

The Pulse

Undergraduate Journal of Baylor University

VOLUME 15 NUMBER 1 FALL 2017



Scientia Crescat

Honors College
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Copyright © 2017
Baylor University.
All rights reserved.

The Pulse

2017-2018

PRESIDENT

Nicholas Coker

CHIEF EDITOR

Kaylie Page

EDITORIAL BOARD

Matthew Graff

Cynthia Liu

Charlotte Stolzhus

Elaine Renberg

Eleni Nasiotis

Ella Liu

Grayson Jackson

PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF

Amanda Cordero

Kyla Ferguson

TECHNICAL DIRECTOR

Stu Mair

SECRETARY

Hannah Rogers

FACULTY SPONSOR

Dr. Jeff Hunt

CONTENTS

Dickens and the Growth of Empathy.....	6
AMANDA CORDERO	

A culture of care starts with empathy. This paper examines how author Charles Dickens cultivated such a culture in Victorian England. The culture of the time was bound by Enlightenment thought, the fantasy of Romanticism, the practicality of the Industrial Revolution, and the sociopolitical influence of the Anglican Church. But Dickens, a celebrity in his own right, was another cultural powerhouse: no other writer of his time had the same social impact he had. Through his works like Bleak House and A Christmas Carol, Dickens coaxed empathy from his readers for his characters. In this way, he brought attention to his readers' failings in caring for their destitute, downtrodden neighbors. Through his literary entreaties, he transformed the novel from a morally cheap, contemptible form of entertainment to a tool that exhorted Victorian readers to better themselves and the society around them.

Wesley as an Intellectual.....	30
MATTHEW GRAFF	

By exploring the book Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism by Richard Brantley, we can see how John Wesley's theology should be rooted in an intellectual understanding of Locke. This demonstrates that Wesley, who is frequently considered a spiritual rather than intellectual thinker, actually had a deep intellectual influence on the Christian tradition.

The Encyclicals of Flannery O'Connor 38
Joseph Lloyd

Flannery O'Connor, a devout Catholic author of the mid-20th century, addresses the value of human life in many of her works. Some of these works – namely The Violent Bear It Away, A Stroke of Good Fortune, and “Introduction to A Memoire of Mary Ann” – pertain to issues concerning the beginning and end of human life: contraception, abortion, and euthanasia. In this paper, I consider these works and their relationship to the papal encyclicals that address the same subjects: Pope Paul VI’s Humanae Vitae, and St. John Paul II’s Evangelium Vitae. I posit that O’Connor’s works, written well before either papal encyclical, provide the same theological doctrine as their papal counterparts, and are crafted in such a way as to be accessible to those who have no formal training in theological discourse.

**Wagner, the Audience, and the Universality of Evil
in Doctor Faustus** 50
JAMIE WHEELER

In Christopher Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus, the character of Wagner, Faustus’ student and servant, is a minor figure who runs the magician’s errands and occasionally quarrels comically with other characters. Nevertheless, Marlowe uses this character to prompt the audience to reflect on their own complicity in Faustus’ evil. As a surrogate for the chorus, for the audience, and for Faustus himself, Wagner reveals that any human being—including, indeed especially, the audience of a play such as Doctor Faustus—is prone to fall into corruption.

About the Authors 56

A culture of care starts with empathy. This paper examines how author Charles Dickens cultivated such a culture in Victorian England. The culture of the time was bound by Enlightenment thought, the fantasy of Romanticism, the practicality of the Industrial Revolution, and the sociopolitical influence of the Anglican Church. But Dickens, a celebrity in his own right, was another cultural powerhouse: no other writer of his time had the same social impact he had. Through his works like Bleak House and A Christmas Carol, Dickens coaxed empathy from his readers for his characters. In this way, he brought attention to his readers' failings in caring for their destitute, downtrodden neighbors. Through his literary entreaties, he transformed the novel from a morally cheap, contemptible form of entertainment to a tool that exhorted Victorian readers to better themselves and the society around them.

Dickens and the Growth of Empathy: An Examination of Charles Dickens's Impact on Victorian Empathy and the Novel

Amanda Cordero

A response to an increasingly socio-politically divided world has been a dramatic increase in empathy, a hyperextension of listening to “the other side,” (usually the financially or socially destitute), and then consequential activism. However, this increase in empathy is not a recent trend. Empathy in literature was a vital tool in inciting social change for the destitute class during the Victorian era. First, I will examine the context of Victorian attitudes of empathy. Then, based on this context, I will consider how the Victorian writer Charles Dickens used empathy in his writing to promote his agenda for social change. In doing so, I will also consider the landscape of novels at this time, and how social activist writers like Dickens changed this landscape. Finally, I will discuss briefly the lasting impact of empathy in literature in society, both Victorian and

present. Through these considerations, I argue that Dickens essentially transformed the novel from a low-brow, contemptible form of entertainment to one held in moral, virtuous regard.

The Victorians and Empathy

In discussing empathy within a historical social context, I must first establish the landscape that shaped how Victorians viewed others, specifically the poor and destitute. In this section, I will examine the contextual factors that constructed Victorian attitudes of empathy through social, economic, religious, and literary lenses. Specifically, I will do this by discussing philosophers Hume and Smith, the Romantic Era, the Industrial Revolution, and the influence of religion, specifically the Church of England. In this examination, I will also touch on the origins of empathy.

The notion of empathy first appeared in eighteenth century Germany, under the term *Einfühlung*, or “in-feeling.” While this notion was first introduced by German Romantic philosophers, it did not pique much interest until the nineteenth century, the time of increased interest in the psychology of perception, or how people think of what they see.¹

Einfühlung did not stay exclusively German: Scottish philosopher David Hume wrote extensively about empathy, or what he called “sympathy,” in his book *A Treatise of Human Nature*. In *Treatise*, Hume stated that the basis of “sympathy” was perception:

“Now ‘tis obvious, that nature has preserv’d a great resemblance among all human creatures, and that we never remark any passion or principle in others, of which, in some degree or other, we may not find a parallel in ourselves; and this resemblance must very much contribute to make us enter into the sentiments of others, and embrace them with facility and pleasure.”²

For Hume, the ultimate goal is happiness for self and happiness for others, with a greater emphasis on happiness for others because of the cultivation of morality and virtue. With this in mind, Hume recognized empathy as an integral component of a community of virtuous, ethical individuals.

Hume also differentiated between this “sympathy” and what he calls “emotional contagion”: sympathy is qualitative in that it requires the contemplation and recognition of “parallels” between oneself and a particular individual. Emotional contagion, on the other hand, is simply a swelling of emotions towards a mass or category of people.³ Emotional contagion contains little to no contemplation of a particular person’s situation, endeavors, or feelings – one circumstance is all the circumstances, i.e., one homeless person represents the entire homeless population. This issue is relevant in relation to Dickens’s work; later in this paper, I will further discuss critiques of Dickens’ novels based on this difference between “sympathy” and “emotional contagion.” Hume’s philosophy greatly influenced the thought of his era and the eras following, including the Victorian.

Scottish economist and philosopher Adam Smith was perhaps the greatest influence in Victorian thought about economy and industry. He shared Hume’s view that man is very much capable of imagining himself in another’s place and that this capability is essential to morality.⁴ Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* focused on economic growth by way of division of labor.⁵ This line of thinking spurred the technology of the assembly line and ultimately, the growth of factories. However, Smith also foresaw this type of economy as one dissatisfying for a substantial part of society, the working class: an increase in productivity meant the loss of man as an individual with morals and virtues. While *The Wealth of Nations* pointed out the productive benefits of the division of labor, it also presented solutions, such as government-sponsored education, to combat its negative side effects. In presenting these solutions, Smith recognized the dangers of increased productivity and attempted to do his part to anticipate solutions for the moral betterment of society.

Smith elaborated on this emphasis of social formation in his book *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, in which he argued that our moral ideas and actions are a direct product of our nature as social creatures. According to Smith, “sympathy” (empathy) drives this morality: “nothing pleases us more than to observe in other men a fellow-feeling with all the emotions of our own breast; not as we ever so much shocked as but the appearance of the contrary.”⁶ Both Smith and Hume established empathy as a natural tendency in man, appealing to his social nature; furthermore, they established that true empathy is essential to man’s morality and virtue.

The Victorian era was influenced by both its immediate predecessor, the Romantic era, and the progress of industrialism. The Romantic era was characterized by an infatuation with Nature, a lending of a voice to society's marginalized and oppressed, and the perspective that children are special because of their innocence.⁷ William Wordsworth is a mainstay poet icon of this era; his poem "Intimation of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood" comes from the perspective of a speaker who yearns to be, once again, the "Child of Joy . . . [the] blessed creatures I see / The heavens laugh with you in your jubilee."⁸ This particular interest in children and their associated innocence and joy would play a critical role in the Victorian era and in Dickens's personal and literary interests.

On the other hand, Britain's Industrial Revolution meant an assault on Romantic ideals: factories and the rapid growth of cities encroached on undeveloped land and the loss of children's innocence by way of child labor became the norm. Elizabeth Barrett Browning's poem "The Cry of the Children" characterizes this loss of innocence:

"For oh," say the children, "we are weary, / And we cannot run or leap — / If we cared for any meadows, it were merely / To drop down in them and sleep. / Our knees tremble sorely in the stooping — / We fall upon our faces, trying to go; / And, underneath our heavy eyelids drooping, / The reddest flower would look as pale as snow. / For, all day, we drag our burden tiring, / Through the coal-dark, underground — / Or, all day, we drive the wheels of iron / In the factories, round and round."⁹

In this poem, Browning cries that children are but a mere commodity for a society which has forgotten its moral ideals.

Furthermore, the Industrial Revolution shaped a more indifferent (and perhaps even negative) attitude towards society's downtrodden. This attitude was a symptom of negative emotional contagion – again, one circumstance became all circumstances, and one category of person became the specific individual. Victorian empathy (and Charles Dickens's writing) would speak to this immense change and degradation of man's social nature.

Religion, specifically the Church of England, had a massive impact on empathy. Founded in the sixteenth century during Henry VIII's reign, the Anglican Church during the Victorian era experienced a surge of government support. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Church had trouble creating new parishes in England's new and rising manufacturing cities because it was a complicated process requiring an act of Parliament. This issue was quickly remedied by Parliament voting on increasing the church budget, spurring a dramatic increase in church building. This increase was later known as the "High Church" Oxford Movement. Furthermore, there was a major increase in the number of Anglican clergymen and later, the above-mentioned required Parliament act was repealed, paving the way for more church building.¹⁰

This overall spotlight on churches also meant that the Church increasingly became the vehicle of private and public social work. Evangelicals believed that to maintain a good social conscience, one had to be socially active. They held the belief that by coming in contact with human nature – particularly with the needy– they were coming in contact with Christ.¹¹ The Matthew 25:40 verse resonated very strongly in the religious and social spheres of Victorian England.¹² However, this act of do-gooding perhaps tainted true empathy: charity towards the poor and destitute, when it happened, was more likely to have come from a place of religious consciousness to commit good works rather than *einfihlung*.

Thinkers like Hume and Smith, the polarized influences of the Romantic era and the Industrial Revolution, and the Anglican Church were vital in shaping the landscape of Victorian empathy. Hume and Smith established empathy ("sympathy") as a natural proclivity for man and its necessity for a morally upright life. This emphasis on living this type of life was intertwined with man's naturally social nature. The tug between the Romantic era and the Industrial Age meant a captivation with both innocence and its loss, both in Nature and with children. Finally, an increase in churches and an insistence on religion-driven charity dictated much of Victorian attitudes of empathy. These dynamic factors set the context in which Victorian writers wrote for and about – this background is especially observed by Charles Dickens.

Charles Dickens: His Life, His Writing, His Empathy

If Dickens were a modern-day rock star, he would be Bono, in that his sphere of positive influence was far-reaching and well-known. In this section, I will use the context of Charles Dickens's life, along with the Victorian England environment, to explain how he used empathy to promote his social agenda. First, I will consider briefly Victorian attitudes towards novels; this exposition will better reveal the context of Dickens's writing and how it differed from its contemporaries. Then, I will discuss how Dickens's background affected his writing. Finally, I will explore why and how he used writing to engage with Victorian society and its empathy.

The rise of industrialism and the advancements of science changed drastically the religious attitudes of Victorian England. With advancements in science came a more critical approach to the Bible: it was no longer considered a strictly divine and infallible text; rather, it was recognized as a document limited by its human writers.¹³ Furthermore, capitalist ideology and industrial-driven rationalist thought challenged religious beliefs. Religion seemed more outdated and superstitious compared to the advancements and technology of the age.¹⁴ The creation of a true middle class due to industrialism now meant an unparalleled amount of materialism, thus detracting from religion and piety.¹⁵

These changes in society inspired the writers of the newest, trendiest form of literature at this time: the novel. As of 1837, half of England's population was literate, and advances in publishing helped increase the production of texts.¹⁶ These advances, along with the rise of a middle class that demanded entertainment, helped popularize the novel. Due to a relatively high literacy rate, the reading public became more and more fragmented, thus encouraging novelists to write a wider variety of texts. In spite of this variety, many themes revolved around a protagonist attempting to define him- or herself in relation to a class or society; many themes also involved the effects of industrialism.¹⁷

This literary trend of novels and their protagonists promoted more secularized thought, contrasting religious sentiment. Novels, with their entire focus on fiction, allowed writers to play more with scenes, characters, ideas, etc. Books were no longer just for philosophical or religious aims – now, they were sources of entertainment. While some Christians defended the value of fiction, a large portion of the Church of England considered these novels a threat to its own views, in that

novels entertained the lower appetites and lower goods, detracting from God. According to an article in the *Christian Observer*, readers of novels “lose the abhorrence of [novels’] faults because they hinder our pleasure.”¹⁸ While the Church still had substantial pull in society with its increase in churches, novels and their more secularized perspectives offered a new, exciting escape from the drudgeries of everyday life. However, Charles Dickens elevated this vulgar form of entertainment to a place in which it had moral value, specifically in the case of charity.

Dickens was born in February 1812. His father, John Dickens, was a clerk in the Naval Pay Office who, unfortunately, found himself and his family imprisoned for debt. Charles Dickens, however, instead of imprisonment, was sent to work at Warren’s Blacking Factory.¹⁹ Even when his family’s financial situation was righted, his mother insisted that he continue to work at the factory, making a mere five to six shillings a week, pasting labels onto pots of blacking.²⁰ Eventually, at the age of fifteen, Dickens left the factory and went to school in London and later found employment as an office boy at an attorney’s firm.²¹ His stint at the factory was psychologically scarring for him, and he only spoke about it to his wife and his closest friend and later, biographer, John Forster. This experience, however, would haunt the pages of his writing, especially in *David Copperfield* and *Great Expectations*.

Dickens’s experiences and subsequent writings found their place in the heart of Victorian England, a society tugged by the forces of Romanticism and Industrialism. While many Victorians feared wasting emotions on the “undeserving” poor (a symptom of negative emotional contagion), this fear was virtually nonexistent when the sufferer was a child. This attitude informed greatly the literary landscape of the time, prompting writers to create works that encouraged social reform.²² Dickens used literary techniques to encourage society’s rearing of ragged children: just as Victorian Britain recycled filthy rags into bright, white, useful paper, the same could be done for impoverished children, a powerful metaphor.²³ In an 1846 letter published in London’s *Daily News*, Dickens wrote that London was a “vast hopeless nursery of ignorance, misery and vice; a breeding place for the hulks and jails.” He exhorted the State to “easily and less expensively, instruct and save [these children].”²⁴ In publishing this letter, Dickens drew on his own scarring childhood experiences in the blacking factory and the blessing of education. He used his own experiences, along with the experiences of other “ragged children,” to appeal to the Victorian public.

Other aspects of Dickens's life helped develop his acute sense of empathy. In 1829, he became a free-lance reporter; seven years later, he published the first set of his popular series *Sketches by Boz*.²⁵ *Sketches*, with the subtitle "Illustrative of Every-day Life and of Every-day People" was a collection of short pieces published originally by various newspapers and periodicals. Through *Sketches*, readers received vivid details on everything from the hilarious complications of courting and married life to the despicable details of London poverty. It is here that readers began to first notice the sensory-heavy, empathy-driven writing style of Dickens.

For example, in his sketch "Cold and Hunger," Dickens writes of a desperate, homeless mother:

"That wretched woman with the infant in her arms, round whose meagre form the remnant of her own scanty shawl is carefully wrapped, has been attempting to sing some popular ballad, in the hope of wringing a few pence from the compassionate passerby . . . Bitter mockery! Disease, neglect, and starvation, faintly articulating the words of the joyous ditty, that has enlivened your hours of feasting and merriment . . . It is no subject of jeering. The weak tremulous voice tells a fearful tale of want and famishing; and the feeble singer of this roaring song may turn away, only to die of cold and hunger."²⁶

Later, *Sketches* morphed into the serialized novel *The Pickwick Papers*. *The Pickwick Papers* became an enormous success, prompting Dickens to turn to novel-writing full-time (while still somehow dabbling in reporting and editing). In 1837, his next novel *Oliver Twist*, the rags-to-riches story of a workhouse boy, began to appear as a periodical series; it concluded in 1839.

However, in May 1837, Dickens' beloved sister-in-law, Mary Hogarth, passed away at the age of 17. Mary was Dickens' friend and confidante, "a privileged sister and domestic companion."²⁷ Her death was absolutely devastating for him: he wore her ring in her memory for the rest of his life.²⁸ On May 17, 1837, Dickens penned a letter to

William Harrison Ainsworth, saying “I have been so much unnerved and hurt by the loss of the dear girl whom I loved, after my wife, more deeply than anyone on earth.”²⁹

The death of Mary Hogarth proved to be one of the biggest influences on Dickens’s writing and an inspiration for his empathy. She served as the inspiration behind many of his beloved, sweetly dispositioned characters: *Oliver Twist*’s Rose Maylie, *Nicholas Nickleby*’s Kate, and *David Copperfield*’s Agnes.³⁰ The most emotionally resonant of these characters for the Victorians was Little Nell from “The Old Curiosity Shop.”³¹ Little Nell appealed to the sentimentality of Victorians and of later generations: in 1910, she was immortalized in a set of cigarette cards produced by John Player & Sons. Her description read “An ideal creation – a gentle, pure-spirited, fearless child, guardian-angel to her wandering, irresponsible grandsire, and ever moving in his company through thronging groups of grotesque shadows toward the silent, dreamless, last long sleep of all – the sleep of death.”³² The card’s illustration features a blonde, rosy girl dressed in a light blue frock, holding a bouquet of lilies and a picnic basket – the very picture of an angel.

Dickens’s childhood, his reporting of London life, and his sister-in-law’s death all impacted his empathy, and consequently, his writing. In this section, I will explore the motivations behind Dickens’s desire to write empathy-driven narratives. Furthermore, while I mentioned a few instances in the previous subsection, I will elaborate on how Dickens infused empathy in his writings by exploring his works and their format.

While Victorian empathy was driven by a Christian charity, Dickens avoided using religion as the basis for his own empathy and social agenda. While many scholars tend to view Dickens as “an inferior Newman, Arnold, or George Eliot” because of his proclivity for excessive sensory details and a superficial lack of religious, intellectual motivations, they fail to see his strength in considering “the irrational feelings, the prejudices, the experiences which form men’s minds.”³³ Furthermore, to say that Dickens did not entertain religious sentiments whatsoever would be incorrect: “his fundamental outlook as a liberal Protestant with radical, Romantic leanings is expressed in remarkably different ways at different times, variously reflecting impulse as well as prevailing currents of belief.”³⁴ Dickens indeed had Christian sentiments and for a spell, wrestled with these sentiments, verging on a religious crisis. However, he did not see himself motivated by intellectual theology as by “social gospel.”³⁵ He wanted to point to “our great

Master, and unostentatiously [lead] the reader up to those teachings as the source of all moral goodness.”³⁶ In this sense, it is better to think of Dickens and his writing beyond the strict intellectual boundaries of theology and doctrine and instead, view him through a scope of sheer moral goodness.

As mentioned previously, it is inevitable that Dickens empathized with the ragged children of London because he too was once a ragged child. His first-hand experiences, rather than Christian sentiment, motivated his empathy. Dickens had a similar attitude as Smith and Hume: empathy and compassion are absolutely necessary for the building of moral character and virtue. For Dickens, charity was “the one great cardinal virtue” – a strong sense of charity would lead to and include all the other virtues.³⁷ Charity was the beginning and end of social and individual virtue.

Not only did this moral position drive his writing, but it drove it in such a way that readers’ emotions engaged completely. Dickens did not shy from passionate, and perhaps excessive, sensory detail because he wanted to capitalize on readers’ emotions for the promotion of virtue. Dickens’s writing was not only his livelihood, but his primary “sphere of action” for practicing moral goodness through practical means: “I want at all times, in full sincerity, to do my duty by my countrymen By literature I have lived, and through literature I have been content to serve my country In my sphere of action I have tried to understand the heavier social grievances, and to help to set them right.”³⁸

Indeed, Dickens served his country through his writing. His novels, such as *David Copperfield*, *A Christmas Carol*, and *Hard Times*, featured protagonists who were trampled by society. For example, in *Oliver Twist*, Dickens wrote that the boys in the workhouse “polished [the bowls] with their spoons till they shone again . . . [then] they would sit staring at the copper, with such eager eyes, as if they could have devoured the very bricks of which it was composed; employing themselves, meanwhile, in sucking their fingers most assiduously, with the view of catching up any stray splashes of gruel that might have been cast thereon.”³⁹ This quote leads to Dickens’s iconic scene in which Oliver Twist is chastised severely and rejected by the workhouse master after asking for more food. The scene is iconic for a reason: it is a classic example of Dickens’s style of writing, designed to capitalize on human emotions and incite empathy, and in this way promoting social change and, ultimately, human virtue.

Dickens took advantage of the emerging popularity of the novel to change Victorian attitudes towards the poor. Additionally, the format of these works enhanced his engagement with his readers. Dickens's works, including the ones mentioned above, were serialized, a process in which a novelist's work was published periodically by installments in newspapers or magazines instead of collectively in a bound book.⁴⁰ Serialized works were more economically accessible to lower- and middle-class readers, allowing them to read the book at the price of one shilling per week instead of the more expensive price for a bound copy.⁴¹ In this way, writers' works were more accessible to the wider public than if they were bound in more expensive volumes; thus, Dickens's appeal for empathy stretched beyond the upper class.

Furthermore, serialization affected the form of the novel in that each installment had to engage the reader singularly while also maintaining the integrity of the novel's overall plot. This form of publication perhaps enhanced Dickens's sensationalism in that it held readers in suspense, without relief until the next installment was released.⁴² This style of writing, along with this publishing format, held readers in agony, their anticipation piqued and their emotions charged. Thus, readers were more committed to a story and its characters, inciting and encouraging empathy.

Inciting a Social Revolution: Dickens's Actualization of Empathy in Victorian England

In the previous section, I discussed the novel in its Victorian context and how Charles Dickens used his background and the emerging popularity of the novel to promote his social agenda. In this section, I will discuss how Charles Dickens helped shape Victorian attitudes of empathy, specifically towards the lower classes. First, I will consider the pragmatics of Victorian empathy. Then, I will focus on Dickens's empathy in his writings. Finally, I will examine Victorian attitudes of empathy in relation to Dickens's writing.

As mentioned previously, Victorians had rich cultural resources from which they drew empathy, namely Hume, Smith, the Romantic era, and the Industrial Age. However, Dickens acknowledged that despite anyone's best intentions, he or she would never be able to access wholly the feelings of another: "That I suffered in secret, and that I suffered exquisitely, no one ever knew but I. How much I suffered, it is, as I

have said already, utterly beyond my power to tell.”⁴³ *Great Expectations*’ Pip expresses this torment of emotional inadequacy: “Words cannot tell what a sense I had, at the same time, of the dreadful mystery that he was to me.”⁴⁴

This idea of incomplete accessibility rang true for the pragmatics of Victorian empathy. The creation of a true middle class during the Industrial Age meant a more complex social hierarchy than what had previously existed. The middle class was not simply relegated to one sphere, but rather developed with multi-facets, ranging from humble clerks to wealthy bankers. However, despite its multi-faceted quality, the Victorian middle class (and for that matter, the upper echelons of Victorian society as well) was nowhere near understanding the hardships of the poor. Rather, the distance between the poor and their wealthier counterparts was vast. This distance protected the middle- and upper class from “exposure to true pain, poverty, and hunger.”⁴⁵ Thus, while the Victorians’ empathy was perhaps informed by its rich context, it was not primarily characterized by action.

Generally speaking, Victorian empathy, while well-intentioned, failed to see the individual, the very description of emotional contagion. For the Victorians, it was easy to lump all single-mothers into one category, all poor children into another category, etc. In doing this, they essentially robbed these destitute individuals of their humanity. Instead, they morphed them “into spectacle, an act that fundamentally denies the human-ness of that person . . . perhaps the last sympathetic act possible.”⁴⁶ Furthermore, in giving in to tendencies of emotional contagion, Victorians were more prone to perceiving the groups as “lazy,” or “malicious,” or “immoral,” instead of recognizing each individual’s humanity.

Additionally, much of the time, this blind pitying was selective: perhaps swept away by the romance of other worlds, Victorians idealized Africa as a charity case. In focusing primarily on these distant spheres of charity, the Victorians oftentimes overlooked the immediate need of the impoverished and destitute in their own cities and towns. Dickens satirizes this in *Bleak House*: Mr. and Mrs. Jellyby are so focused on their charity work in Africa that they neglect their own children who are dirty and ill-bred.

The Victorians might have had empathy (arguably, a cheapened, perverted version based on emotional contagion), but they failed having true empathy by justifying their lack of action through categorization of individuals and in the failure to see immediate, domestic needs. Dickens

felt that this lack of action reflected poorly on his society. Dickens's concerns were legitimate because Victorians seemed unconscious of how their actions (and in most cases, lack thereof) negatively impacted the lowest levels of society; the New Poor Laws of 1834 support this theory. These laws were intended to arm "guardians, clergymen, and receiving officers" for providing the poor, the aged, the infirm, etc. "with tickets for admission to workhouses, moving them under one roof for purposes of efficiency and moral reform."⁴⁷ These laws are a prime example of good intentions, but terrible consequence: most of these workhouses were cramped and had terrible living conditions. In most cases, the intended subjects of these laws were better off without the workhouses.

Dickens, because of his depth of moral virtue and the trauma of his childhood, recognized this severe lack of true empathy in Victorian society. He understood that complete comprehension of another's suffering was impossible. He chose not to focus on that, but rather, the consequences of the lack of true empathy in his writings. For him, these consequences could be combated by "the awaking of the people, the outspokening of the people, the uniting of the people in all patriotism and loyalty to effect a great peaceful constitutional change in the administration of their own affairs."⁴⁸

This "awaking of the people" occurred when the people recognized the failures of society and responded accordingly. Dickens recognized the power of story as something that "affords facilities which cannot otherwise be secured . . . [the novel] is a frame-work for better things."⁴⁹ Again, this basic desire for improving the moral formation of society and the individual is what primarily drove his writing.

This "framework for better things" can be seen perhaps most vividly in one of Dickens's most well-known and beloved works, *A Christmas Carol*. This story is an example of Dickens using "active sympathy," an empathy that encouraged action.⁵⁰ Through his writing, Dickens believed that middle- and upper-class readers could imagine the suffering that they themselves did not experience; because their imagination – through his writing – would be so thoroughly stimulated, "they would be moved enough to intervene."⁵¹

This call to action is most seen through the character of Tiny Tim, the sickly little boy who walks with a crutch. As with the character of Little Nell, Tiny Tim's creation was inspired by a real person: Harry Burnett, the small son of Dickens' eldest sister, Fanny. Harry

Burnett died shortly after his mother's unexpected death. His death inspired Dickens to write a character so small, innocent, and naïve that readers would have to confront feelings of loss and anguish over losing a child.⁵² Indeed, the loving, sweet Tiny Tim launched *A Christmas Carol* into a classic in which readers fondly remember him and his impact on Scrooge. The theme of generosity moved from the page to the public: "In the spring after *A Christmas Carol's* release, *The Gentleman's Magazine* credited the story with a surge in charitable giving: 'More extensive kindness has been dispensed to those who are in want at the present season than at any preceding one.'⁵³

Some argue that Dickens did very little to actually shape socioeconomic reform in Victorian England. Hugh Cunningham, professor of social history at the University of Kent, argued that Dickens did not explicitly state a "coherent doctrine" of how society should be reformed; rather, he "helped create a climate of opinion."⁵⁴ While Cunningham sees Dickens's contributions to this "climate of opinion" as insufficient, I argue conversely that Dickens's writing and its serialized format helped proliferate a more nuanced, cultivated, and active form of empathy which was largely absent in its preceding condition (the form shaped by Hume, Smith, the Romantic era, and the Industrial Age).

As mentioned above, *A Christmas Carol* and specifically its character Tiny Tim spurred on the public's generosity during the holiday season. While this consequence was perhaps an exception rather than the rule and Dickens never truly proposed pragmatic solutions, he did play a major role in creating spheres of conversation that led ultimately to solutions: The Factory Act of 1878 and the Education Act of 1880 improved working conditions and education prospects for children. Additionally, Dickens himself heavily promoted social change: he created Urania Cottage (a safe house for former prostitutes), advocated for education, housing, and sanitation for the poor, and, as mentioned above, advocated on behalf of children who were forced to work.⁵⁵ His celebrity as a writer helped bring attention to these issues and his own philanthropy. Thus, in this way, he continued to promote social change.

Cunningham and others may criticize Dickens for not offering pragmatic solutions, but perhaps that was not his role. As stated previously, Dickens said "By literature I have lived, and through literature I have been content to serve my country . . . In my sphere of action I have tried to understand the heavier social grievances, and to help to set them right." For Dickens, setting right social grievances meant encouraging

a cultivation of morals (both by example and through his writing), not necessarily fixing legislation. Ultimately, a cultivation of morals meant that men empathized for each other, and in some way, acted on that empathy.

Conclusion: Dickens' Impact Today

Countless studies today point to the key role of reading in encouraging empathy. Literature disrupts our norms and expectations, introducing us to different characters and scenarios and allowing us the space to process these disruptions in safely; in this way, they guide us to better understand others.⁵⁶ Thus, literature guides us to be better, kinder versions of ourselves – people who are better in community, as qualified by Hume and Smith.

Novels have dramatically altered the landscape of empathy. Dickens was one of the first authors to write fiction in a way that encouraged a cultivation of morals for the improvement of society. While he recognized that individuals would never be able to understand each other completely, he still insisted on a wholehearted attempt to better attain this understanding. According to Harrison, Dickens spurred on the idea that “literature was an appropriate and a powerful means of transforming society, and popular audiences accepted largely this social and ethical function.”⁵⁷ Dickens recognized the power of storytelling; while people could not save characters, storytelling inspired them to save people who reminded them of their favorite characters – the Tiny Tims and Little Nells of the world.

Stories encourage this empathetic inspiration because they offer “safe zones for readers’ feeling empathy without experiencing a resultant demand on real-world action.”⁵⁸ While this absence of “real-world action” has its flaws, it is the first step in an empathetic process in which the ultimate goal is an empathy that is indeed active. According to Keen, thrusting individuals into real-world situations for which they are not emotionally, empathically prepared leads to personal distress – “an aversive emotional response also characterized by apprehension of another’s emotions.”⁵⁹ This reaction leads into avoidance of, not sympathy for, these difficult situations; thus, individuals’ altruistic actions are hindered instead of heartened. Novels, however, provide an accessible, appealing way for people to “prepare” for these real-life scenarios: individuals, while they may be caught up in the story, recognize that there are no

consequences caused by their own actions (or lack thereof). This alleviation of pressure thus gives them the space to grow an active, nuanced empathy.

For Dickens, this was his job: to prepare readers to see the difficulties of their world, and then, inspire active empathy. Through his own background, life situations, and personally motivated social agenda, Dickens wrote in such a way that encouraged this type of empathy. While not particularly or orthodoxically religious, he offered morally-upright sentiments of charity that were encouraged by Hume, Smith, and the Church of England. Empathy was his goal, and writing was his apparatus.

It is because of Dickens and his convictions that the form of the novel transformed from a vulgar, lowbrow medium (and a medium that was antithetical to traditional moral, Christian values) to something that could be used for the cultivation of virtue. It is because of Dickens that we see an alternative to the societal norm. He regarded literature as something that could be elevated and valued – just like the people about whom he often wrote.

NOTES

- 1 Magdalena Nowak, "The Complicated History of Einfühlung," 301.
- 2 David Hume, *A Treatise on Human Nature*, 75.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 73.
- 4 Geoffrey Sayre-McCord, "Hume and Smith," 9.
- 5 Yousuf Dhamee, "Adam Smith and the Division of Labor."
- 6 Adam Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 9.
- 7 Jacqueline Banjeree, "Ideas of Childhood."
- 8 William Wordsworth, "Intimations Immortality."
- 9 Elizabeth Barrett Browning, "The Cry of the Children."
- 10 "Victorians: Religion."
- 11 Henry Bradford Washburn, *The Religious Motive in Philanthropy*, 8.
- 12 In Mt. 25:40, Jesus tells the charitable how their good works towards the poor and broken are really good works towards Him: "And the King will answer and say to them, 'Assuredly, I say to you, inasmuch as you did *it* to one of the least of these My brethren, you did *it* to Me.'" Mt. 25:40 (NKJV)
- 13 Herbert Schlossberg, "Moral Hegemony and Moralism."
- 14 *Ibid.*
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 "Volume E: the Victorian Age."
- 17 *Ibid.*
- 18 "On the Influence of Literature."
- 19 David Cody, "Dickens: A Brief Biography."
- 20 "Dickens and the Blacking Factory."
- 21 *Ibid.*
- 22 Deborah Wynne, "Reading Victorian Rags," 8.
- 23 Imogen Lee, "Ragged Schools." Dickens was a staunch supporter of Ragged Schools, institutions that provided free education for children too poor to receive it elsewhere. Dickens visited London's Field Lane Ragged School.
- 24 Jenny Hartley, *Selected Letters of Charles Dickens*, 163.
- 25 Cody, "Dickens: A Brief Biography."
- 26 Charles Dickens, *Sketches by Boz*, 223.
- 27 Fred Kaplan, *Dickens: A Biography*, 92.
- 28 Phillip Allingham, "Mary Scott Hogarth."
- 29 Dickens, "On the Death of Mary Hogarth," Letter.
- 30 Paul Schlicke, "True Pathos," 189.

- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Clayton J. Clarke, “Nell.”
- 33 K.J. Fielding, “Dickens Criticism: A Symposium,” 76.
- 34 Dennis Walder, *Dickens and Religion*, xxiii.
- 35 Ibid., 4.
- 36 Cody, “Dickens and Religion.”
- 37 Walder, *Dickens and Religion*, 45.
- 38 R.H. Shepherd, *The Speeches of Charles Dickens*, 170.
- 39 Dickens, *Oliver Twist*, 17.
- 40 Dickens’s works were initially serialized
but later bound in volume format.
- 41 The University of Victoria, “Victorian Serial Novels.”
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens*, 27.
- 44 Dickens, *Great Expectations*, 338.
- 45 Rebecca N. Mitchell, *Victorian Lessons
in Empathy and Difference*, 43.
- 46 Ibid., 47.
- 47 Jessica Sheetz-Nguyen, “The Case for Charity,” 21.
- 48 Shepherd, “*The Speeches of Charles Dickens*,” 170-171.
- 49 “Calebs in Search of a Wife.”
- 50 Mitchell, *Victorian Lessons in Empathy and Difference*, 46.
- 51 Harrison, “The Paradox of Fiction
and the Ethics of Empathy,” 263.
- 52 *Original Photograph of Harry Burnett.*
- 53 Mary-Catherine Harrison, “The Paradox of
Fiction and the Ethics of Empathy,” 271.
- 54 Matthew Davis, “Did Dickens Really Save Poor Children.”
- 55 Jenny Hartley, *Charles Dickens
and the House of Fallen Women.*
- 56 56 Julianne Chalet, “Novel Finding: Reading
Literary Fiction Improves Empathy.”
- 57 57 Harrison, “The Paradox of Fiction
and the Ethics of Empathy,” 262.
- 58 58 Suzanne Keen, *Empathy and the Novel*, 3.
- 59 59 Ibid., 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allingham, Philip, ed. "Mary Scott Hogarth, 1820-1837: Dickens's Beloved Sister-in-Law and Inspiration." *Victorian Web*. Accessed April 9, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/maryhogarth.html> ghgh
- "Sentimentality: The Victorian Failing." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed March 13, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/xmas/pva305.html>
- Amigoni, D. "Dickens the Novelist, Dickens the Journalist." *Literati by Credo*. Accessed March 13, 2017. http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/eupcglvictor/dickens_the_novelist_dickens_the_journalist_modes_of_publication_sketches_and_the_making_of_the_old_curiosity_shop/0?id=10430877
- "British Romanticism." *University of Nevada Las Vegas*. Accessed April 4, 2017. https://faculty.unlv.edu/kirschen/handouts/british_romanticism.html
- Banjeree, Jacqueline, ed. "Ideas of Childhood in Victorian Children's Fiction: The Child as Innocent." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/genre/childlit/childhood1.html>
- Browning, Elizabeth Barrett. "The Cry of the Children." *Poetry Foundation*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/43725/the-cry-of-the-children>
- *The Poems of Elizabeth Barret Browning*. Edinburgh: W.P. Nimmo, Hay & Mitchell, 1894.
- "Calebs in Search of a Wife: Comprehending Observation on Domestic Habits and Manners, Religion, and Morals." *Christian Observer* Feb. 1908.
- "Charles Dickens and the Blacking Factory." *The Dickens Fellowship*. Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://www.dickensfellowship.org/charles-dickens-and-blackening-factory>

- Chiaet, Julianne. "Novel Finding: Reading Literary Fiction Improves Empathy." *Scientific American*. Accessed April 29, 2017. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/novel-finding-reading-literary-fiction-improves-empathy/>
- Clarke, Clayton J. "'Nell' by J. Clayton Clarke ('Kyd')." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 9, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/art/illustration/kyd/24.html>
- Clark, William Ross, ed. *Discussions of Charles Dickens*. Discussions of Literature. Boston: Heath, 1961.
- Cody, David. "Dickens: A Brief Biography." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/dickensbio1.html>
- . "Dickens and Religion." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/dickens4.html>
- Davis, Matthew, "Did Charles Dickens really save poor children and clean up the slums?", *BBC*, Accessed March 13, 2013. <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-16907648>
- "David Hume: Scottish Philosopher." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Accessed April 8, 2017. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/David-Hume>
- Dhamee, Yousuf. "Adam Smith and the Division of Labor." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/economics/division.html>
- Dickens, Charles, ed. "A Walk in a Workhouse," *Household words*, 1, no.9 (1850): 204–207.
- , ed. "Boys to Mend," *Household* 5, no.129 (1852): 597–602.

- Charles Dickens on the Death of Mary Hogarth. Letter from the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of The New York Public Library.
- , ed. "London in Books." *All the year round* 14, no.338 (1865): 270–276.
- , ed. "London Pauper Children." *Household words* 1. no.23 (1850): 549–552.
- . *Great Expectations*, Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2001.
- . *Sketches by Boz: Illustrative of Every-Day Life and Every-Day People*, The Centenary Edition of the Works of Charles Dickens in 36 Volumes. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd & New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.
- , ed. "The Sorrows of the Poor." *Bentley's miscellany* 18 (1845): 385.
- , ed. "Where We Stopped Growing." *Household words* 6, no.145 (1853): 361–363.
- "Empathy and Sympathy in Ethics." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/emp-symp/#SH3a>
- Fielding, K. J. "Dickens Criticism: A Symposium," *Dickensian* 59, no.340 (1963):73–77.
- Forster, John. *The Life of Charles Dickens*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1889.
- Fraser, Derek, ed. *The New Poor Law in the Nineteenth Century*. Problems in Focus Series. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- Harrison, Mary-Catherine, "The Paradox of Fiction and the Ethics of Empathy: Reconceiving Dickens's Realism." *Narrative* 16, no. 3 (October 2008): 256–278.

- . "Sentimental Realism: Poverty and the Ethics of Empathy, 1832–1867." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2008. *ProQuest*. Accessed March 12, 2017.
- Hartley, Jenny. *Charles Dickens and the House of Fallen Women*. London: Methuen, 2008.
- , ed. *The Selected Letters of Charles Dickens*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Eighteenth Century Collections Online, 2007. <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/004806339.0001.002>
- Kaplan, Fred. *Dickens: A Biography*. New York: Morrow, 1988.
- . *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Keen, Suzanne. *Empathy and the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. *EBSCOhost*.
- Landow, George P. Review of "Mudie's Circulating Library and the Victorian Novel," by Guinevere L. Griest. *Modern Philology* 69, no.4 (1972): 367-369.
- Lee, Imogen. "Ragged Schools." *The British Library*. Accessed April 9, 2017. <https://www.bl.uk/romantics-and-victorians/articles/ragged-schools>
- "Letter from Charles Dickens on Ragged Schools, from the Daily News." *The British Library*. Accessed April 9, 2017. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/letter-from-charles-dickens-on-ragged-schools-from-the-daily-news>
- "Miscellaneous: On the Influence of the Literature of Fiction." *Christian Observer* July 1817.

- Mitchell, Rebecca N. *Victorian Lessons in Empathy and Difference*. Victorian Critical Interventions. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011.
- Nowak, Magdalena. "The Complicated History of Einfühlung." *Biannual Philosophical Journal* 1, no.2 (2011), 301-326.
- Original Photograph of Harry Burnett*. Photograph. New York Public Library, New York.
- "Philanthropy." *B.C. Protestant Orphans' Home*. Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://web.uvic.ca/vv/student/orphans/philanthropy.html>
- Roberts, Lewis. "Trafficking in Literary Authority: Mudie's Select Library and the Commodification of the Victorian Novel." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34, no.1 (2006): 1-25.
- Sayre-McCord, Geoffrey. "Hume and Smith on Sympathy, Approbation, and Moral Judgment." *Social Philosophy & Policy* 30, no.1-2 (2013): 208-236.
- Schlicke, Paul. "The True Pathos of 'The Old Curiosity Shop.'" *Dickens Quarterly; Louisville, Ky.* 7, no.1 (1990): 189-199.
- Schlossberg, Herbert. "Moral Hegemony and Moralism." *The Victorian Web*. Accessed April 5, 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/herb9.html>
- Shepherd, R.H., ed. *The Speeches of Charles Dickens*. London: Michael Joseph Ltd, 1937. <https://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~matsuoka/CD-Speeches.pdf>
- Sheetz-Nguyen, Jessica. "The Case for Charity" in *Victorians and the Case for Charity: Essays on Responses to English Poverty, the Church, and the Literati*, ed. Marilyn D. Button 21-41. Jefferson: McFarland and Company Inc., Publishers, 2014.
- Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. London: A. Millar, 1759. *Gale*.

The Norton Anthology of English Literature. "Volume E: The Victorian Age." Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://www.wwnorton.com/college/english/nael9/section/volE/overview.aspx>

"The Theory of Moral Sentiments." *Adam Smith Institute*. Accessed April 4, 2017. <https://www.adamsmith.org/the-theory-of-moral-sentiments/>

"Victorian Serial Novels." *The University of Victoria*. Accessed April 25, 2017. <https://www.uvic.ca/library/featured/collections/serials/VictorianSerialNovels.php>

"Victorians: Religion." *English Heritage*. Accessed April 5, 2017. <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/learn/story-of-england/victorian/religion/>

Walder, Dennis, *Dickens and Religion*. Taylor and Francis (2007). Accessed April 20, 2017. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bayloru/detail.action?docID=1075224>

Washburn, Henry Bradford. *The Religious Motive in Philanthropy: Studies in Biography*. The George Dana Boardman Lectureship in Christian Ethics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1931.

Wordsworth, William. "536. Ode. Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood." In *The Oxford Book of English Verse: 1250-1900*, edited by Arthur Quiller-Couch. New York: Bartleby.com, 1999. <http://www.bartleby.com/101/536.html>

Wynne, Deborah. "Reading Victorian Rags: Recycling, Redemption, and Dickens's Ragged Children." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 20, no.1 (2015): 34–49.

*By exploring the book *Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism* by Richard Brantley, we can see how John Wesley's theology should be rooted in an intellectual understanding of Locke. This demonstrates that Wesley, who is frequently considered a spiritual rather than intellectual thinker, actually had a deep intellectual influence on the Christian tradition.*

Wesley as an Intellectual

Matthew Graff

“Beware you be not swallowed up in books! An ounce of love is worth a pound of knowledge.” This quote from John Wesley illustrates the man that many people remember: a charismatic preacher, strong voice for the poor, and a vehement supporter of abolition. He was not and is not however, remembered often for his contributions to the intellectual space of Christianity. This paper seeks to argue that Wesley was not simply a social activist, but an important intellectual figure whose theological ideas were rooted both in scripture and informed by the philosophy of John Locke. In order to prove this point, this paper will first explore the general misconceptions about Wesley which have led many to believe that he was not an intellectually important figure, which will lead into the discussion of Wesley's ideas of sensible experience. It will then connect this idea of sensible experience with Wesley's ideas of Empiricism. Then this paper will go on to explore one of the chief ideas of Richard Brantley's book *Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism*, specifically that Wesley's philosophy (and thus his empiricism) was firmly rooted in a Lockean tradition. Lastly, this paper will prove that far from being a nonintellectual figure, Wesley was one of the most influential intellectual figures of the Christian tradition.

In Frederick Dreyer's paper *Faith and Experience in the Thought of John Wesley* he emphasizes that there are large factions of people who do not want to see Wesley and Methodism as intellectually significant. He gives a few examples of this early in his paper, citing several figures. The first of these is William Edward Hartpole Lecky, who sees Wesley

as “very credulous and very dogmatic, utterly incapable of a suspended judgement, and utterly insensible to some of the highest intellectual tendencies of his time.”²¹ He goes so far as to assert that it was Wesley’s lack of intellect that drew people to the Methodist ideology. This claim seems to be rooted in a fundamental misunderstanding of Wesley’s ideas on the significance of certain theological ideas. We can see this in two distinct areas of Wesley’s theology. The first area is Wesley’s beliefs about the importance of experience, especially in relation to inspired Scripture. The second area in which we see how a misunderstanding of Wesley could lead to this conclusion is Wesley’s doctrine of faith as sensible experience. One of the most glaring parts of the statement about Wesley from Lecky is the idea that Wesley rejected the “highest intellectual tendencies of his time.”²² In a sense, this was true, but this statement by itself does not offer the reader the full picture. The primary instances in which Wesley rejected the use of reason were in instances where prominent scholars were attempting to reason their way to conclusions which can be gleaned directly from Scripture. Dreyer gives his reader a specific example of this idea. In fact, “to a colleague who attempted to explain the nature of the Trinity by the use of reason, Wesley objected, ‘What have you or I to do with that difficulty? I dare not, will not, *reason* about it for a moment. I believe just what is revealed and no more.’”²³ Throughout his life, Wesley made it clear that revealed Scripture was at the forefront of his theology. This fact can be most plainly seen in what is now called Wesley’s Quadrilateral. Wesley’s Quadrilateral is concerned with “the principal factors that John Wesley believed illuminate the core of the Christian faith for the believer.”²⁴ Wesley did not invent this concept on his own, in fact it did not take this name until long after his death. The concept takes the form of a list of principal ideas which Wesley believed that Christians should consider in this order. The four parts of the Quadrilateral are Scripture, Tradition, Reason and lastly Experience. Wesley does not reject the use of reason in the Christian life, he rather determines that Scripture should be the consideration which Christians make first. Wesley’s Quadrilateral offers a unique insight into the secondary issue which may have caused individuals to see John Wesley as a nonintellectual figure. This concept is John Wesley’s idea of faith as sensible experience.

Many people view John Wesley’s ideas about sensible experience as nonintellectual because these ideas posit that there are certain aspects of the Christian life which must be experienced. Wesley desired “that

faith which none can have without knowing that he hath it.”²⁵ For Wesley, faith was a physical experience and knowledge of faith was recognition of that physical feeling. The greatest example of this is what is commonly referred to as Aldersgate, which was the occasion of Wesley’s conversion. John Wesley was converted when, upon hearing someone preach on Luther’s commentary on Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, Wesley felt his heart strangely warmed. This experience was physical for Wesley, but that does not mean that he expected every Christian’s experience to be physical. In fact, as Dreyer explains, “[Wesley] was not, indeed, talking about bodily fits and convulsions. Physical manifestations might accompany a conversion, but Wesley attached little importance to them.”²⁶ The point of sensible experience is that if a Christian is to maintain a strong faith, it must be a faith that is not purely intellectual, but a faith that is experienced. In this doctrine we begin to see the influence of Locke on Wesley. Locke, like Wesley, did not believe in the concept of innate ideas, and as such relied on experience given by the senses to give knowledge. Wesley believed that human beings had a sense which allowed them to inwardly experience the “fruits of the spirit.” As Dreyer explains “what the mind knew had to come from the senses. In the case of spiritual truths, however, the physical senses were inadequate. For the perception of spiritual truths, spiritual senses were required.”²⁷ For Wesley, human beings have a set of senses which allow them to affirm their faith in a sensible way. This is not ancillary to his theology it is necessary, as “Wesley supposed that by the very nature of the thing the assurance of the pardon had to precede the believer’s knowledge and confidence.”²⁸ This in itself seems like a nonintellectual idea. If faith must be experienced in order to exist, then it seems that the senses determine truth in Wesley’s theology. However, this is not true. Once again, Wesley’s Quadrilateral applies. The experience of faith did not, for Wesley, overwhelm that which is revealed in scripture. In fact, all of the experiences of faith had to be compared to inspired writings. Dreyer emphasizes the disconnect between Wesley’s sensible experience and mystic theology saying that Wesley “never encouraged the believer to transcend his human senses and attempt to lose himself in some ineffable union with God.”²⁹ For Wesley, all things in the Christian experience relied on the intellectual truths which are imparted to the Christian believer in revealed Scripture. As this essay noted before, this emphasis on the senses being the source of knowledge, along with the use of language of sensation

reveals in part the influence of Locke on Wesley's philosophy. In order to prove this, however, we must directly connect Wesley's use of this language of sensation with Locke.

At this point in the paper, it has been discussed how John Wesley's insistence upon certain teachings have been misconstrued as nonintellectual, specifically in reference to his conception of sensible experience. However, the paper has yet to discuss how John Wesley came to these conclusions. As James Pedlar points out, "John Wesley studied at Oxford during a time when John Locke's empiricist epistemology was gaining influence."¹⁰ John Wesley's early theology is heavily influenced by the ideas of John Locke. We can see this in the vocabulary that he uses to discuss his ideas of sense experiences. As Pedlar notes: "although Wesley sees the experience of the Spirit as beyond explanation, his commitments to empiricism do in fact influence the particular way in which he speaks of the spiritual senses, and the way he attempts to integrate his account of theological knowledge with his empiricism."¹¹ Pedlar argues that we can trace a direct connection between Wesley's ideas of sensible experience and his empiricism, which we can then trace back to the Lockean tradition. This connection is one of the chief ideas of Richard Brantley's *Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism* which will be explored later in the paper. First, however, we must explore one of the individual examples that Pedlar gives in his paper. Pedlar argues that "it becomes clear that Wesley is drawing on his empirical account of natural knowledge as an analogy to describe something which he considers to be beyond explanation. While strongly asserting the *reality* of God's communication to humans in the experience of the Spirit, Wesley is reticent to attempt any explanation of the *manner* of such communication."¹² For Pedlar, this reluctance to explain the manner of the communication is indicative of a connection between Locke and Wesley. Both authors are reluctant to discuss the exact method by which this type of communication occurs.

Is this convergence of language the only place where we can connect John Locke to John Wesley? Richard Brantley would argue that it is far from the only place. In fact, he argues that John Locke provided an expansive foundation for the philosophical ideas of John Wesley. The first connection that Brantley makes between Locke and Wesley is in a letter that John Wesley writes to his mother Susanna almost thirteen years before his conversion at Aldersgate. In this letter, Wesley in a roundabout way affirms Locke's ideas of faith. As Brantley notes, "That

definition of Faith which Dr. Fiddes sets down,' i.e., 'a firm persuasion built upon substantial reasons,' had been accepted by Wesley as 'the only true one'.¹³ Not only can we see the connection between Locke and Wesley in Wesley's vocabulary regarding the sensible experience of faith, we can also see it in Wesley's early ideas about what fundamentally constitutes faith. Brantley goes on to make this idea more concrete saying, "the letters to Susanna . . . seeking a Lockean means of encompassing saving and speculative faith, give reason to think that [Wesley] saw faith as compatible with the *Essay's* skeptical method."¹⁴ These letters emphasize that from a very early age the writings of John Wesley were deeply influenced by the empiricist ideas of Locke, among others. Brantley then goes on to emphasize what has already been noted by the essay, the fact that John Wesley should be fundamentally disconnected from the nonintellectual individuals who have previously espoused themselves as Methodist. As John C. Villalobos points out in his review of Brantley's book "Brantley convincingly argues that Wesley's theology is fundamentally philosophical and demonstrates Wesley's emphasis on the fusion of the institutional and experiential nature of religious conviction."¹⁵

Brantley uses this important connection between Locke and Wesley to argue for the intellectual importance of Wesley in the eighteenth century. One of the most central claims in Brantley's book is the idea that "what has not been fully addressed is the nature and extent of [Wesley's] *intellectual* influence; few, that is, have found occasion to build upon the twofold recognition of Augustine Birrell, i.e., not only that 'no single voice touched so many hearts' as Wesley's did, but also that 'no single figure influenced so many minds.'"¹⁶ For Brantley, Wesley's connection to Locke is only valuable insofar as it proves the intellectual being of Wesley. It emphasizes that individuals like Lecky, who desire to see Locke as a figure who is fundamentally nonintellectual, misunderstand the nature of the theologian that is John Wesley. Brantley's success in tracing Wesley's connection to other philosophers of the time only serves to prove Wesley's intellectual integration with the greatest minds of his day. This was not limited to Locke, but rather is also found in Wesley's interactions with Peter Browne and David Hume, among others.

In conclusion, Richard Brantley's book *Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism* sets forth an argument for the intellectual value of John Wesley. This essay seeks to, in a much shorter form, introduce readers to the concepts which are necessary to understand at a

base level the sort of argument that Brantley ends up making. The essay started off by determining why Wesley has historically been viewed as a nonintellectual figure. It then traced this sentiment back, in part, to Wesley's ideas of sensible experience in the Christian faith. It used this concept not only to reject the idea that John Wesley was a nonintellectual man, but also to connect John Wesley concretely with John Locke. The discussion of this connection led to a discussion of Brantley's work, in which he makes the connection between Locke and Wesley in order to emphasize Wesley's status as an intellectual figure in Christian history. Though it is clear that Wesley relies heavily on Locke's empiricism to shape his conceptions of faith, it is also incredibly clear that Wesley's belief in empiricism did not come lightly, rather it came as a result of serious thought, and careful consideration of revealed Scripture, church tradition, reason and experience.

NOTES

- 1 Frederick Dreyer, "Faith and Experience in the Thought of Wesley," 12.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid. Emphasis in original.
- 4 United Methodist Church, "Wesleyan Quadrilateral."
- 5 Dreyer, "Faith and Experience in the Thought of Wesley," 14-15.
- 6 Ibid., 15.
- 7 Ibid., 18.
- 8 Ibid., 18.
- 9 Ibid., 17.
- 10 James Pedlar, "Sensing the Spirit," 86.
- 11 Ibid., 89.
- 12 Ibid., 90. Emphasis in original.
- 13 Richard Brantley, "Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism," 27.
- 14 Ibid., 29.
- 15 John Villalobos, "Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism," 314.
- 16 Brantley, *Locke, Wesley and the Method of English Romanticism*, 103. Emphasis in original.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brantley, Richard E. *Locke, Wesley, and the Method of English Romanticism*. University Press of Florida, 1984.
- Dreyer, Frederick. "Faith and Experience in the Thought of John Wesley." *The American Historical Review* 88, no. 1 (1983): 12.
- Pedlar, James E. "Sensing the Spirit: Wesley's Empiricism and His Use of the Language of Spiritual Sensation." *The Asbury Journal* 67, no. 2 (2012): 85-104.
- "Wesleyan Quadrilateral - The United Methodist Church." The United Methodist Church. Accessed March 24, 2016.
- Villalobos, John C. "Locke, Wesley, and the Method of English Romanticism." *Huntingtons Library Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (Summer 1985): 313-18.

Flannery O'Connor, a devout Catholic author of the mid-20th century, addresses the value of human life in many of her works. Some of these works – namely The Violent Bear It Away, A Stroke of Good Fortune, and “Introduction to A Memoire of Mary Ann” – pertain to issues concerning the beginning and end of human life: contraception, abortion, and euthanasia. In this paper, I consider these works and their relationship to the papal encyclicals that address the same subjects: Pope Paul VI’s Humanae Vitae, and St. John Paul II’s Evangelium Vitae. I posit that O’Connor’s works, written well before either papal encyclical, provide the same theological doctrine as their papal counterparts, and are crafted in such a way as to be accessible to those who have no formal training in theological discourse.

The Encyclicals of Flannery O’Connor

Joseph Lloyd

The famous encyclical “Humanae Vitae” by Pope Paul VI concerning the “transmission of human life” as it pertains to the context of marriage was released in 1968, and marked the beginning of the age of debates concerning life at its most critical junctures: its beginning and end. This age of debates, in the Catholic world, reached a pinnacle in 1995 with St. John Paul II’s encyclical “Evangelium Vitae,” which takes on the more daunting topic of the value of human life. Flannery O’Connor, a devout Catholic author who lived just prior to the time of “Humanae Vitae,” addresses many of the same issues as these two encyclicals in her writings. I posit that Flannery O’Connor witnessed these issues in her lifetime, and subsequently demonstrated Catholic responses to them in her works well before the encyclicals were written.

The two encyclicals “Humanae Vitae” and “Evangelium Vitae” establish doctrines of the Catholic Church which cover the same truths that O’Connor revealed in her writings well before the encyclicals were published. The earlier of the two, “Humanae Vitae,” was written four years after O’Connor’s death in 1964. It encompasses contraception

and the nature of marriage in the Catholic Church, and the latter is specifically the topic which will be considered in this essay in relation to O'Connor's works. The latter of the two encyclicals, "Evangelium Vitae," is much broader in scope, and concerns human life and the value ascribed to it in modernity. The issues of abortion and euthanasia will be examined as they are laid out in "Evangelium Vitae," with relation to their iterations in O'Connor's works.

In "Humanae Vitae," Pope Paul VI attempts to explain and standardize the Church's teaching on contraception. He approaches this in a number of ways, specifically the nature of contraception and the damaging effects that it can have on a marriage and on an individual, and how reproduction factors into the question of marriage's purpose. He says that the culmination of marital love lies in child rearing: "it [marriage] contrives to go beyond [the loving interchange of husband and wife] to bring new life into being."¹ More than just the love between husband and wife existing for its own sake, marriage transcends itself (the loving union between a man and a woman) and participates in the creative act originating in God's bringing the cosmos into existence.

Because contraception is such a controversial topic, "Humanae Vitae" spawned generations of academic work with the purpose of explicating and clarifying the encyclical that addresses it. Dietrich von Hildebrand released an illuminating take on the oft-confusing phrasing found in "Humanae Vitae," not more than a year after the encyclical was published. In his essay, "The Encyclical Humanae Vitae – a Sign of Contradiction," Hildebrand attempts to refine the somewhat brusque claims made in "Humanae Vitae," particularly with regards to the place of procreation in marriage. He calls procreation a "cooperation with His divine creativity," praising the connection between "the deepest love communion, the ultimate self-donation out of love, and the creation of a new human being."² His important distinction comes between "instrumental finality" and "the principle of super abundance." If procreation were the instrumental finality of marriage, Hildebrand says, then the conjugal act simply becomes a means for procreation. He likens it, quite aptly, to the relation between a knife and chopped vegetables. In instrumental finality, "the being which is considered as a means is in its meaning and value completely dependent upon the end, whereas in superabundant finality, it has a meaning and value independently of the end to which it leads."³ Procreation is meant to be understood as the superabundant finality of the marital act, not the instrumental end.

The marital act itself has “meaning and value.” The clarification of the role of procreation with respect to a marital union, however, does not come close to resolving the issues surrounding the Church’s doctrine on contraception.

The issue with controversial topics is that dissent occurs, and division can result. John C. Ford, in *The Teaching of Humanae Vitae: A Defense*, recognizes the possibility of division in the Church and warns against the dangers of it. Written six years before “*Evangelium Vitae*,” Ford recognizes the issues that are emerging within the Church with regard to human life, and his writing indicates that there was widespread discussion of these issues before the encyclical was released. Ford says that there is simply no room for dissent from the Church’s doctrine on contraception because it is “a matter of faith.”⁴ Ford sees that such dissention is dangerous, because “the morality of contraception cannot be isolated from the whole set of moral issues concerning sex, marriage, and innocent life,” all of which are topics covered in St. John Paul II’s massive encyclical “*Evangelium Vitae*.”⁵ Ford even outlines a similar progression of moral degradation to this encyclical, saying that “virtually every theologian who dissents from the Church’s teaching on contraception also rejects other relevant moral absolutes and so asserts that it is *sometimes* morally acceptable . . . to kill the innocent (especially the unborn).”⁶ Ford understands that issues concerning life are a slippery slope, and that making concessions on something that appears innocuous can have extremely damaging results over time.

In 1991, four years prior to the release of St. John Paul II’s iconic encyclical, Janet Smith released *Humanae Vitae, a Generation Later*. Largely a culmination of 20 years’ worth of theological and philosophical debate spurred by Paul VI’s 1968 encyclical, Smith offers an additional view of what occurs in the life of the laity, one that constitutes a more concrete account of events based in lives and not in abstract discourse. She points out that “marriages fail so often in our modern age because spouses expect and want marriage to be something it is not and cannot be.”⁷ What marriage is supposed to be, Smith says, is “a relationship instituted by God for Man’s well-being and it has a form, function, or essence that corresponds to Man’s nature.” Essentially, marriage does have a proper “form, function, or essence,” all three of which Smith implies can be found in the teaching of the Church. The failure of contemporary marriages is a failure to adhere to the doctrine of the Church.

Coming at long last to the monumental encyclical written in 1995 by Pope Saint John Paul II, the most important aspect to note about the work is the natural progression that John Paul II claims exists between abortion, euthanasia, and finally, the loss of any sense of the value of human life. Nearly 20 years have passed since the *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision that made abortion legal in the U.S. As such, abortion is discussed at length in this work. What it all boils down to, though, is the fact that when it comes to abortion, so much is concealed about the heinous act by polite words: “Especially in the case of abortion there is a widespread use of ambiguous terminology, such as ‘interruption of pregnancy,’ which tends to hide abortion’s true nature and to attenuate its seriousness in public opinion.”⁸ Abortion is, as far as the Church is concerned, a violation of the fifth commandment, ‘Thou shalt not kill.’ So many issues arise as a result of people denying this commandment. If the fetus is not a person, then it is not a sin to kill it. Much of “*Evangelium Vitae*” is then concerned with countering such claims with arguments based in truths other than the fifth commandment.

The next issue pertains to euthanasia. Euthanasia is addressed in “*Evangelium Vitae*” primarily as an assumption that suffering is the ultimate evil in this world which must be avoided at any cost, even through killing: “Euthanasia in the strict sense is understood to be an action or omission which of itself and by intention causes death, with the purpose of eliminating all suffering.”⁹ Euthanasia can be carried out under the guise of goodwill – what it actually indicates is a disturbing misunderstanding of the role of suffering in the world. In addition, one must not assume that the alleviation of suffering arises from the euthanizing of the sufferer. For example, an elderly parent could cause financial and emotional suffering on the part of the child. The child may then alleviate their own suffering by eliminating its source.

Beyond this question of suffering comes the mass slaughter of innocents. It may seem like a bit of a leap, but the connection between the two – suffering and the mass slaughter of innocents – stems from the same misunderstanding of suffering. John Paul II seeks to answer Cain’s question to God,

‘Am I my brother’s keeper?’ . . . If the promotion of self is understood in terms of absolute autonomy, people inevitably reach the point of rejecting one another. Everyone else is considered an enemy

from whom one has to defend oneself. Thus society becomes a mass of individuals placed side by side without any mutual bonds.¹⁰

This mindset results from the allowance of abortion and euthanasia. They permit a disregard for the value of human life.

There is one glaring problem that can occur with the publishing of dense theological works such as these encyclicals. Their intended audience is, truly, the Church as a whole; the doctrine established in encyclicals is meant to apply universally to the Church. The term “universal application” implies that the encyclical is meant to be believed and practiced by the Church, which requires an understanding of the text. Blaney and Zompetti raise concerns about the opacity of encyclicals in their work *The Rhetoric of Pope John Paul II*. They say that “a problem with encyclicals is that few outside of the Church hierarchy are expected to decipher them,” and that the laity have a tendency to read summaries or commentaries on the works in order to “find the gist” of them. Because of this tendency, they say, much of the laity leaves the encyclicals “on the shelves.”¹¹ Blaney and Zompetti attribute this issue to two main problems. First, the encyclicals are written under the assumption that their primary readers will be bishops and theologians. Second, “most readers have not acquired a specialized literacy for understanding the peculiar discursive nature of the encyclical.”¹²

Now is the point at which Flannery O'Connor comes into play. She saw, in her time, the same issues addressed by these two encyclicals. Her response to them in her works, her own ‘encyclicals,’ coincides with the doctrines established by “*Humanae Vitae*” and “*Evangelium Vitae*,” and her works are written well before either of the encyclicals, and in a manner that is much more accessible than the papal encyclicals. O'Connor’s response is a wholly Catholic one, and the fact that she responds with the same underlying teaching as the encyclicals indicates the universality of the truth revealed by them. Part of her accessibility results from the fact that O'Connor’s stories lie between writing as “an autobiographical exercise” and writing “without reference to their public or private lives. . . . Her stories can stand on their own, presupposing no knowledge of her background or life experience.”¹³ Unlike the encyclicals, O'Connor’s stories do not require much (if any) higher education in theological deictic discourse, and are thus easily accessible to a wider audience than the encyclicals.

In *The Violent Bear It Away*, O'Connor addresses the purpose of marriage, abortion, euthanasia, and the value of life. It is by far the most all-encompassing work when it comes to issues of life. In O'Connor's story, all of these issues center around the dim-witted Bishop. There are the questions of Bishop as the product of Rayber's marriage, whether Bishop should have been aborted, whether Bishop would be better off dead, and whether any of these questions actually matter, or if the questions are moot because of the dearth of value to his life. Bishop plays a complicated role as the result of a marriage, because his parents' marriage ended in divorce. The union between them, the union of love, is broken, and thus there is a distorted view of love in Rayber's household. This view further stems from Rayber's repeated attempts to reject the love of God, but that goes beyond the scope of this paper. One kind of this rejection appears in his attempts at rejecting his love of Bishop. He is repeatedly "overwhelmed by a blind senseless love for his idiot child, whom he is determined to look on as simply 'a mistake of nature.'"¹⁴ The fact that Bishop is a participation in the creative love of God, as Dietrich von Hildebrand said, means that part of Bishop's existence entails the love of God. Rayber cannot seem to be rid of Bishop, the physical manifestation of his marital love, because that marital love is a participation in God's love, which one cannot rid oneself of by one's own will. The fact that Bishop is the result of this conjugal love is also shown when Rayber tries to drown the boy. He attempts to rid himself of this burden, but is once more overwhelmed by his love for the boy and pulls him out of the water. Rayber's inability to be rid of the boy because of Bishop's relationship to God's love informs his reaction to Bishop's death. When Bishop is drowned by Tarwater, Rayber loses the one connection he had to God, and he is severed. Therefore, he feels nothing, because there is no longer any vestige of God in his life.

As Sumner Ferris so aptly puts it, "he knows immediately that Bishop has been drowned; and he realizes that he has created a hell for himself through his denial, a hell of vacuity, the awful state of the spiritual trimmer deprived equally of torment and grace."¹⁵ Hell is described in terms of a separation from God's presence. God is love, and Rayber has separated himself from God's love, thus creating this hell that Ferris describes. His realization of this sudden and final emptiness in his life overwhelms him, and he drops out of the story. The fact that this is the last time O'Connor shows Rayber to the reader hints at the relationship between God's love and existence: one either has both or neither. When

Rayber no longer has Bishop, he ceases to exist. Bishop, the physical manifestation of the conjugal love Rayber had with his wife, which was a participation in God's creative power, is gone.

O'Connor also touches on the issues of abortion and euthanasia in this same work, likewise centered around Bishop. With regard to abortion, she seems to capture quite well the argument that some people would be better off if they hadn't been born. Rayber cannot reconcile the fact that God made his son a "simpleton," and lashes out at Old Tarwater, saying that it would have been better if Bishop had never been born, telling the old man to "ask the Lord why he made him an idiot in the first place."¹⁶ Rayber cannot seem to understand that God would create such a person as Bishop whose existence, according to Rayber, is less preferable than no existence. Rayber argues that it would have been acceptable to abort Bishop, because, it seems, Rayber thinks that simpletons have no place in this world – that they simply place a burden on society. Here, Rayber is just thinking of himself. Bishop places a burden on Rayber, and Rayber thinks that he would be better off if Bishop had never been born. He disguises this desire, whether intentionally or not, behind an anger directed at God for creating what he perceives as a dysfunctional human.

Rayber's comment that Bishop would have been better off never having been born sheds a peculiar light onto the instance in which Rayber attempts to drown Bishop. Rayber attempts to drown Bishop because Bishop's existence is suffering. He does not think that Bishop is suffering on account of his existence, but rather Rayber, and more generally society, suffers because of Bishop's inadequacies. Rayber attempts to drown Bishop out of a desire to alleviate his own suffering. However, he cannot go through with the drowning because he sees a flash of what his life would be like without Bishop – without God's love – and he is once more involuntarily overwhelmed with this love and seeks help to resuscitate Bishop. O'Connor's point here seems to be that no one who recognizes the fact that everyone is created through a participation in God's love could actually go through with euthanasia. Euthanasia stems from a misunderstanding of the truth of creation.

In *A Stroke of Good Fortune*, O'Connor tackles both the issues of marriage and abortion. First, the very title of the story intimates what O'Connor thinks of pregnancy. Ruby, the main character, is told by a fortune teller that she is going to have "a long illness," but that it will end in "a stroke of good fortune."¹⁷ The long illness here, as revealed later, is

a pregnancy, and the stroke of good fortune would in turn be the child. What makes this story so fascinating is that the child, the stroke of good fortune, is looked upon by Ruby with disdain. She fails to understand that children really are the strokes of good fortune in a marriage. Her misunderstanding of the nature of marriage as outlined in “*Humanae Vitae*” betrays itself most clearly when speaking about contraception. She never explicitly says the word “contraception,” but she does say, when “accused” of being pregnant, that Bill “takes cares of that,” implying that Bill has taken measure against pregnancies.¹⁸ This exact issue is what Paul VI addresses in “*Humanae Vitae*.” A marriage that is not open to the bearing of children is not a full union, because it is not a full acceptance and offering between partners. All is offered and received except fertility, or the openness to children. As such, Ruby and Bill’s marriage is a dubious one. For them, a child is not the product of the ultimate union of two persons participating in the creative power of God; it is a nuisance. Her reaction to Hartley hurtling up the staircase is evidence enough of this perspective. Moreover, Ruby does not desire the suffering of pregnancy, childbirth, and raising a child. For Ruby, this suffering is a bad thing, and she wishes to avoid it at all costs. When walking up the stairs, she even notes a “pain in her stomach,” and this is all she views child-rearing as: a pain.¹⁹ This misunderstanding of suffering, according to O’Connor, leads to contraception, abortion, and (though not in this particular instance) euthanasia.

O’Connor clearly outlines the effects of this misunderstanding of suffering in her “Introduction to a Memoire of Mary Ann:”

In the absence of this faith now, we govern by tenderness. It is a tenderness which, long since cut off from the person of Christ, is wrapped in theory. When tenderness is detached from the source of tenderness, its logical outcome is terror. It ends in forced labor camps and in the fumes of the gas chambers.²⁰

According to O’Connor, modernity’s solution to the problem of evil in the world is the elimination of suffering, and that suffering is taken to be the evil itself. The elimination of suffering is the tenderness of which she speaks. Tenderness cut off from the person of Christ is an incomplete understanding of suffering as it exists in the world – an ignorance of Christ’s own suffering. O’Connor says in this introduction

that the ultimate act of a Christian is a preparation for death in Christ.²¹ For Mary Ann, this preparation took the form of suffering caused by her terminal illness. Mary Ann's preparation would not have occurred if she had been euthanized as soon as she was diagnosed as terminal. O'Connor believes that the majority of her contemporaries would have said that Mary Ann didn't deserve to suffer, and that she would have been better off not going through that. O'Connor's argument is not that Mary Ann's suffering was a good thing in and of itself; rather, she argues that just as God uses art in His own way, so an artist should do his best to create something that is good. Attempting to ascribe meaning to a piece of art while creating it is beyond the capabilities of man, and the same is true of suffering. All that can be done, according to O'Connor, is to remember that all suffering derives from the suffering of Christ on the cross, and any misunderstanding about this ultimate context of all suffering can have dire consequences when it comes to matters of human life.

O'Connor says herself that she is unapologetically Catholic, and that all of her works ought to be read in light of her faith:

I see from the standpoint of Christian Orthodox. this means that for me the meaning of life is centered in our Redemption by Christ and that what I see in the world I see in its relation to that. I don't think that this is a position that can be taken halfway or one that is particularly easy in these times to make transparent in fiction.²²

All the aforementioned instances in O'Connor's works must be read, therefore, in light of the teaching of the Church on matters of human life. O'Connor came to the same conclusions and saw the same answers that the papal authorities saw. She managed to accomplish with her fiction what it took the cardinals and priests in Rome decades to do: provide for Catholics a firm response to the complex atrocities being committed in the modern world. Moreover, her response is more accessible than the encyclical letters published later. This accessibility suggests that for some issues, it is possible for Catholic laity to reach appropriate conclusions that the Catholic Church may take a rather long time to explore and verify.

NOTES

- 1 Pope Paul VI, "Humanæ Vitæ," I.9.
- 2 Dietrich Von Hildebrand, *Humanæ Vitæ – a Sign of Contradiction*, 29.
- 3 Ibid., 30.
- 4 John C. Ford, *Humanæ Vitæ: A Defense*, 21.
- 5 Ibid., 21
- 6 Ibid., 22. Emphasis in original.
- 7 Janet Smith, *Humanæ Vitæ, a Generation Later*, 38.
- 8 Pope John Paull II, *Evangelium Vitæ*, 3.58.
- 9 Ibid., 3.65.
- 10 Ibid., 1.20.
- 11 Joseph R. Blaney and Joseph P. Zompetti, *The Rhetoric of Pope John Paull II*, 235.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Lorine M. Getz, *Flannery O'Connor, Literary Theologian*, 28.
- 14 Robert Drake, *Flannery O'Connor*, 34.
- 15 Sumner Ferris, "The Outside and the Inside," 54.
- 16 Flannery O'Connor, *The Collected Works*, 351.
- 17 Ibid., 185.
- 18 Ibid., 193.
- 19 Ibid., 190.
- 20 Ibid., 830.
- 21 Ibid., 828.
- 22 Flannery O'Connor, "The Fiction Writer and His Country," 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blaney, Joseph R., and Joseph P. Zompetti, eds. *The Rhetoric of Pope John Paul II*. Lexington Studies in Political Communication. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009.
- Drake, Robert. *Flannery O'Connor: A Critical Essay*. Eerdmans, 1966.
- Ferris, Sumner J. "The Outside and the Inside. Flannery O'Connor's *The Violent Bear It Away*." In *The Critical Response to Flannery O'Connor*. Critical Responses in Arts and Letters, no. 43. Edited by Robillard, Douglas. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.
- Ford, John C., ed. *The Teaching of Humanae Vitae: A Defense*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988.
- Getz, Lorine M. *Flannery O'Connor, Literary Theologian: The Habits and Discipline of Being*. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 2000.
- Hildebrand, Dietrich Von. *The Encyclical Humanae Vitae - a Sign of Contradiction: An Essay on Birth Control and Catholic Conscience*. Franciscan Herald Press, 1969.
- O'Connor, Flannery. *Collected Works*. The Library of America 39. New York, NY: Library of America: Distributed to the trade in the U.S. and Canada by Viking Press, 1988.
- O'Connor, Flannery. "The Fiction Writer and His Country" *The Living Novel: A Symposium*, ed. Granville Hicks, MacMillan. 1957.

Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, Encyclical letter on the regulation of birth, Vatican Website, July 25, 1968, http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae.html

Smith, Janet E. *Humanae Vitae, a Generation Later*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

St. John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, Encyclical letter on the value and inviolability of human life, Vatican Website, March 25, 1995, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031995_evangelium-vitae.html

In Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, the character of Wagner, Faustus' student and servant, is a minor figure who runs the magician's errands and occasionally quarrels comically with other characters. Nevertheless, Marlowe uses this character to prompt the audience to reflect on their own complicity in Faustus' evil. As a surrogate for the chorus, for the audience, and for Faustus himself, Wagner reveals that any human being—including, indeed especially, the audience of a play such as Doctor Faustus—is prone to fall into corruption.

Wagner, the Audience, and the Universality of Evil in *Doctor Faustus*

Jamie Wheeler

Wagner, student and servant to the eponymous magician of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, can turn his hand to anything. As Faustus' servant, his activities vary from carrying messages for his master to hiring his own servant, whom he treats with a Faustian arrogance. In a sense, his function in the construction of the play is similar: Wagner is a secondary character in a play whose protagonist is "remarkably lonely," yet he contributes significantly to the play's development of its themes.^{1 2} Wagner's position in the narrative initially invites the audience's sympathy—or at least fellow-feeling for a harassed and commonplace character—but when he finds himself in his own position of power, his cruel behavior echoes that of Faustus. Marlowe thus challenges the audience's complicity, not simply in Faustus' deeds, but in all evil. As a surrogate for the chorus, for the audience, and for Faustus himself, Wagner's characterization provides a way for Marlowe to repeat and universalize his portrait of evil.

Doctor Faustus, first performed in the early 1590s and printed (in two different forms known as the *A* and *B* texts) in 1604 and 1616, is in fact based on a much older German legend about Faust, an ambitious university professor who makes a deal with the devil. In Marlowe's version, a character called the Chorus introduces and summarizes the play (Prologue/Chorus 1), and then Faustus appears. He

talks about his ambition, and we also meet his overworked student-servant, Wagner. Dissatisfied with the abilities he has attained through study, Faustus promises his soul for the power of magic, which he will have for twenty-four years, at the end of which he will be damned. With his new power, and with the demon Mephistopheles as his servant, he plans to do magnificent works and become the ruler of the world. Mephistopheles shows him a series of marvelous sights, including a pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins, at which Faustus is impressed rather than alarmed. Meanwhile Wagner, who has been reading some of his master's books of magic, hires a servant of his own, whom he treats badly. The servant Wagner has a brief soliloquy, explaining that Faustus and Mephistopheles are on their way to Rome to play tricks on the Pope with magic (Chorus 2), which they do. The Chorus appears again to tell us that Faustus is coming home to Germany to perform for the Holy Roman Emperor (Chorus 3), and again he does so. Faustus does not look very impressive in these scenes; he who wanted to become some kind of world-dominating necromancer is playing practical jokes and showing off spirits that look like famous historical figures. He does several other small shows for various people, in the midst of which Wagner comes back and tells the audience that he thinks Faustus may expect to die soon, although the scholar is presently feasting merrily (Chorus 4). Throughout, Faustus makes some attempts to repent, but never seems to believe that he is truly capable of doing so. When the time is up, he is dragged away to hell by devils, despite all his pleas, and the Chorus appears once more to recapitulate the tragic arc of his career (Epilogue/Chorus 5). *Doctor Faustus* is famous for the force and impact of its rhetoric, especially in the soliloquies and long speeches by Faustus, by Mephistopheles, and by the Chorus.

The Chorus and similar devices fill an interesting place in narrative theory, which has been described using some useful terminological distinctions. Literary critics distinguish between “diegetic” and “mimetic” narratives; in mimetic narratives, the events of the narrative are represented directly, while in diegetic narratives, they are mediated through a narrator.³ Most plays are mimetic, as Plato observed when he first coined the term.⁴ Greek choruses remained strictly within the realm of mimesis; even though their main function was to comment on rather than participate in the action, they were characters within the story, and therefore mimetic. Later development of the chorus in Renaissance drama, although based on Greek models, began to blur the line between

diegesis and mimesis. This trend existed before *Doctor Faustus*—Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton’s 1561 play *Gorboduc* marks the beginning of a shift away from the Greek-style chorus, and Thomas Kyd’s roughly contemporary *Spanish Tragedy* even has a character who becomes a chorus.⁵ Yet it is especially exemplified by *Doctor Faustus*’ character called “Chorus.” This figure does not observe the actions it comments on; rather, it narrates them.⁶ In its first speech, the Chorus carries the story from the protagonist’s birth—“Now is he born”—to the point where he appears on the scene, when the Chorus exits and Faustus comes on stage, with the parting line “And this the man that in his study sits” signaling a change to mimetic direct representation (that is, the portrayal of Faustus by an actor pretending to be him, rather than someone talking about him).⁷

In addition to breaking the boundary between diegesis and mimesis, the Chorus breaks the so-called fourth wall. The convention of the fourth wall was never strictly observed in Elizabethan theatre—partially due to the commonness of chorus-type characters—but normal characters do not typically speak directly to the audience or acknowledge openly that they are in a work of theatre. The exceptions are fools, choruses, and characters fulfilling chorus-type functions (such as requesting applause at a work’s conclusion). These characters often used their special position not only to speak directly to the audience, but also to speak directly for the author; in fact, this was a traditional function of the character called the Prologue, a type of chorus whose role was simply to deliver the prologue.⁸ Understanding these typical functions of choruses is essential background to Marlowe’s subversion of choric expectations by giving part of the chorus role to a minor character.

Doctor Faustus is, one would suppose, sufficiently supplied with a single chorus, yet Marlowe gives the second and fourth choric speeches to Wagner, a character within the play. Mark Thornton Burnett, one of surprisingly few critics who have seriously examined Wagner’s role, notes that Wagner may have delivered all of the Chorus’s speeches in early productions of the play, and that the bifurcation of the Chorus and Wagner came later.⁹ Scholar Sarah Dewar-Watson notes that the division of the two was never fully complete, as Wagner retains some degree of identification with the Chorus.¹⁰ Burnett is clear that, although not delivered by the figure named Chorus, the lines in Chorus 2 do serve a choric function; he writes simply that “Wagner delivers the second chorus.”¹¹ Despite delivering a choric speech, Wagner retains his indi-

viduality; for instance, he does not have an omniscient narrator's knowledge of Faustus' plans and must qualify his speech with "as I guess."¹² Nevertheless, he performs the function of a chorus because his speech advances the plot, like the Chorus-character's Prologue and Chorus 3, and because he addresses himself directly to the audience.

Chorus 4 is more clearly a speech that Wagner alone, and no impersonal narrator, could give. He announces, "I think my master means to die shortly," and speculates on Faustus' behavior with an uncertain "methinks."¹³ Despite this, I consider Chorus 4 a true choric speech (as do the *Norton* editors). For one thing, this leads to a pleasing ring composition, as the Chorus-character delivers the Prologue, Chorus 3, and the Epilogue, alternating with Wagner's delivery of Chorus 2 and Chorus 4. Also, Chorus 4 is clearly of the same type as Chorus 2, a speech that, as it were, updates the audience on Faustus' recent doings and current plans. The intrusion of Wagner's own speculation only confirms that the lines are being further blurred between Wagner and the chorus-archetype whose place he is temporarily taking. Wagner becomes, in fact, a surrogate for the Chorus, and this leads to a certain amount of identification between him and the Chorus. As such, there is an expectation that, like a typical chorus, he will in some sense speak for the author—an expectation that, as I shall demonstrate, Marlowe subverts.

In addition to his role standing in for the chorus, Wagner's initial appearance invites the audience's sympathy, or at least some degree of fellow-feeling. He is no hero, but he seems to be a comic rogue who will, surely, do no real harm. His first appearance on stage involves only one line: "I will, sir," as he receives Faustus' command to carry a message to the magicians Cornelius and Valdes.¹⁴ There is no indication that Wagner knows Faustus' business with his dangerous friends, and by comparison with the frighteningly cynical and hubristic soliloquy we have just heard from the would-be necromancer, the colorless student-servant seems reassuringly innocent. He has more lines in the next scene, when he meets two of Faustus' friends who are worried about the scholar's possible interest in magic, but he is still treated as a subservient "boy," contemptuously addressed as "sirra."¹⁵ He has little power in these scenes, a characteristic which continues to provide a refreshing contrast to Faustus' nightmarish quest for superhuman power. Additionally, in Scene 2 his verbal quiddities put him in the place of a fool. His pseudo-learned riddles and deliberately obstructive answers are typical of Elizabethan stage fools and "comic relief" characters such

as the Fool in *King Lear*, Feste in *Twelfth Night*, and even the Porter in *Macbeth*—often appealing characters with whom the audience can identify in the midst of events very far removed from normal human experience. Wagner’s fool-like behavior invites similar audience identification in this scene.

A more fundamental reason for the audience’s potential identification with Wagner is that, in the early scenes, he is himself an audience to Faustus’ new studies, as he reveals in his choral speeches. According to critic Brian Walsh, Elizabethan playgoers were a “heterogeneous” collection, but Marlowe’s work displays a particular ability to bring different kinds of people together as a unitary audience who would “participate *en masse*” in the dramatic moment, via their shared attention to the play itself.¹⁶ Since spectators were beginning to conceptualize themselves as part of a distinct body called the audience, they would naturally respond with a certain fellow-feeling for Wagner, since, like him, they were observing and marveling at Faustus’ deeds. Although Wagner is not present while Faustus works the magic that we watch, he has apparently observed other acts of sorcery. Like Marlowe’s audience, Wagner initially shows ambiguity toward Faustus’ behavior.¹⁷ In Chorus 2 he refers to his master in terms such as “Learned Faustus,” “Olympus’ top,” and “a chariot burning bright” that seem to glorify his master’s daring, even as the same terms hint at reservations about his hubris.¹⁸ By Chorus 4, Faustus’ desperation and the ultimate futility of his skills have become more evident, and the audience, observing this, is increasingly speculating on his possible fate. Wagner’s similar observations have led him to the same course of thought; he speculates in Chorus 4 on whether Faustus’ “death [is] near” and how his impending death reconciles with his apparent merriment.¹⁹ Thus, Marlowe repeatedly presents Wagner as a sort of liaison between Faustus and the audience, a comic-relief figure who fulfills an audience-like performative role of observation and speculation.

Wagner’s biggest scene, the only one other than his choric appearances in which he is not merely there for Faustus’ convenience, is Scene 4, in which he becomes a sort of Faustus figure himself. Wagner blurs the lines between audience and play and, potentially, draws the spectators into complicity with the events of the plot. In this scene, he has clearly learned from his master; he retains the incessant wordplay and hyper-learned humor of the comic rogue he appears to be, but he is no longer the harassed servant being appealingly cheeky to his betters.

Instead, he stands in a position of power over the unfortunate Clown, a lower-class man Wagner is hiring as his own servant. Wagner immediately abuses his position, addressing the Clown as “sirra boy.”²⁰ Just as the scholars previously addressed Wagner slightly, Wagner uses a term so scornful that the Clown, as an adult man, objects to it.²¹ The student-servant then begins to perform roles that he has learned from watching Faustus and Mephistopheles. Wagner mimics Faustus not only in the arrogance of his behavior to the Clown—from the opening “Sirra boy” to the concluding “Villain, call me Master Wagner”—but also in the actual and cruel practice of magic, as he calls two devils to frighten the hapless Clown.²² He also mimics Mephistopheles in that he passes on the corruption he has received: he suggests that the Clown “would give his soul to the devil for a shoulder of mutton” and offers to teach his new servant shapeshifting, just as Mephistopheles purchases Faustus’ soul and gives him magic powers.²³ This development is disconcerting, even frightening, for the audience. Wagner is supposed to be an audience surrogate (and, later, an author surrogate in his role as chorus), one who is in some sense aware of the theatricality of what he is seeing. If, from this role as spectator to Faustus, he becomes an imitator of Faustus, what does this say about the play’s spectators themselves, not only watching but prepared to applaud?

Insofar as Wagner becomes identified with Faustus, then, the audience grows uncomfortable. They must withdraw their previous identification with Wagner as they realize that, in Marlowe’s world, to be an attentive spectator of evil is all too easy a way to learn that evil. The Elizabethan audience who watched *Doctor Faustus* would have been, even if subconsciously, concerned about the possibility of their own complicity in the events depicted in their entertainment. This concern comes to the surface in contemporary anecdotes about performances of *Doctor Faustus* in which extra devils appeared, figures that the retailers of these anecdotes supposed were genuine demons summoned by invocations that were a little too real.²⁴ As scholar Genevieve Guenther argues, the early moderns understood magic rituals as themselves a kind of performance that attracted demons; thus, it was hard to distinguish between an actual magic performance and a performance of such a performance.²⁵ Guenther draws a connection between this concept and spectators’ specific fears “that their own interest in Faustus’ magic was theologically dangerous.”²⁶ Faustus’ sorcery is always perilously close to the real world—especially since Wagner, minor character that he is, is an

audience figure whose observation of the magician has exactly the corrupting results the audience might fear for themselves. Guenther notes that the play invites its spectators to identify with Faustus himself in his fascination with the spectacles Mephistopheles presents and his longing to see more; this identification might still be resisted by some spectators, perhaps those particularly aware of theatricality or particularly repulsed by Faustus.²⁷ Even these, however, might well have accepted Wagner as a fairly harmless and funny minor character possessing nothing more than the careless cruelty of the typical theatrical clown. Seeing him suddenly emerge as a cruel, overbearing sorcerer—exhibiting, in his own inferior sphere, all the “aspiring pride and insolence” of Faustus or the devil himself—would have tended to confirm the audience’s worst fears about the dangers of being a complacent spectator of sorcery.²⁸

It is not only the audience’s spectator status towards Faustus’ magic at which Marlowe brings them to shudder. Wagner’s corruption also reveals a universal evil, one that is by no means limited to power-hungry scholars. The Augustinian concept of evil as *privatio boni* (literally “the privation of good”) may underlie Marlowe’s portrayal of evil. Philosopher René Van Woudenberg explains the *privatio boni* theory as “the claim that evil is *not a positive substance*... but a lack of a certain property,” just as darkness is the absence of light or sickness the absence of health.²⁹ This idea implies that different kinds of evil arise from the absence of different kinds of good, so that cowardice is the absence of courage or hatred the absence of charity. Wagner’s arrogance and cruelty is certainly parallel to that of Faustus and Mephistopheles, but it is also different in tone: Wagner’s rowdy devils retain a more comic tone than the plottings of Faustus. Wagner remains a comic character even in his jarring cruelty, just as Faustus remains a tragic hero, however wicked. Marlowe illustrates that evil is not limited to one kind of person; the abuse of Wagner’s comedic energy is just as much a *privatio boni* as the abuse of Faustus’ intellectual powers. Indeed, in relation to *The Jew of Malta*, another play by Marlowe, author and critic Erich Segal suggests that Marlowe’s comedy is rooted in *Schadenfreude*, the feeling of delight at others’ misfortunes.³⁰ The comic scenes’ exposition of evil is, perhaps, the reason they are simultaneously both funny and unsettling. This hint at the universality of evil not only suggests what view of evil Marlowe may be using, it also deepens the moral urgency of the play for the audience. Marlowe makes sure they understand that, even if they could never be a Faustus, there is a possible corruption that awaits them.

Wagner's last speech presages Faustus' death, after which Wagner is never heard from again; just as he depends on Faustus economically as a servant and performatively as an imitator, he apparently also depends on him for his relevance to the play. His disappearance is itself one of the alarming things about his story; we simply do not know what happens to him. Was he, unlike Faustus, able to repent of his cruelty and devil-summoning? Was he caught up in his master's downfall, or will he live out his life, and if so on what terms? We do not know. Wagner is a minor character, and the play simply drops him. Perhaps the question of what happens to Wagner is too intimately bound up with the question of what happens to the audience to admit of a single answer.

The final speech in the play, then, is given by the official Chorus, the one that Wagner briefly supplanted. This returning figure gestures again toward *privatio boni*, describing Faustus as a "branch that might have grown full straight [*sic.*]" but did not.³¹ Then, in case the connection was not clear enough, the Chorus points the story's moral directly at the audience: "Regard his hellish fall," and learn "only to wonder at" rather than practice "unlawful things."³² The Chorus seems truly to be what Wagner only made a pretense of being, an actual spokesman for the author, insofar as the author's intention is at all clear. The Chorus' presence here in place of its sometime substitute Wagner itself serves as a subtle reference to Wagner's corruption, a foil and parallel to that of Faustus, and thus, finally, warns the audience—high and low, learned and ignorant—against the dangerous seduction of power.

Although a minor character, Wagner is important to understanding how *Doctor Faustus* works. Wagner initially wins the spectators' sympathy by appearing to be an audience stand-in, someone through whose eyes they, too, can watch Faustus' story unfold. But Wagner then reveals a disturbing streak of cruelty and a knowledge of magic; he has progressed from watching Faustus to imitating him, the very progression that some early modern audience members worried might happen to them. He also acts as a kind of chorus, but a chorus who cannot be trusted to give a true interpretation of events, forcing the spectators to pay attention to the theatricality of the performance and therefore to question their own investment in watching Faustus' wicked proceedings. The story of Wagner in *Doctor Faustus* guides the play's socially and economically varied audience to realize that, however unlike Faustus they may be in other ways, within them also lies the potential to go wrong.

Marlowe suggests that the corruption of a servant—and therefore, by implication, that of a seamstress, a printer, a brewer, a merchant, or a countess—is just as real, just as much the loss of a soul, as the corruption of a brilliant scholar like Faustus.

NOTES

- ¹ Laurie Maguire and Alexandra Thostrup, *Marlowe and Character*, 45.
- ² Wagner chiefly appears in the comic scenes, whose authorship has been questioned. However, the comic scenes are indispensable to any coherent reading of *Doctor Faustus*, as otherwise differing critics such as Cleanth Brooks and Ruth Stevenson agree. Therefore, I assume that either the comic scenes are Marlovian or their author had an excellent understanding of Marlowe's intentions; for brevity I refer to them as written by Marlowe.
- ³ Wolf Schmid, *Narratology*, 6-7.
- ⁴ Plato, *Republic*, 394b.
- ⁵ Sarah Dewar-Watson, "Marlowe's Dramatic Form," 50, 53.
- ⁶ I refer to the Chorus as "it" rather than "he" to reflect that this character is not a human within the world of the play, but an entity existing solely for the purpose of narration; Dewar-Watson notes that "if any identity is attributed to the Chorus, it is as the acting troupe performing the play" ("Marlowe's Dramatic Form" 54). This usage also emphasizes the difference between the impersonal Chorus and the decidedly personal Wagner.
- ⁷ Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, Prologue 11-28.
- ⁸ Ruth Lunney, *Marlowe and Popular Tradition*, 108.
- ⁹ Mark Thornton Burnett, "Faustus and the Chorus," 39.
- ¹⁰ Dewar-Watson, "Marlowe's Dramatic Form," 53.
- ¹¹ Burnett, "Faustus and the Chorus," 35.
- ¹² Marlowe, *Faustus*, Chorus 2.8.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, Chorus 4.1, 3.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.67.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.3-4.
- ¹⁶ Brian Walsh, "Marlowe and the Elizabethan Audience," 76-77.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 71.
- ¹⁸ Marlowe, *Faustus*, Chorus 2.1, 4-5.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.3.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.1.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 4.1-3.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 4.1, 69, 43-44.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 4.8, 58-59.
- ²⁴ Genevieve Guenther, "Why Devils Came," 46.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 47-48.

- 26 Ibid., 48.
27 Ibid., 48-49.
28 Marlowe, *Faustus*, 3.66.
29 René Van Woudenberg, "History of Theodicy," 179.
30 Eric Segal, "*Schade and Freude*," 277.
31 Marlowe, *Faustus*, Epilogue 1.
32 Ibid., 4-6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartels, Emily C., and Emma Smith, editors. *Christopher Marlowe in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Brooks, Cleanth. "The Unity of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*." In *Marlowe: Doctor Faustus: A Casebook*, edited by John Jump, 208-211. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Doctor Faustus and the Form and Function of the Chorus: Marlowe's Beginnings and Endings." *CIEFL Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (1985): 33-45.
- Dewar-Watson, Sarah. "Marlowe's Dramatic Form." In Bartels and Smith, 49-55.
- Guenther, Genevieve. "Why Devils Came When Faustus Called Them." *Modern Philology* 109, no. 1 (2011): 46-70. Accessed 1 October 2016. search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2012296131&site=ehost-live&scope=site.
- Lunney, Ruth. *Marlowe and the Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama Before 1595*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Maguire, Laurie, and Alexandra Thostrup. "Marlowe and Character." In Bartels and Smith, 39-48.
- Plato. *The Republic*, trans. Allan Bloom. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Segal, Erich. "Marlowe: *Schade and Freude*," in *The Death of Comedy*, 273-285. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Schmid, Wolf. *Narratology: An Introduction*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Stevenson, Ruth. "The Comic Core of Both A- and B-Editions of *Doctor Faustus*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 53, no. 2 (2013): 401ff. Accessed 1 October 2016. go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&u=txshradc2488&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CA335842893&it=r&asid=160fc820c6642d2e62b78d89b270c59e.
- Van Woudenberg, René. "A Brief History of Theodicy." In *The Blackwell Companion to the Problem of Evil*, edited by Justin P. McBrayer and Daniel Howard-Snyder. John Wiley and Sons, 2013. Accessed 27 November 2016. site.ebrary.com/lib/baylor/detail.action?docID=10829272.
- Walsh, Brian. "Marlowe and the Elizabethan Theatre Audience." In Bartels and Smith, 68-77.

About the Authors

AMANDA CORDERO is a junior University Scholar from Friendswood, Texas, studying Literature (Great Texts and English) and Creative Writing. Her love for these disciplines stems from an innate understanding of the transformative power of narrative. Her honors thesis will be an anthology of creative nonfiction essays. Amanda currently serves as the College Council Mentor (President) of the Honors Residential College, as well as a Public Relations officer for The Pulse. She has written for other Baylor publications, most notably Focus Magazine. This year, she is working with Malorian scholar Dr. Tom Hanks in creating aural recordings of *Le Morte D'Arthur*. She is also writing a screenplay about an anti-art utopia and short fiction story about a blue whale. She enjoys volunteering at the World Hunger Relief Farm and exploring central Texas. After Baylor, she hopes to be involved in the entertainment industry, specifically in the legal or writing arenas.

JOSEPH LLOYD is a senior University Scholar from Houston, Texas, with concentrations in Biology, Classics, and Great Texts. He plans on attending medical school after going on to get an MA in Bioethics next year. His appreciation for Flannery O'Connor stemmed from two courses taken with Dr. Ralph C. Wood, who played an important role in the genesis and completion of this paper.

MATTHEW GRAFF is a senior majoring in Great Texts from El Campo, Texas. His research interests include modern literature and pastoral responses to current political issues. The paper published in this edition was written for Dr. Ralph Wood's Christian Heritage class, which greatly formed his views on the role of the church in the modern era. He has lived in Alexander Residence hall for four years and is very involved in the Honors Residential College; he is also an editor on The Pulse. When he graduates, Graff's immediate plans are to teach in a classical school. He later plans to go to seminary and be ordained as an elder in the Methodist Church.

JAMIE WHEELER is a junior University Scholar with concentrations in Classics and Renaissance/Early Modern Studies. Her interests include narrative in Latin poetry, Roman political thought, and early modern classical reception. Besides Horace, she particularly enjoys studying Virgil, Propertius, and Lucan. In her free time, she enjoys reading, crocheting, and playing the fiddle, as well as volunteering at her church, Redeemer PCA. She is proud to be a part of Baylor's Honors Residential College, where she serves on the Academic Committee. In the future, she hopes to attend graduate school in Classics and become a professor. Throughout her studies, her goal is to bring together language, literature, and history across different eras to achieve a deeper understanding of the human condition, both past and present.