hegel, but rational beings who progress the state, and that their social reform is actually the fulfillment of the duty each subject — both the passive citizen and active reformer — has to its community. This is precisely why Rev. King declares proudly, “The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to distrust all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny.”\textsuperscript{39}

However, Schopenhauer returns to object to my response: when political theories are based on “constructive histories, guided by a shallow optimism” the governments they create “always ultimately end in a comfortable, substantial, fat” degree of success for the regime, but whose moral rectitude “remains essentially unaltered.”\textsuperscript{40} In these systems, the only form of social perfection is “intellectual perfection” because of the philosophers that uphold the standards of the immoral regime; no matter how abhorrent, their philosophies justify the regime’s oppressive structures with abstract concepts.\textsuperscript{41} The disgruntled lecturer raises a difficult challenge: could it be the case that Hegel’s logic is simply a totalitarian system built on a consistent ideological lie that coerces people into submission to the demands of the state?

Though one can draw parallels, appropriating Hegel’s system as totalitarian would be an oversimplification; his thought avoids the charge of being totalitarian and prohibiting

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid, 370.
\textsuperscript{39} King, Martin L., Jr. "I Have a Dream." Speech, 3.
\textsuperscript{40} Schopenhauer, Arthur. \textit{The World as Will and Representation}, 443.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
individual freedom because the state’s rationality is dependent on all its citizens feeling at home inside the state. Hegel realizes that freedom to do as one pleases often ends in slavery.\textsuperscript{42} If one chooses to do something arbitrarily, there is no rational justification behind it; one would simply be a slave to his/her ego, instinct, or appetitive desires. But, as distinguished scholar Pinkard points out, Hegel desires us to be free from coercion by other humans as well, and not just by natural desires and circumstances.\textsuperscript{45} An und für sich, In-and-for-itself, requires being at home with oneself by finding itself in the other.\textsuperscript{44} Self-awareness can only be achieved if one recognizes other selves to make it aware: the state can only reach self-awareness by allowing all the members of its body to be free from coercion, which requires feeling at home in their society.

Further, as Hegel views freedom as objective, it can only be available to people when they act rationally according to universal principles.\textsuperscript{45} In a communist society, peoples’ choices only work for the good of the state — but since a state’s justification for existence is supposed to be predicated upon rationality, it would not even exist in the rational sense if people were simply coerced into obeying its commands.\textsuperscript{46} Like the body, a state is not complete without its parts: if some people are being tortured for the state to continue, the state is not truly rationally justified, as its people are not able to actualize freedom or feel “at home” within the state.\textsuperscript{47} If the majority in society disregards the dignity of certain members of society, the State has not developed to its potential.

\textsuperscript{42} Hegel, \textit{Elements of the Philosophy of Right}, 356.
\textsuperscript{43} Pinkard, Terry. \textit{Hegel’s Phenomenology: The Sociality of Reason}, 53.
\textsuperscript{44} Hegel, \textit{Elements of the Philosophy of Right}, 356.
\textsuperscript{45} Pinkard, Terry. \textit{Hegel’s Phenomenology: The Sociality of Reason}, 53.
\textsuperscript{46} Hegel, \textit{Elements of the Philosophy of Right}, 276.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 67.
Accordingly, Rev. King proclaims, “We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their adulthood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating, ‘For White Only.’”

Ultimately, I contend that Hegel does not deny the dignity of the disenfranchised and disregard the criticisms of social reformers like Rev. King and Solzhenitsyn, and that Sittlichkeit is relevant to contemporary society. It is precisely the opposite: Hegel acts as a call to action. In our society, we cannot realize our own freedom if there are members of society who are marginally oppressed. Without one of our vital organs, we cannot function properly to survive. I conclude that in reality, Hegel’s work truly endorses answering King’s call in I Have A Dream:

Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God’s children...They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. We cannot turn back...And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. With this faith we will be able to work together...knowing that we will be free one day. When we allow freedom to ring, we...will be able to join hands and sing…”Free at last, Free at last, thank God a-mighty, We are free at last.”

48 King, Martin L., Jr. "I Have a Dream." Speech, 3.
49 Ibid, 2-6.
Works Cited

Books:


**Articles and Journals:**


**Speeches and Addresses:**


**Websites:**

“THE WORLD IS GOD’S GREAT BOOK IN FOLIO”: PRODIGY REPORTS IN ENGLAND 1638-1643

Xinxin Anna Zhang

“If we repent, God will repent of the evil…. If we repent not, God will repent of the good.” This was one of the closing remarks of a sermon given to the House of Commons by Edmund Calamy on December 22, 1641. In the sermon, Calamy was greatly concerned with the prospect of England as a nation, namely her ruin and repair in light of Jeremiah 18:7-10. God was able to pluck up and destroy an ungodly nation, but before doing so, He would first give warnings: “…he hangs out his white Flag of mercy, before his red Flag of utter defiance; first he shoots off his warning Peeces, before his murdering Peeces.” Forewarnings of various kinds would be God’s “white flags of mercy,” after which He would expect men’s proper repentance. A nation turning away from evil would please God, and therefore procure national blessings so

1 L. Brinkmair, The Warnings of German by Wonderfull Signes (London: Printed by John Norton, for John Rothwell, and are to be sold at the Sunne in Pauls Church-yard, 1638), §2.
2 Edmund Calamy, Englands Looking-Glasse, Presented in a Sermon, Preached before the Honorable House of Commons, at their Solemne Fast, December 22, 1641 (London: Printed by I. Raworth, for Chr. Meredith, and are to be sold at the Crane in Pauls-Church-yard, 1642), 3, 57. [In this paper, original spellings are kept for all primary-source quotations].
3 Ibid., 3-22. As a good Puritan preacher, Calamy divided his sermon into numerous points and subpoints. His point on God’s flags came from doctrines one and two of the sermon.
that He would build and plant her. Her oblivious handling of His mercies, however, would lead to her ruin.\(^4\)

Throughout the sermon, Calamy shed light on God’s two natures—transcendence and immanence. God’s supremacy was illustrated in His “independent and illimited Prerogative over all Kingdoms and Nations” and His “absolute Right to govern over His creatures.”\(^5\) His transcendence enabled Him to execute His mercy and/or judgment immanently, reflected by the many action verbs Calamy used in depicting God at work. Men’s belief in these two attributes allowed them to view God as the Author of every occurrence in their lives and to endow meaning to each event, especially to the anxiety-inducing ones that England was experiencing at the time of this sermon.

The end of King Charles’ (r.1625-1649) third Parliament (March 1629) witnessed the unpleasant parting between King and Parliament. Charles claimed to personally rule by his royal prerogatives. During this time, the people’s voices were suppressed by Parliament not being convened and Reformed doctrines compromised in the Church of England. Puritans’ condition exacerbated as William Laud—a representative of English Arminianism—became the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and introduced anti-Puritan church reforms. Harsh punishments befell resistant Puritans, such as William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton. Outside of England, in 1636-7, Laud imposed episcopal supremacy on the Scottish Presbyterian kirk, demanding usage of the Canons and the Book of Common Prayer, which led to two Scottish Bishops’ Wars 1639-40. Thus, after over a decade without Parliament, the 1640s began with fiercely escalating political and religious tensions between King and Parliament.\(^6\)

\(^4\) Ibid., 22-62. Doctrines three and four of the sermon.
\(^5\) Ibid., 3-4.
\(^6\) For a concise and precise account of the escalated conflicts during Charles’ Personal Rule without Parliament (1629-40), see Mark
In light of these intensified incidents and on the eve of Charles’ departure from London due to popular support of Parliamentarian critiques, the Puritan Calamy delivered this sermon to demonstrate God’s active involvement in English affairs. The belief in God’s divine guidance in human affairs—both triumphant and catastrophic—was known as Providentialism. As Calamy delineated, God could guide England using “eight wayes.” In the course of analyzing printed pamphlets from this period, I have been able to augment Calamy’s eight ways with a ninth: namely, God speaking to England through prodigies, or supernatural occurrences, whose appearances dominated Wars of the Three Kingdoms (1638-1651), which included the English Civil War beginning in 1642.

A recent thorough study on England’s Providentialism, Alexandra Walsham’s Providence in Early Modern England, analyzes the significant impact that Providentialism had left in the English society between roughly 1580-1640. Walsham depicts crucial moments of God at work in the world to argue that Providentialism functioned as a “cultural cement” that forged sentiments of “collective Protestant consciousness” and “anti-Catholic and patriotic feelings” during national crises. However, as Walsham moves beyond the chief

---

7 Ibid., 13-19. The eight ways were: the voice of His ministers, the voice of His lesser judgements, the death of His godly servants, the voice of other Protestant nations, the bloody rebellion in Ireland, many sad divisions, delay of the reformation of the Church, and the voice of our own consciences.
8 Earthquakes, tempests, monstrous births, triple suns, and bloody water were all viewed as prodigies. For selected annotated pamphlets in seventeenth-century England, see Timothy Fehler and Abigail Hartman, eds., Signs and Wonders in Britain’s Age of Revolution: A Sourcebook (London: Routledge, 2019).
frame of her study, she broadly states that after 1642 when the English military conflicts began, sectarian struggles undermined the vitality, visibility, and credibility of divine activities; she thus dismisses Civil War-related portents as “overtly and crudely polemical.”

Walsham also generalizes that they were “being harnessed as signs of God’s anger with the Laudian and Caroline regime.”

This paper attempts to complicate Walsham’s viewpoints on Civil War-related prodigies by extending analysis beyond the chief terminus of her book. Far from being crude, these prodigy reports, I argue, reflected a complex Protestant consciousness even if it was united by a common anti-Catholicism. Furthermore, the range of interpretations of prodigies expressed in the pamphlets also indicated both varying degrees of hope and uncertainty concerning the current political-religious situations and different expectations concerning the viewers’/readers’ responses to these prodigies. While Walsham provides a broad analysis of England’s Providentialism across an eighty-year period, I hope to anchor this paper to a shorter period of time in order to more fully analyze and contextualize specific pamphlets in their precise circumstances. I focus, then, on the manifestation of God’s Providence in prodigies on both national and local level from 1638 to 1643, a period that saw the outbreak of actual military conflicts in the British Isles through the first year of the English Civil War.

In pursuit of this fuller depiction, I will investigate three genres of printed works. First are sermons, represented by Calamy’s previously mentioned Englands Looking-Glasse. After briefly discussing the Calvinistic understanding of God’s Providence, I will move onto the next two genres: long pamphlets providing theoretical framework for interpreting prodigies, and shorter pamphlets depicting specific prodigious

10 Ibid., 5-6, 218-224, 333-334.
11 Ibid., 220.
Xinin Zhang

occurrences.\textsuperscript{12} The pulpit functioned as a powerful medium for broadcasting news, especially when events came to touch on the “soteriological concern,” as Calamy’s sermon suggested.\textsuperscript{13} Calamy delivered his sermon orally to the Commons, but the House later published it for greater circulation. Beyond the sermon, the pulp literature could feed into common people’s concerns and fears in the midst of turbulence.\textsuperscript{14} L. Brinkmair’s “Briefe Discourse of Prodigies” in his extended pamphlet \textit{The Warnings of Germany} (1638) and John Vicars’ \textit{England’s Warning Pieces} (1643) laid out theoretical frameworks regarding how one should understand prodigies. Lastly, the much-shorter pamphlets published throughout 1641 and 1642 illustrated ways in which the populace perceived and interpreted specific prodigies currently in the news.

These pamphlets could exert an influence on readers across England. All of them were individually printed for or by specific people in London, thus they were by nature less subjected to royal censorship, which was breaking down in the midst of the political conflicts.\textsuperscript{15} More importantly, the pamphlets did not just stay in London. The carrier and postal sys-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[12] I will not include many newspaper accounts because the period of 1638-1643 did not witness a flourishing newspaper industry. Newspapers did not initially attract many readers when they first appeared not only because partnerships among the editor, printer, and publisher were constantly changing, but also because page designs and editorial techniques were haphazard. Moreover, the occasional ongoing censorship until 1643 prevented the free flow of newspapers. See Joad Raymond, \textit{The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 20-26, 184.
\item[13] Raymond, \textit{The Invention of the Newspaper}, 188-193.
\item[15] Ibid., 7.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
tems, established and advanced by 1635, made readership outside London possible. The illiterate benefited from the development of the communication system as well, for in this still-oral early modern culture, they could listen to the literate reading pamphlets in public places and still absorb the messages. A wide readership was especially crucial at the beginning of the English military conflicts. The realm of media resembled a bloodless battlefield, on which each group strove for its ideological ideals.

Theological and Practical Underpinnings of Providence: Calvin & German Wonder Books

The theological assurance of Providentialism in early modern Protestant thought owed much to the French theologian John Calvin (1509-1564). Defining God’s Providence as “the order which [He] maintains in governing the world and in the conduct of all things,” Calvin believed that God has presided over all seemingly fortuitous occurrences to His purpose. Although God’s foreknowledge had predetermined all happenings in human history, He has indeed showed instances of repentance, Jeremiah 18:8-10 being one of them. His purpose of doing so lay in His willingness to offer opportunities of repentance—through punishments or warnings—to whomsoever He wished to pardon. Calvin did not mention prodigious signs in his work, but in practical divinity, some of the Calvin’s divine “punishments” would be turned into prodigies,

---

17 Friedman, *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford’s Flies*, 5.
19 Ibid., 455. This passage in Jeremiah was also Calamy’s passage of preaching.
20 Ibid., 457.
my ninth way that God spoke to a nation. Provoked by humanity’s wrongdoings, God would send signs as reminders. Such mentality, then, inspired God-fearing men to interpret the occurrences that could be as natural as comets and bad weather and as supernatural as monstrous births and sky battles.21

England’s interests in providential signs can be seen even in Reformation Germany. 22 Philip M. Soergel’s *Miracles and the Protestant Imagination* encompasses an extensive analysis of German wonder books. Although Martin Luther regarded prodigies as less significant than the Scripture, he did acknowledge God’s “ubiquitous presence” in them, which left liberty for his disciples to “exploit…the wonders.”23 In Job Fincel’s 1556 book *Wunderzeichen*, designed with an apocalyptic outlook, he incorporated descriptions of hundreds of natural wonders, monstrous births, and celestial signs.24 A more aggressive work with systematic categorization, Caspar Goltwurm’s *Wunderwerck und Wunderzeichen* (1557) included wonders since the beginning of history.25 Inheriting such a legacy, by the late 1630s, German captain L. Brinkmair composed *Warnings of Germany*, which incorporated both systematic interpretive discourse and individual prodigy accounts from the first two decades of German wars.26

21 See also Walsham, *Providence*, 20. For England, she states the most vividly exhibited was the “Puritan propensity for detecting the finger of God in the most mundane events.” If the Puritans discovered God’s presence even in mundane happenings, then more so in extraordinary ones.
22 See also Fehler & Hartman, *Signs and Wonders*, 1-2.
24 Ibid., 67-92.
25 Ibid., 93-122. See also Walsham, *Providence*, 72.
26 This conflict later became known as the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648), which initially started with the tension between several Protestant and Catholic states in the Holy Roman Empire and
In 1638, the Holy Roman Empire had been afflicted by warfare for twenty years. Although England did not directly participate in the continental conflict, she kept a watchful eye on occurrences in her sister Protestant states. Such an awareness became clear in Calamy’s sermon as he made several references to Germany. Indeed, God had spoken to England through Germany: “Me thinks I heare Rochell, Bohemia, the Palatinate, and other parts of Germany, saying: Oh England look upon us, and learn to be righteous.” Later on, demanding speedy repentance, he stated, “Sinne destroyed Rochel and the Palatinate; it brought the sword into Ireland, and will bring it into England, unless we turned away from all our evill doings.” Destruction caused by sin had been ravaging in places close to England; thus she must repent.

My first pamphlet with an explicit discussion of what he considered the appropriate interpretive framework, Brinkmair’s Warnings of Germany, originally a German pamphlet translated into English and published in 1638, served as a preemptive warning piece for the English context. The fact that the English translation of this pamphlet appeared just when political tension in England was escalating demonstrates English interests in recognizing God’s previous works on the Continent and her urgency to learn from continental prodigies so that she might maintain her peace. Before analyzing specific prodigies that had occurred in the German wars, Brinkmair provided an extensive systematic “Discourse on Prodigies” in which he defined the notion of God speaking through

---

27 Calamy, A Looking-Glasse, 15-16.
28 Ibid., 25.
29 Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 36.
prodigies and more importantly, theoretically categorized different types of prodigies—natural, moral, and divine—and their proper interpretations. Prodigies, as “extraordinary prognosticating signs,” carried God’s forewarnings pertinent to “judgement ensuing.” Natural ones were generally celestial and elementary, involving heavenly bodies and basic elements. Moral ones consisted of men’s “affections, passions, words, or actions.” Divine ones contained the presence of divinity in them. Therefore, one should treat prodigies with prayer, contentment, and a faithful heart.

By 1643, five years after the publication of *Warnings of Germany*, England had already experienced a year of warfare. The focus of geographical locations of warnings shifted therefore from distant Germany to nearby Britain. John Vicars in *Prodigies & Apparitions, or, Englands Warning Pieces* (the second long, interpretive pamphlet) stated that “we may no longer looke abroad into forreigne parts, nor many yeeres past.” Also shifted was the tone used to talk about prodigies. Brinkmair’s was rather detached, and his discourse was descriptive in nature whereas Vicars was less likely to detach

30 Brinkmair, *The Warnings of German by Wonderfull Signes*, §4. [Brinkmair’s “Discourse on Prodigies” occupied unnumbered pages in his preface; I have thus cited his section numbers].
31 Ibid., §8.
32 Ibid., §12. “Contentment” referred to being satisfied with what God provides: “Secondly we may not bee too curious in searching after the particular evills which Prodigies foreshew, much lesse to know their circumstances, when where, and how they shall happen.” This thought of Brinkmair’s corresponded to that of Calvin that Christians ought “not to seek out the things which God has wanted to be hidden, and also not to neglect those which He has revealed, out of fear of being condemned for too great curiosity on one hand or of ingratitude on the other.” See also Calvin, *Institues*, 417.
himself from England’s religious strife as a devout Calvinist Englishman writing about English affairs. \(^{34}\) He reflected on several representative English prodigies with a clear anti-papery agenda. As tensions escalated, prodigies became increasingly politically charged but also endowed with spiritual messages, especially—but not exclusively—by the Parliamentarians.\(^{35}\)

Brinkmair had, in his prodigy discourse, brought up a relevant question now applicable to England in 1643: how would one know to whom a prodigy is applied in the midst of a conflict between two antagonistic groups? “The only necessary thing is,” Brinkmair said, “for each private person of what sort-soever…to examine his heart, wayes, and spiritual estate, that he may reforme himselfe according to the word of God, lest hee also perish.”\(^{36}\) Namely, everyone should examine him-/herself first even though the natural tendency is to cry woe to others. Vicars’ approach to prodigies then was different from Brinkmair’s: Vicars regarded any God-sent prodigy as a

---


\(^{35}\) Walsham, *Providence*, 5-6; Fehler & Hartman, *Signs and Wonders*, 37. William E. Burns, *An Age of Wonders: Prodigies, Politics, and Providence in England 1657-1727* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 14: “Parliamentarian prodigies therefore often involved more dramatic divine intervention than did royalist prodigies.” One should also note that prodigies in Vicars’ pamphlet were representative but limited. In the penultimate paragraph (pp. 56-57) of the end of his extended accounts of prodigies, Vicars acknowledged that “I have made no mention all the while, of the many strange, fearfull, and unaccustomed Eclipses of the Sunne, and Moone, which have been seen from yeare to yeare both in other parts, and also in our owne English Horizon…many notable changes and overtures of States and Kingdoms; as also that late and memorable conjunction of Saturne and Jupiter among us in February last, 1643…doth prognosticate and demonstrate unto us that great alteration and vicissitude of the Kingdoms.”

\(^{36}\) Brinkmair, *Warnings of Germany*, §10.
sign particularly against the Papist others and demonstrated this stark interpretative difference to Brinkmair in almost all the episodes in his pamphlet.

Vicars’ account of destroyed churches served as an especially adequate proof of his mentality. Echoing Calvin, he affirmed Brinkmair’s thought that some prodigies might seem to be natural occurrences, yet they all took place under God’s appointment. 37 Horrific thunderstorms and winds, for instance, were inflicted upon the Withcombe Parish Church in Devonshire on October 21, 1638, Micham, Greenhith, and Stone churches in Kent on January 14, 1639, and St. Anthony Parish Church in Cornwall on Whitsunday, 1640. 38 In all cases, church buildings were defaced, pulpits torn away, beams fallen down. 39 Vicars added that in the 1638 occurrence, many church-goers’ clothes, including those of the minister’s wife, were burnt off and their bodies scorched. 40 All defaced churches shared a common detail: being full of ritualistic objects, which were the source of God’s wrath. Vicars was certain that these occurrences had been God’s righteous act to purge the “Romish-rubbish”: sumptuous church buildings, altar-worship, Communion-tables, crucifixes, and Popish pictures. 41 From a Puritan perspective, these churches had committed apostacy.

Here one sees, in polarized England, Vicars’ agenda against audacious church-goers who would not relinquish popishness. These prodigies could have been, as we saw in Calamy’s terms, a “red Flag of defiance” for the ruined people.

37 Vicars, Englands Warning Pieces, 27-46. See also Calvin, Institutes, 446; Brinkmair, Warnings of Germany, §1; Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 5.
38 Vicars, Englands Warning Pieces, 28-29, 39-40. They would all be natural prodigies according to Brinkmair’s categorization.
39 Ibid., 27-46.
40 Ibid., 33-34.
41 Ibid., 37-44.
but more so a “white Flag of mercy” for England.\textsuperscript{42} Destruc-
tions of the aforementioned churches could be due to their lack
of improvement in words and deeds.\textsuperscript{43} Vicars hoped that, after
such severe destructions, truth and purity could prevail follow-
ing the readers’ repentance and that this mentality of penitence
could ideally spread across the country if wide readership of
this pamphlet enlarged belief in God’s divine intervention.

Besides the church incidents, Vicars understood sev-
eral other English prodigies revolving around his anti-popish-
ness. He set up his argument by interpreting the famous 1618

\textsuperscript{42} For the discussion of God’s flags, see Calamy, \textit{A Looking-
Glasse}, 11.

\textsuperscript{43} References to events like these in the south and southwest (Kent,
Devon, and Cornwall) are not surprising after the post-Reformation
research findings by scholars such as Robert Whiting and Eamon
Duffy. Whiting’s \textit{The Blind Devotion of the People} surveys the sur-
vival of Catholicism in southwestern England (Devon and Corn-
wall) during the institutional English Reformation from reigns of
Henry VIII to Elizabeth I. Duffy’s \textit{The Stripping of the Altars} pro-
vides an overview of fierce pressure and disruption that the English
Reformation brought about in light of English Catholicism in pre-
Reformation/late Medieval era. In the section “The Visitation of
Kent, 1557,” Duffy outlines the intense visitation or restoration of
Catholicism that Kent went through during Mary’s reign. In \textit{The
Voices of Morebath}, Duffy focuses exclusively on Morebath, this
thirty-three-family town in Devon, and its resistance to the Refor-
mation, based on parish accounts by Sir Christopher Trychay, the
vicar of Morebath from 1520 to 1574. From these three works, one
senses reluctance to relinquish ritualistic objects in England south
and southwest, thus other parishes in Kent, Devon, and Cornwall
became the Puritan Vicars’ targets of criticism. See Robert Whit-
ing, \textit{The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the
English Reformation} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1989); Eamon Duffy, \textit{The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Reli-
University Press, 2005); Eamon Duffy, \textit{The Voices of Morebath:
Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village} (New Haven:
Yale University Press, 2001).
Comet as a criticism against England’s “meer externall and sensuall peace...” under James I’s reign (1603-1625), and more importantly, a harbinger for England’s division of prominent figures and for her sins.\textsuperscript{44} Vicars further advanced his contention by introducing a man-child, born on October 3, 1633, with two heads, two hearts, two arms, and a stump.\textsuperscript{45} Two heads represented the King and Parliament, two hearts “Papists and Protestants,” two arms English and Scottish armies, and the stump “lamentably torne and mangled Ireland.”\textsuperscript{46} This prodigy, too, was a forerunner of “some fearfull judgement to come for sinne,” sinners being Papists living “for beggarly Ceremonies and Romish trash and trumpery” rather than pious believers “for Gospel and a holy Reformation.”\textsuperscript{47} Additionally, Vicars described the manifestation of God’s operating hands on the sea. The Spaniards on one day in September 1640, attacked the English shore, but God saved England from them by directing a Dutch fleet to fight for England since England was not prepared to defend herself.\textsuperscript{48} The event was a warning through deliverance that intended to remind England of her lack of diligence.\textsuperscript{49} England ought to examine herself, lest more severe godly judgment would arrive.

Vicars ended with a sky battle, a divine prodigy that had an optimistic prospect. On August 4, 1642, in Alborough,
a town in Suffolk, the loud sound of drums and small shots of muskets were heard; just when a captain regarded the fearful noise as the approach of enemies, it turned to sweet, melodious sound of music. Although Vicars was writing in 1643, this sky battle happened not long before the battle of Edgehill (October 23, 1642), the first one of the Civil War. Therefore, this prodigious event would originally have been a harbinger for the real battle to come, as Brinkmair saw incidents happening “in ayre” as “most lively pictures of the same to bee on earth.” Thus, Vicars in this moment at the beginning of armed conflict felt that “terrible storme of woes” have begun by Papists; nevertheless, a glorious peace and perfect reformation” shall be achieved eventually, just as sounds of gun-shots became those of music.

Individual Prodigy Reports / Pamphlets

England’s interests in prodigies did not stop at the extensive theoretical analysis provided by Brinkmair and Vicars. I will now explore shorter pamphlets with specific episodes. Numerous anonymous authors published much shorter chapbooks—likely more widely read than the longer ones—to interpret both national-level occurrences indicating national crises and more local-level ones regarding divine punishment of specific individuals. These individual prodigy news reports, compared with Vicars’, revealed more hope for unity between antagonistic groups and more uncertainty and fear regarding

50 Ibid., 51-52.
51 Brinkmair, Warnings of Germany, §11.
52 Vicars, Englands Warning Pieces, 15, 55-56.
53 See Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 5. One should also note that although they did not necessarily include exhaustive theoretical frameworks, these authors often started and/or interrupted their storylines with general admonishing words: listing biblical verses, tracing precedents, and typically working to establish credibility for their reports.
England’s future, which led the pamphlets’ authors to different kinds of expected responses by the readers.

**National-Level Occurrences.** It is interesting to compare the same prodigy across two genres of pamphlets. In fact, the sky battle in Vicars’ pamphlet had also been published as a separate one a mere week after the incident. In *A Signe From Heaven* (1642), the anonymous author began by referring to signs that had appeared in continental cities—Prague, Leipzig, and Nordlingen—during the German wars. By shifting to Suffolk, though, heavenly signs ceased to be distant tales but current events. The sky of Alborow appeared “tokens in the Ayre,” which indicated the troubles approaching. England, this “sinfull Land and Nation,” had prompted God to send “this most strange signe from Heaven.” The author closed this pamphlet with the hope for God to “have mercy upon this sinfull land and Nation” and the expectation for men to demonstrate “true and unfained repentance” by supplication.

When this prodigy occurred, full-fledged war had not yet broken out, but King Charles had already begun mobilizing his army, which indicated that the King and Parliament would soon be at war. However, the author did not explicitly mention the Papists or denounce them. Rather than being quick to identify enemies, this pamphlet was simply one with a sense of urgency supplicating God’s mercy and demanding repentance. Vicars, on the other hand, accused the Papists of being “the chaffe” and “the drosse” and hoped them to be burnt up for “a glorious…Reformation” in the Church. Such contrast illustrated Vicars’ more uncompromising attitude toward England’s religious division and determination to eliminate the Papists.

---

54 Different spelling of the town in this pamphlet and in Vicars’.
55 *A Signe From Heaven, or a Fearefull and Terrible Noise heard in the Ayre at Alborow* (London: Printed by T. Favvbct, 1642), 4.
56 Ibid., 4.
In terms of England’s political division, one could also see a similar kind of phenomenon in *A Strange Wonder, or The Cities Amazement* (1642), which depicted unnatural tides above the London Bridge on February 4.\(^5\) Five hundred men witnessed an unmoving and dead tide up in the sky. Afterwards, a new tide roaring from Greenwich in a “furious manner” raised the original tide by four feet and then ebbed in a “confused” and “unaccustomed” manner.\(^5\) Although England ought to uphold “a hate in popish idolatry,” the author expected readers to also pray for “a perfect Concord” between the King and Parliament.\(^6\)

This prodigy occurred not long after King Charles had left London but still a half year before the war began. The tides’ strange nature could have prognosticated God’s displeasure toward England’s political strife. At this point, her future was ambiguous. Heavy and disheartening events—death from battles and natural disasters—could follow, yet few was certain about how and when.\(^6\) Charles’ departure due to the popularity of Parliamentarian support would be a big change in England. As Friedman points out, “The idea of change often elicited fear”;\(^6\) it could have been England’s fear for change that prompted desire to pray for the peace between the King and Parliament, which would have been the most foreseeable and the least changing future.

The same kind of prayer also appeared in *A Great Wonder in Heaven* (1643), a sky battle account on Edgehill two months after the battle there. “Two jarring and contrary

---

\(^5\) The date of publication was February 4, 1642 [1641, printed on the title page, was according to the old calendar].


\(^6\) Ibid., A4.

\(^6\) Even after the English Civil War had started, few could have foreseen that the conflict would last until 1649 and end with the execution of Charles.

\(^6\) Friedman, *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford’s Flies*, xiv.
Armies” met in the sky for several consecutive weekends. The author interpreted this prodigy as “[God’s] wrath against this Land, for these civill wars” and believed He would “send a sudden peace between his Majestie and Parliament.” England’s political division and military escalation post Edgehill was even more obvious, and yet this pamphlet still projected the same outlook: that readers shall supplicate for peace rather than deeper conflicts. Through this mindset, one actually sees another sort of Protestant consciousness different from that of Vicars, for, as interpretations in the above three pamphlets suggested, none strove for the elimination of the other side but rather advocated for harmony in England.

Divine Punishment of Individuals. Another type of warning applied directly to specific individuals. The “retributive justice” of each person, through the media, could serve as a warning for people who had not experienced the punishment. One also sees the complication of the dichotomies between the King and Parliament / the Papists and Protestants.

Catholics (or popishness in Vicars’ pamphlet) were not the only causes of judgment as some prodigy accounts also reported strange retributions, death, and organ deformity falling on Protestant sectarians as well for not conforming to the Church of England.

A Strange Apparition at an Alehouse (1641) presented such “A Relation of a Strange Judgement” from a Puritan perspective. Two gentlemen fell into disagreements while having a discourse on Mr. Burton, Mr. Prinne, and Doctor Bastwike, three prominent earlier resisters against Archbishop

63 A Great Wonder in Heaven (London: Printed for Tho. Iackson, Jan. 23, 1643), 4-6. [1642 according to the old calendar]. The New Yearaes Wonder (London: Printed for RobertEllit, 1643) recorded the same prodigy/sky battle and reached the same conclusion as A Great Wonder in Heaven. See also Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 80.
64 Ibid., 7.
65 Walsham, Providence, 65.
Laud’s anti-Puritan church reform. One gentleman praised for their good conscience while the other accused them of just being “base dissembling fellows” and extended such criticism to all Puritans. After some more humiliating remarks, this second gentleman started to sweat, grow faint, and his ear began bleeding. The author closed this pamphlet admonishing the audience to remember this punishment, that he who had demeaned God’s people shall be avenged.

Despite the Puritan-leaning perspective that the pamphlets above projected, my final two prodigy accounts were employed by supporters of the Church of England to discourage the common people from siding with Protestant sectarians. Speedy proliferation of Protestant sects in the mid-seventeenth century complicated the already existing religious tension and posed danger to the unity of Church of England. Both Anglicans and Puritans were anti-Catholics (and to some extent represented Walsham’s “Protestant consciousness”); yet within these two Protestant groups, disapproval and denunciations of each other were also growing in terms of both religious and political disagreements. Under such circumstance, a further

66 A Relation of a Strange Apparition (London: Printed for Richard Smethrust, 1641), 3-4. For more details on Burton, Prinne, and Bastwike, see Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 266 (endnote 17) and Kishlansky, A Monarchy Transformed, 129.
67 A Relation of a Strange Apparition, 5.
68 Ibid., 5.
69 For examples of proliferation of sectarians in the popular press, see the broadsheet A Catalogue of the Severall Sects and Opinions in England and other Nations (London: Printed by R.A. 1647), the pamphlet Religions Lotterie, or the Churches Amazement (London: Printed by T.F. for F.S. July 20, 1642), and the minister Thomas Edwards’ massive Gangrena, or A catalogue and discovery of many of the errors, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of this time (London: Printed by T.R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1646), which went through several editions and enlargements in 1646. See also Fehler & Hartman, Signs and Wonders, 234-237.
split of Protestant consciousness emerged. The next two prodiggy pamphlets demonstrated Anglicanism’s attempt to demonstrate God’s discontentment with nonconformists. The consequences of rejecting certain Anglican rites became sound warnings for others.

The prodigies in these two pamphlets all took place in the same area: Northamptonshire, a Parliamentarian stronghold. As the first pamphlet’s author John Locke recorded in A Strange and Lamentable accident (1642), a woman named Mary Wilmore residing in the village Mears Ashby gave birth to a headless baby because she had not wished her child’s head “to be signed with…the Crosse” during baptism, for she had been affected by sectarians. Wilmore regarded the cross as a symbolism of “a pernicious, popish and idolatrous ceremony.” In Wonderfull Newes (1642), Robert Stichbery, the churchwarden of Toscester, removed a stained glass window from the parish church with strong determination. Two days later, his wife died from severe pain and torment in her limbs, and he himself died of extreme madness; moreover, Stichbery’s sister, Anne, experienced rotten hands after she had torn out pages from the Book of Common Prayer.

Both accounts recorded the sectarians’ offense against certain Anglican conventions: baptismal rite, stained-glass windows, and the Prayer Book. Overt rejections of such practices, as both authors suggested, led to personal disasters. The intention of these two pamphlets were completely opposite to that of A Strange Apparition of an Alehouse. God, Who clearly

---

70 John Locke, Lamentable Accident (Printed at London: for Rich: Harper and Thomas Wine, and are to be sold at the Bible and Harpe in Smithfield, 1642), A3r.
71 Ibid., A3r.
73 Ibid., A2r-A3. Although not the Scripture itself, the Book of Common Prayer consisted of verses from the sacred Scripture that shall not be abused.
was on the side of the Church of England in this time of conflict, could not tolerate sacrilegious acts against His sacred conventions and did not leave the offenders’ sins unpunished. Through these two prodigies, the authors demonstrated sectarians as schismatics and established the unity of the orthodoxy and authority of the Church of England. Locke concluded *Lamentable Accident* with a call for unity: “one Lord, one faith, and one baptism” and hoped for the restoration of “the bond of peace.” The other author closed *Wonderfull Newes* with a declaration, or an expectation, that no one shall challenge to alter anything in the Church or church conventions.

One could also further contrast destructions of churches in Vicars’ *Englands Warning Piece* with the two prodigies above. While Anglican rites were a source of God’s wrath in one case, they were under His protection in another. *Lamentable Accident* and *Wonderfull Newes* greatly undermine claims of one-sided Civil-War prodigies and of an unified Protestant consciousness. Not every portent in the early Civil War era was a sign of God’s “anger with the Laudian and Caroline regime”; rather, contra Walsham, prodigy pamphlets represented a variety of political and religious viewpoints. Furthermore, there were two distinctive types of Protestant consciousness just according to these individual punishments: one Puritan and the other Anglican. Even during the complication caused by religious strife and contested interpretations, the importance of prodigies as a means of demonstrating proper responses was not undermined; the pamphlets vividly presented God’s operating hands, the readers’ hopes and insecurity, and their expected proper responses.

---

74 Locke, *Lamentable Accident*, A3-A4r.
75 *Wonderfull Newes*, A3r.
76 Walsham, *Providence*, 220.
77 If we add the conclusion from the last section (national-level occurrences), we see at least three sorts of Protestant consciousness in this early stage of Civil War.
Conclusion

“God only punisheth for sinne….Consider that there is no way or meanes to remove God’s anger and judgement, but by removing of our sins….Therefore be perswaded to reforme your selves.”78 In this issue of the *Scottish Dove*, where God’s Providence was seen for the first time in a newspaper’s extensive editorial remarks, editor George Smith admonished his readers in a five-page editorial on Providence (out of his eight-page weekly newspaper) to take to heart the actions performed by “the Immediate hand of God.”79 Echoing Calamy, Smith suggested to readers the importance of repentance through prayer and faithfulness.80 *The Scottish Dove*’s remarks indicate the popularization of Providence in print culture (as the demand for newspapers and weekly news of the Civil War grew), as this newspaper encompassed the essential message of all analyzed sources in this paper (sermon and pamphlets).

Nevertheless, careful reading of the pamphlets and contextualization of the dramatically portrayed prodigies enables us to sense the complex range of interpretations of prodigies and range of human emotions. They were more than crude propaganda pieces. Vicars’ great personal involvement ideologically in *Englands Warning Pieces* formed a stark contrast to Brinkmair’s “Discourse of Prodigies.” Yet, not all Puritan-leaning authors were as fiery and certain as Vicars was. In the early 1640s when the future was uncertain, readers’ hearts were drawn to supplicate God for His mercy and peace between the King and Parliament. In individual prodigy reports, God cast His wrath upon both the Papists and Sectarians.

79 Ibid., 57. See also Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspapers*, 34-35.
80 Smith, *The Scottish Dove*, 59. For Calamy’s point on national and individual reformation, see *A Looking-Glasse*, 22-52.
which demonstrates several Protestant consciousnesses. Regarding types of prodigies, we encountered a great diversity: defaced churches, monstrous births, sea and heavenly battles, unnatural tides, bleeding ears, strange deaths, and rotten hands. All of these wonders were signs offered to foster the appropriate response—even if the authors differed in what that should be—for the anxiety of this early stage of English Civil War.
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