

Carson- Newman Studies

Vol. X, No. 1

Fall 2002

ISSN 1081-7727

Don H. Olive, Sr.
Dean of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy
Editor

Michael E. Arrington
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Managing Editor

Carson-Newman Studies is published annually by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee. Correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, P.O. Box 71938, Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, TN 37760.

Opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors or of Carson-Newman College. Statements of fact are the responsibility of the individual contributors.

Contents

A Word from the Editors	iii
Excellence Doesn't Happen by Accident [Distinguished Faculty Award Address, August 17, 2001] James A. Coppock.	1
The Decline and Fall of the Supernatural: Peirce, Design and the Distinction between Natural and Supernatural D. Brian Austin	11
Study of the Discrimination of Same and Different in Musical Statements Marshall P. Forrester	22
"Tell me some such fiction . . . shew me examples": The Protestant "Word" and Saving Fictions Jennifer Wallace Hall	30
True to Twelfth-Century Form: Gautier d'Arras's <i>Eracle</i> David S. King	52
Will There Always Be a South? Tradition, Modernity, and Memory [Carlyle Marney Lecture, Nov. 12, 2001] Wayne Flynt	76
"Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary Revisited" [The Carlyle Marney Lecture, Sept. 13, 2001] Walter B. Shurden	90
The Feminine Potential Calvin S. Metcalf	102
From DNA to DEAN [Address at Carson-Newman College, Nov. 1, 2001] Arthur Peacocke	107

Distinguished Alumni 2001-02
Martha Cortner Pixley (C-N '31) 120
Joe E. Barnhart (C-N '53) 121
Mack F. Bingham (C-N '55) 125
Carrie Owen McConkey (C-N '92) 127

Contributors. 129

A Word from the Editors

Carson-Newman Studies represents the fact that intellectual, scholarly activity is central to this academic community. This may appear to be a strange claim for a small liberal arts institution with a professed emphasis on teaching rather than research. Closer examination of the concept of teaching, however, confirms that scholarly activity is neither unnecessary nor optional to faculty of an academic institution such as Carson-Newman College.

The quality of teaching we seek at Carson-Newman College is marked by an intellectual liveliness that results from the engagement of thinkers with the concepts of their disciplines. The best teaching is accomplished out of the overflow of masters of learning themselves. Admittedly, different styles of learning and teaching exist. But teaching out of the overflow is necessary to energize all styles. The best presentation of external ideas never produces those amazing moments of learning where the teacher and student in a classroom discover the insights that change lives. Teachers must possess their own ideas in order to be guides to and in those moments.

The content of many of the articles in this issue of *Carson-Newman Studies* is beyond the scope of baccalaureate students. But unless the teachers are and remain active at this level, their students soon know that they need only memorize what obviously the teachers have memorized. Students in such classes are never stretched, for mere memory work allows them to capsule and manage the concepts being delivered. Memorization allows the students to dodge the bullets of new ideas. They can put class notes in safe places and never have to suffer the entertainment of new ideas. Only teachers who venture into new intellectual ground can impart the courage to be educated.

In the final analysis scholarly activity is the expression of courage, for all attempts to learn, to truly learn, are threatening. Academic freedom is not always provided. But the more grievous situation prevails when academic freedom is unused because of the lack of courage on the part of faculty members to do academic work that is necessary to bring the life of the mind to their classrooms and their students. Academic freedom is not freedom for its own sake. It is the freedom

required to be an educator, one who “leads out” the best ideas. And in the process such educators model being challenged with new ideas. How much easier it is to be the authority than to be the model for continual study and growth!

So, this year’s issue, as all issues, stands as testimony to quality teachers. Scholarly papers are not the only testimonies to scholarly activity, but testimonies they are. Readers will delight in these evidences from a variety of disciplines and from a variety of teachers. The common element, however, is not far to find: an intellectual vigor that brings life to the learning experience.

Readers are encouraged to sample what goes on before quality teachers step behind their lecterns, turn on their power point presentations, or, in one case here, speak from the pulpit. The ongoing dynamic of scholarly activity is clearly what makes the difference of engagement and thus learning, which even the best of content alone cannot produce.

Don H. Olive, Editor

Michael E. Arrington, Managing Editor

Excellence Does Not Happen by Accident

[Distinguished Faculty Award Address, August 17, 2001]

James A. Coppock

[This presentation was supported by PowerPoint visuals.]

The year 2001 is a special time in the history of Carson-Newman College for many reasons. This is our sesquicentennial anniversary, 1851-2001. The College has a new administrative team. Two thousand and one is the first year of the institution-wide self-study. Additionally, the results of the recent changes in the College's relationship with the Tennessee Baptist Convention are still being assessed.

As we celebrate this important year in Carson-Newman's history, we also note that the sesquicentennial motto is "A Heritage of Faith, A Future of Excellence." The temptation is for those of us who have been part of the Carson-Newman family for many years to spend this year looking backward. This presentation, however, looks forward to "A Future of Excellence." Ultimately, the task here is to blend the leadership tool of strategic management with key strategic issues facing Carson-Newman College today.

What Is Strategic Management?

Institutional excellence is not achieved by isolated individual action. Good people with good intentions are not enough to propel an entire organization to its full potential. Instead, a future of excellence requires a clearly articulated vision and an integrated process for achieving that vision. Strategic management is a universally applicable process for aligning an institution's resources with its pursuit of a clear vision.

First, strategic management is comprehensive, for the strategic management process embraces the entire institution--its vision, mis-

sion, values, students, faculty, staff, structure, culture, finance and facilities.

Second, strategic management includes planning and implementing. In fact, strategic management must include both the creation of a strategic plan and the implementation of that plan. Unfortunately, developing the strategic plan is sometimes seen as an end in itself. On the contrary, implementation of the plan is often the hardest component to achieve and the most frequently neglected one.

Third, strategic management is a continuous process. It is not an annual retreat or material stuffed away in a bulky binder. To be effective, strategic management must be dynamic and adaptive. It must play an active role in daily life throughout the organization.

Finally, strategic management is the key tool of leadership, for, as a recent *Wall Street Journal* reported, executives rate strategic management as the most valuable of management tools. When properly employed, it acts as an umbrella under which all other organizational programs and activities are aligned and are made to function effectively.

The Five-Circle Model for Strategic Management

Someone once claimed, “All models are wrong; some are useful.” There are many good models for strategic management. Break-downs in implementation are seldom the fault of the model itself, but of the enormously difficult task of implementing any model in the real world of organizational politics and fragile egos. Some models are, however, more promising than others. The **five-circle model** [see below] is the foundation for the strategic management course at Carson-Newman and will serve as the framework for this presentation and for the vision it hopes to support.

The Leadership Circle: CEO, Team, Continuity

Effective executive leadership is essential to achieving institutional excellence. Organizations seldom advance beyond the effectiveness of their leadership. Outsiders (consultants) may contribute, but strategic management is an inside job. Ownership of this process resides squarely with the CEO, the leadership team, and the governing board whose principal role may be to ask pertinent questions at the appropriate time.

First and foremost, the **CEO** must be the vision-focused chief executive. The CEO orchestrates the key elements of the institution's performance and strives to close the gap between the current situation and the institution's potential. The CEO must work closely with the **Leadership Team** or the group of senior executives who actively participate in the strategic management process. A CEO, acting alone, can rarely plan and execute an effective strategic management process in the modern organization. Strategic leadership requires the collaboration of several key people. Effective CEOs build productive leadership teams by surrounding themselves with strong people—sometimes people stronger than themselves. As Peter Drucker insists,

The conscious function of giving vision, of setting standards, and of auditing against these standards is basically a top-management function. But it has to work within the entire management group.

While the CEO and the Leadership Team are crucial to the success of an institution, continuity may be even more crucial. **Continuity** is the provision for steadfast adherence to organizational vision and values even when the institution experiences turnover in leadership positions. The tenure of a CEO and his or her leadership team seldom survive the life of the organization's vision. The CEO and the governing board should ensure swift, appropriate transitions when turnovers occur in these positions.

The Focus Circle: Vision, Mission, Values

After the Leadership Circle, the next part of the model explores the institution's fundamental purpose. In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare speaks not only to the human condition but also to the condition of or-

ganizations when Ophelia declares, “We know what we are, but not what we may be” (4.5.60). Ophelia speaks of vision, and vision describes what an organization will look like in the future. Proverbs 29:18 reminds us that “Where there is no vision, the people perish. . . .” **Vision** is a stretch goal that is within the institution’s potential, a dream that can be realized. Ultimately, the duties of the chief executive officer are to articulate the vision, to inspire and mobilize commitment to the vision, and to institutionalize change in support of the vision.

As we consider Carson-Newman’s future, we must appreciate both our past history and our dreams. Carson-Newman College’s situation at its sesquicentennial has been shaped by decades of events planned and unplanned. One could say we have been “history pushed” to this point. Now is an opportune time to choose between those qualities from our past that we will preserve and strengthen and those that we will discard. Looking ahead, our new vision must set the direction. We can expect that our pursuit of excellence will be “pushed” by the strengths of our heritage and “pulled” by the vision of our future.

In addition to a shared vision, our **mission** must define who we are, what we do, and where we are going. The College’s mission statement may be drafted for a variety of audiences including administrators, faculty, students, parents, and donors. Its role in strategic management, however, is in serving as the critical element that links vision to objectives, strategies, and actions.

Final in the Focus Circle, **values** are the institution’s fundamental concepts and standards of behavior. Values are the guidelines that direct people’s behavior. Authentic values are ingrained in the institution’s culture and are rooted in the work itself. Once the College’s **vision, mission, and values** are absorbed into its daily culture, the foundation is in place for successful strategic management.

The Assess Circle: Competencies, Opportunities, Markets

With the Leadership and Focus Circles in place, the strategic management process can next address issues of assessment by studying (1) the internal and external situations in which the institution operates and (2) the current and potential markets. The College must first perform an internal situation analysis that deals with those factors under the influence of its leadership. It must identify **competencies** or those qualities it possesses or does well that give it a competitive advantage (e.g. campus life, “The C-N Experience,” teaching excellence, Christian commitment, strong academic programs, and small size). It must

also identify weaknesses, those traits the institution lacks or performs poorly, that put it at a disadvantage (e.g. tuition dependence and small endowment).

Next, an external situation analysis must deal with those factors that are beyond the direct control of the institution's leadership. The College should study **opportunities** that offer some advantage to the institution (e.g. favorable changes in demographics, growing interest in faith-based higher education, and the introduction of state tuition vouchers for private colleges). Also studied should be threats or external factors that impose restraints or obstacles that may jeopardize growth and performance (e.g. broad acceptance of web based education and increasing emphasis on professional programs at the expense of the liberal arts).

After accessing competencies, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, the College can then access the **market** or group of customers (students) it strives to attract and serve. An anonymous response from Carson-Newman's institutional assessment in the spring of 2001 declared, "We can't be all things to all people. We must decide who we are and whom we will serve." Carson-Newman College has a place on the wide spectrum of institutions of higher learning. We are somewhere between the traditional liberal arts college and a comprehensive university. A strategic issue is where we are today and where we desire to be in the future. In other words, do we know "who we are and whom we will serve?"

Vision, mission, and values are the principal guides, but the process becomes more focused as the institution's **market** is defined.

The Formulate Circle: Measures, Strategies, and Actions

A long held management axiom states, "What gets Measured Gets Done." Strategic **measures** are the short list of indicators used to track the essence of the institution's performance. Experience reveals that specific, measurable objectives consistently produce better results than general statements such as "We must do better." Performance is improved when the institution develops its own short list of key measures that capture the essence of its overall performance. The following indicators used by *U.S. News and World Report* in selecting the Best Colleges in America can be a useful starting point:

- academic reputation
- graduation and retention rates

- faculty resources
- student selectivity
- financial resources
- alumni giving

A strategic question for Carson-Newman is which key measures capture the essence of our pursuit of excellence?

As Carson-Newman determines the measures it will adopt in its pursuit of excellence, it must also develop **strategies** to do so. Strategies are the broad plans of action that describe how the institution will achieve its objectives. Textbooks offer long lists of strategy options such as (1) low price, (2) differentiation, and (3) focus or niche. How might these apply to Carson-Newman?

First consider the low price strategy. A low price strategy implies delivery of services similar to those provided by the competition, but at a lower price. As we saw earlier, our dependence on tuition and fees negates general application of this strategy by Carson-Newman.

Second, consider the differentiation strategy. A differentiation strategy implies that the organization offers a service that attracts buyers for reasons other than price. In our case this might be what some have described as “The Carson-Newman Experience.” Although debate continues over the meaning of “The Carson-Newman Experience,” broad opinion includes small size, individual attention, Christian atmosphere, liberal arts foundation, good teaching, and mentoring. The issue here is whether sufficient buyers will pay the required price for the experience.

Third, consider the focus or niche strategy. A focus strategy implies a narrow target market that does not appeal to everyone. Thus, if we “can’t be all things to all people,” whom will we elect to serve? For example, our niche might mean offering limited programs to families of certain income levels within our region.

The final component of the Formulate Circle is **action**. Actions are the specific initiatives that are employed to carry out strategies and to achieve objectives. Determining the specific strategic actions to implement completes the planning process. Examples of actions include additions or deletions of programs, major changes to physical facilities or technology, reallocating of resources, financial restructuring, and major staffing changes.

All actions in the strategic management process should be aligned with the institution’s vision, mission and values, competencies, opportunities, markets, measures, and strategies. Actions are the bridge between planning and implementing, for actions planned at this stage are later implemented as described in the following Executing circle.

The Executing Circle: Implementing, Evaluating, Realigning

Implementing actions requires a different mindset than does planning. Some people seem to thrive on planning while others are more comfortable with implementing. Using descriptions common to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, planners often are “intuitives” and implementers frequently are “sensors.” In short, “intuitive” planners are inclined to be more comfortable with possibilities, the big picture, and long-range implications. On the other hand, “sensing” implementers tend to be more comfortable with facts, details, and practical applications. Regardless of who performs the work, implementing is the process by which plans must be converted into action. This stage is when the bright ideas of planning require the hard work of making it happen.

As the hard work progresses, **evaluating** is the process for tracking the organization’s actual performance and comparing it to performance objectives. Evaluating continually reads the vital signs of the institution. Strategic level evaluating must, therefore, (1) monitor the performance of key measures and (2) proactively determine if issues are in need of attention.

Realigning, the final component of the Executing Circle, is the process of adjusting and correcting, when necessary, to ensure achievement of performance objectives. Realigning modifies programs and activities and adapts to changing opportunities in order to ensure institutional excellence. The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award offers clear criteria for performance excellence, revealing the importance of realigning:

A major aim is to create organizations that are flexible and responsive – changing easily to adapt to new needs and opportunities. Through their roles in developing strategy and reviewing company performance, senior leaders develop leadership and create an organization capable of adapting to changing opportunities and requirements. (20)

Clearly, flexibility and responsiveness are crucial to success. Thus, implementing is a matter of continuous evaluation, alignment, and realignment of the entire strategic management process.

What are the pitfalls of the Strategic Management Process?

Though they start with the best of intentions, most ventures into strategic management fall far short of their potential. Many fail. Therefore, institutions should be aware of familiar pitfalls that should be avoided.

First, beware the CEO who delegates strategic management to a staff member or consultant. Assistance is essential, but only in a supporting role. To be effective, the CEO must not only endorse strategic management, but he or she must own the process and live it every day.

Second, be aware that too often a small (elite) group develops the strategic plan and hands it off to others for implementation. This approach seldom works. Strategic management should be a team effort that involves planners and implementers who work together throughout the process.

Third, remember that an effective plan is the institution's road map to excellence. When important decisions are made without regard to the plan, the credibility of that plan is diminished and its effectiveness is weakened.

Finally, avoid failure to monitor and revise the process. Strategic management is a continuous process. All aspects of that process should be subject to ongoing assessment and revision. At some point, the total plan might need to be replaced.

The Five-Circle Model (a Recap) and Two Questions Everyone Can Ask

Clearly, the model can be complicated, but it can also be highly effective. Most members of the institution do not need to be concerned with the nuts and bolts of the complete model. However, every member of the institution has a stake in the success or failure of this effort, for success or failure affects us all. To be involved in the process, every member of the institution should continually ask two questions regarding the progress of the strategic management process.

1. What is Carson-Newman going to look like in the future?

This is the vision question. When most of us, including board members, administrators, faculty, staff, and others can answer this question essentially the same way, we will have a shared vision. Until

this happens, the institution will not be fully engaged in institution-wide strategic management.

2. What are our key performance measures (measures of excellence)?

Several members of the C-N family remember our vision statement from 1987. It stated, “We want to become the best small Baptist College in America by 2001.” A frequent question from that period was, “How will we know when we get there?” A clear understanding of the key measures was not established. By contrast, when the College identifies and successfully implements a list of key measures,

- We will have specific targets describing what we are trying to achieve.
- Planning and implementing will be linked through these measures.
- We will be able to track our progress toward excellence.

Today, August 17, 2001, we do not have a shared vision of our “future of excellence,” nor do we have widely recognized key measures of excellence. You can do your part. Keep asking the questions. Remember, excellence does not happen by accident. Let’s make it Happen!

Epilogue

On October 5, 2001, the Carson-Newman College Board of Trustees approved the following new vision and mission statements.

Vision Statement:

To become a premiere Christian liberal arts college with a worldwide impact.

Mission Statement:

Carson-Newman College offers a Christian, liberal arts education in an environment that encourages open intellectual inquiry and

deeper spiritual maturity. Students receive a personalized education in small classes. Caring faculty and staff mentors get to know and nurture each student. We seek to instill Christian virtues in our students and inspire them to use their unique gifts for a lifetime of service.

The historic Baptist distinctives of religious liberty, personal responsibility and compassion for others create a welcoming community that fosters a sense of belonging. The cultural heritage and geographic beauty of the Appalachian region enriches the Carson-Newman experience, and the college contributes to the environmental preservation and economic development of this national treasure.

References

Coppock, Jim. *The Strategic Management Handbook: Managing Growth with High Performance*. Alcoa, TN: Pressmark International, 1998.

Heilman, Bruce. "The Importance of Presidential Vision to an Education Institution's Success." *The Southern Baptist Educator* 65.2 (First Quarter 2001): 7-9.

Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. 1997 Criteria for Performance Excellence. National Institute of Standards and Technology. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Commerce, 1997.

The Decline and Fall of the Supernatural: Peirce, Design, and the Distinction between Natural and Supernatural

D. Brian Austin

Introduction: A Problem
And a Peircean Proposal

The bag holding the sliced bread proudly proclaims “All Natural Ingredients,” or “no artificial ingredients.” Early on this bothered me. So I began to examine the ingredients label on other products to see if there was a difference between those that made this apparently crucial claim and those that did not. As I suspected, the line of demarcation was quite fuzzy. Apparently, according to one manufacturer in my very unscientific study, “Yellow #5” is a natural product. To another, monosodium glutamate fits the bill. One rationale that might be used to justify this classification would point out that not a single component element of Yellow #5 comes from beyond the periodic table. Even the Styrofoam cups that I handed out by the thousands at my dreadful first job at KFC could be considered natural under that description. There is nothing at all in Styrofoam that comes from beyond nature. All natural ingredients! Little did I know that just beneath the surface of these juvenile musings lay a persistent terminological conundrum. That conundrum is the subject of this paper.

The first job that I really loved was as an astronomy lab instructor during college. Along with the wonder of physics and the cosmos, I had the privilege of taking small groups of young ladies into separate rooms for experiments. At least one of these experiments was very successful, as Sandra and I now have been married twenty years and have two wonderful children. Other experiments, such as the one where we measured the acceleration of gravity, began in me a frustration and curiosity that have persisted. I led students in performing the “tuning fork/wax paper” version of the gravity experiment hundreds of time over four years, and the blasted thing never turned out the same way twice! Each group would thus, in good scientific fashion, repeat

the procedure five or six times and then use their vast training in statistics to find the average value, and report this as their finding.

Part of the lab report required a recounting of the trials, and a suggestion about the possible reasons behind the variant results. Friction, air resistance, human imprecision in calibrating and utilizing the timekeeping devices, etc., appeared on practically every report. We presumed that the standard Newtonian constant was absolute, and that our very rudimentary efforts were just beginning to zero in on it. Never a thought was given to the possibility that maybe the law itself was not finished yet. The use of statistics was obviously only a concession to our inability to unmask exactly the inexorable mathematical necessity of the clockwork universe. Charles Peirce's suggestion that the universe isn't finished yet in its trek toward lawfulness has something to say concerning some of science's curiously imprecise experimental results.

The Problem

One of the lasting impressions that one may gain from reading a book such as William Dembski's *Intelligent Design* or Michael Behe's *Darwin's Black Box* is the failure of these authors, who are writing philosophy, after all, to define key terms. Among the terms that remains undefined by both of these of these champions of intelligent design is "intelligence." They also argue that mainstream science is to be faulted for ruling out of hand the possibility of supernatural explanations. But neither of them offers a meaningful definition of "supernatural."

Similarly, but not surprisingly, vigorous opponents of supernaturalism insist with the late Carl Sagan that "the universe is all that there is," but they, too, normally fail to offer their readers a clear account of the distinction between natural and supernatural. So persons like Dawkins and Provine and Wilson share the debate stage with the likes of Dembski and Behe and Philip Johnson at venues like "Darwin Days" and Campus Crusade for Christ meetings. They make for sensational debates because the opponents share the same language of dualism. One side is for it and the other is against it, both assuming, but not arguing, that the distinction between natural and supernatural is substantive.

This paper will argue that there are serious obstacles in the way of making good sense of this oft-used distinction, and that the fact that these problems are not likely to be solved should lead us to explore a different vocabulary, one that might offer promise of progress rather

than of more posturing. American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce offers a perspective and a vocabulary that may provide a way out of the intellectual swamp created by arguing over ill-defined or even vacuous terms.

As far as I know, there is exactly one book that had made the attempt to shine a light in the midst of the heavy terminological fog engulfing debates about supernatural intelligent design, including the problems of talking about the distinction between nature and super nature. Philosopher of science Del Ratzsch, of Messiah College, has made this effort in his fine book *Nature, Design, and Science*. He correctly identifies the problem by recognizing the renewal of discussions of the design argument, but noting that “surprisingly, virtually none of the foundational work essential to exploration (pro or con) of key issues has been done” (ix).

Ratzsch effectively identifies the core intuition of designedness in an early quote:

So we typically recognize artifactuality—and get our first clues to designedness—through recognizing indications of counterflow in results, processes, or initial conditions, and we recognize such counterflow against the background of and in contrast with our understanding of the normal flows of nature. That is essentially our method whether applied to watches, TVs, houses, marbles, stands of pine trees growing in evenly spaced rows, shocks of wheat tied up with strands of twisted straw—or signals from outer space (9).

Then he focuses more specifically on the concept of design.

So design is to be understood in terms of deliberate agent activity intentionally aimed at generating particular patterns. Pattern, in turn, is to be understood in terms of structures that have special affinities to cognition—which correlate to mind. The agent activity involved produces artifacts that are defined via counterflow and that frequently exhibit familiar primary marks of agent activity and counterflow by which that activity and artifactuality can be identified (15f).

Because Ratzsch’s book, so far as I know, is the only solid treatment of these foundational issues that speaks to our current debates about design and because I think he is essentially correct in identifying the core intuitions that underlie our use of terms like “design,” “pattern,” “natural,” and “supernatural,” this paper will look at his project

and explore the prospects of his aim of clarifying our discourse in these areas. Can we succeed in using terms like these, especially “natural” and “supernatural,” with sufficient clarity to ground a useful dialogue? Probably not, for a number of reasons, two of which can be treated here.

Problem One: Identifying “Counterflow”

Central to Ratzsch’s discussion of intelligence and design is the notion of “counterflow.” Counterflow is a characteristic of objects, events, or systems that have been brought about by intelligent agents. If we see, to use one of his examples, a large Titanium cube on the surface of Mars, we would not hesitate to conclude that its existence and presence there was the result of some intelligent beings. Why do we know this? Because this cube is not something nature would normally do if left on her own (4-6).

The existence of the cube, or the VCR, or the evenly spaced rows of trees is a pointer to agent causality because it is not what nature would do normally. Paley’s watch found on the heath is the most famous philosophical example of counterflow. Paley observed that it would be obvious to anyone that this watch did not occur due to the normal flow of nature.

Though I think Ratzsch’s notion of counterflow accurately portrays the chief intuition behind inferences to designedness, I also think that it will be unable to do the work he sets for it—to clarify the dialogue about nature and design. But it may do a great service yet, if it helps to expose the deep difficulties in defining “natural,” and the concomitant problems with defining “supernatural.” The main difficulty in the concept of counterflow is our inability to pin down “what nature will normally do.” In order for us to recognize counterflow, we must first have a good idea of normal flow. And we simply do not know nearly enough about that, at least not yet.

Presumably the Grand Canyon would not qualify as counterflow, and thus would not be understood as designed. This is because nature does normally have water running *downhill* and carving its way through rocks over millions of years. On the other hand, the canyon would not be there except that the water began to flow in a certain contingent direction a long time ago. If the water had left the rock alone, then the canyon would not be there. What does it mean for nature to be left alone?

But what about the biota that feed on that water from the Colorado River? Are they natural? Think of the ants that feed on the

leaves that grow near the river. Their colonies are pretty remarkable, but are they counterflow? Are they designed? Would an ant colony be something that nature would do if left on her own? As we look down on that pretty remarkable piece of organization, the teamwork, the division of labor, we might be pretty impressed, but since ants are everywhere, always making colonies, we would not usually think of their work as counter to the normal flow of nature. On the other hand, the dirt would just be dirt if not for the ants. Their activity has transformed the dirt into a highly organized working and dwelling place.

Or, switch continents and imagine coming upon remnants of African chimpanzee activity. We might easily find a stick that had been stripped of its leaves in order to make it more suitable as a tool for extracting termites from a tree trunk at lunchtime. Is that stick, which has been altered by the tool-making ape with planning and purpose, an example of counterflow? Is that stick something that nature would not have done if left on its own? Is a chimpanzee natural? Since these sticks and perhaps other kinds of tools are common features of the lives of some chimpanzees, we might call them natural. On the other hand, the existence of a constructed tool, intentionally prepared ahead of time for a specific purpose, might qualify as counterflow. Nature, in the absence of this hungry and resourceful primate, would have no such stick.

Now, imagine alien anthropologists looking down on *Homo sapiens* (maybe the same aliens that put the titanium cube on Mars) and asking questions like those that we put to canyons, ants, and apes. Instead of finding termite sticks and burrowed out ant colonies, they would happen upon Styrofoam cups and high-rise apartment buildings. In fact they would find cups and apartments by the millions, very regular means for the human species to feed and house itself. All of this could be seen as very much within in the normal flow of nature. On the other hand, if humans had not intervened in certain ways, then nature on her own would never have created Styrofoam or high-rises. And if the galaxy turns out to be littered with titanium cubes, then these might be considered natural as well, or not.

Each of these examples might involve counterflow, or, maybe, none of them does. And the same can be said about any object or system in the universe, or indeed the universe itself. So it seems that we will never, short of seeing the whole universe *sub specie aeternitatis*, have a way of definitively discerning counterflow, because we have no way of telling just what sorts of bizarre things nature might be able to do. To call an event or structure “something that nature would not have done on her own” requires seeing both sides of a boundary. We cannot claim to *see* both sides, or even to assert confidently that there are two sides. In the spirit of Kant and Wittgenstein, we cannot *know* the limits

of knowledge, *say* the limits of language, or assume a perspective outside of nature that will allow us to determine just where or even if, it ends. And if we cannot draw at least a relatively clear boundary around *nature*, then we cannot claim to have a clear understanding of the term *supernatural*.

What we do see in the cases of ants, apes, and humans is a relatively more complex (dare I say “advanced”?) entity leaving marks that a less complex entity does not. The river does not carve an ant colony, the ant does not make tools for individual future use, the ape does not manufacture Styrofoam, and humans cannot construct spacecraft that will accomplish manned interstellar travel. So, it can be argued that we do see a progression and that we have no way of knowing just where we stand in that progression.

So, what are the ultimate origins of the complexity that we see in different degrees in our world? Is this order evidence of a designing mind? Or, is what we call mind one result of the processes of a complexifying world? It seems that this age-old question is the inevitable result of speculation like that above about the order in our world. And since we cannot even come up with a clear picture of “natural,” the backdrop against which “supernatural” would be defined, explanations of order that rely on the concept of supernatural are very vulnerable. Explanations of order that boldly *insist* on supernatural explanations are, of course, even weaker. So, perhaps the fact that we have not made a lot of progress in answering this question in the last 3000 years suggests that we should be framing the question differently, more humbly, more suited to our deeply limited perspective.

Problem Two: The Analogy of Agent Activity

Related to the central problem sketched above is the problem of using human agent activity as an analogy for explaining other features of the universe. Design arguments universally rely, at least in part, on analogy to human design (although Ratzsch does argue that Paley’s core argument should not be read as an analogical argument). One of the conclusions that can be drawn from the presence of counterflow, according to Ratzsch, is agent activity, which is to be distinguished from “natural” activity. Styrofoam cups are clearly the result of agents.

I fail to see how this assertion says anything more than that these cups are the result of some human-like process. And when proponents of intelligent design argue that supernatural intelligent agency must be invoked to account for eyeballs or bacterial flagella, they are saying the same thing. Attempts to be any more specific than that are

bound to founder. The entire idea of “agency” is deeply problematic, having exercised some of the best philosophic minds in history, yet leading to nothing resembling consensus.

Explanatory analogies should seek to shed light on the lesser known by appeal to the more familiar. So we explain the physical concept of field by referring to the motion of a field of grain in the Kansas wind. We explain atomic structure by referring to familiar pictures of the solar system. These analogies have been helpful, even though severely limited, because the *explanans* is a relatively better understood phenomenon. To explain the bacterial flagellum by analogy to human agency in the construction of locomotion devices is not nearly as helpful because human agency (and the related notions of mind, freedom, consciousness) is one the most poorly understood phenomena that we have faced. Not that there is no value in exploring the potential analogy; there is. We should explore the deep affinities between our thinking and nature’s (other) processes, but we are nowhere near providing an explanation of order by invoking an analogy to human intelligent agency.

Proposal for A Different Question

In the spirit of American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, I suggest an improved way of approaching these truly fascinating questions. Rather than using dualistic language to either affirm or deny the existence of some “realm beyond nature,” maybe our experience should rather be conceived on a continuum of explicability. We could still, for the sake of simplicity, begin with two categories: those objects, events, or systems which we can explain and those which we cannot. A thing is “explained” if it fits into some regularity scheme in a fashion with which are pleased. A thing is unexplained if it fails to fit into our regularity schemes, and thus causes us what Peirce calls the “irritation of doubt.”

When we encounter something that does not fit into our regularity explanations, then we are driven either to make it fit or to revise our schemes. This is how we learn about our universe. A mountain-sized titanium cube on Mars would not fit our current schemes. So we seek to enlarge our schemes to account for it. And our seeking ends when the irritation settles into belief.

Important for a Peircean reading of explanation is the endlessness of the process. Nothing is ever fully explained, because there are always more levels of regularities that might be uncovered. Only in the

infinite future will all things have happened so that all things might then be explained. Peirce says, “Explicability has no determinate and absolute limit, everything being explicable everything has been brought about” (Kloesel 219). So, we would seek the explanation of the cube, then explanations of the aliens who put it there, and ultimately of the origins of the ordered cosmos itself. In the limit of the infinite future, explanations are reached, regularities are crystallized into law, and the quest is consummated as all the irritations of doubt are quieted.

An important part of this universal drive toward regularity, toward cosmos, for Peirce, is his contention that paramount among the things that cry out for explanation is the existence of law itself. We tend to count things “explained” when we name the law that accounts for the relevant aspects of the *explanandum*. Peirce insists that we go further, and seek an explanation for the *law itself*, for lawfulness in general. Peirce’s candidate for the explanation of laws, which I mention here because it is a potential unifying principle that avoids the above-mentioned pitfalls of dualism, is “habit-taking.”

For Peirce, the universe exhibits habit-taking at all levels. As it grows, the habits become more regular. But they are not completely regular yet. Hence what we call “laws” of nature are better understood as growing statistical regularities. In an insight prescient of quantum mechanics Peirce asserts that “there is room for serious doubt whether the fundamental laws of mechanics hold good for single atoms . . .” (Hartshorne 6.11). And that ““I suppose that on excessively rare, sporadic occasions a law of nature is violated in some infinitesimal degree” (Kloesel 218).

He later modified that view to hold that serious violations of regularities happen very rarely and that minor violations, too small normally be noticed, happen all the time. But there is a sense in which these anomalies are not really violations, and that is because they submit to an explanation of sorts. They do fit into a Gaussian distribution. The bell curve is a kind of explanation of the improbable, at a very general level.

This is relevant to our discussion of natural and supernatural because Peirce’s notions here, if legitimate, give us yet further reasons to question whether we will ever make sense of a distinction between “natural” and “supernatural.” As quantum mechanics has confirmed to the satisfaction of most interpreters, the “laws” of nature are in fact fundamentally statistical and hence cannot strictly be “broken.” It violates no law of nature for a watch to be spontaneously generated on the heath. It is prohibitively unlikely, which gives us good reason to explain it as the result of the actions of some intermediary entity, but it is not impossible that it be formed otherwise.

According to standard design intuitions, and as parsed by Ratzsch, all agent activity introduces a discontinuity into the normal flow of nature. One sign of supernatural agency, though is in no way required of supernatural agency, is that it can introduce an anti-nomic discontinuity—it can break the laws of nature. Indeed this justification for belief in the supernatural is as old as humanity itself. Laws of nature are broken in ways that affect human ends and aims; hence there must be influence from some realm beyond. Now, if garden-variety human agent counterflow is hard to pin down, then supernaturally introduced counterflow is in serious conceptual trouble. It seems that finite intelligent agency is held by the design people to disrupt the flow of nature. Supernatural intelligent agency apparently differs in that it can *really* disrupt the normal flow of nature, even to the point of suspending its laws.

I think the statistical understanding of natural regularities causes the resurrected design argument additional trouble at this point, because there is no such thing as breaking a law of nature. Some beings have the ability to introduce peculiar, even profound discontinuities into the histories of other things. As stated above, complex entities can do things with matter and energy that leave marks that differ in degree from the kinds of marks left by less complicated things.

And it is very likely that they do so precisely by exploiting the less-than-complete-lawfulness of the universe, a type of exploitation apparently very accessible to self-referential systems (from autocatalytic chemical reactions to deeply recursive organisms like human beings). Humans are especially adept at magnifying the microscopic movement of energy and chemical into noticeable results. The overall aims of the organism somehow fold back upon the lower level subsystems to produce symphonies and paintings and love and hate. I have a hunch that this is part of an explanation of how “reasons can be causes” in the work of Davidson on agency.

Now if there are systems that can take minute variabilities in nature’s regularities at crucial causal junctures, then this further weakens any inference to the supernatural in the dualistic sense. Extremely unusual events can and do happen in a world like this. This recursive world is deeply unpredictable and interesting, maybe even to the point of being “enchanted.” I use that loaded word quite intentionally, because the kind of Peirce-inspired world picture that I paint is not going to be very palatable to today’s committed naturalist, who, as described by Michael Ruse, “is the person who is an atheist, who does deny that there is anything beyond blind law working on inert matter” (99).

A Peircean world-picture can easily affirm the reality of general class names, of regularities and patterns that are every bit as real as

their component parts, of spirit, of God. Peirce cannot unambiguously be invoked as an advocate for this whole list, but there can be a solid metaphysic built in this way, preserving even key religious values, without the need for some indefinable split between natural and supernatural. There is no reason to confine this amazing universe to “blind, inert matter.” Such value judgments are every bit as presumptuous as those that jump quickly to blame a magical God for every unexplained event.

There is considerable debate about Peirce’s own private religious views, so let me suggest a possible Peircean way of undoing the nature/supernature tangle that would work even for the theist. Remembering Bishop Butler’s notion (quoted by Darwin as an epigram for *The Origin of Species*) that there is nothing in the word “nature” except the ideas of “fixed and settled,” what would it mean for the theist to continue to understand more and more about reality? In the infinite limit, when we see face to face, will we understand God? If we do, then that means we will understand the *nature* of God, those things that are fixed and settled as part of the faithfulness of God. So all things will then be natural to us, for they all will be seen to flow from the nature of God.

As one who agrees with Peirce, I do not think we will ever actually arrive at such a place, but it is good to conceive of the limit. Only the most monumental arrogance would suggest that the wonder of the unknown could ever be exhausted by minds like ours. Whether we refer to these denizens of the undiscovered countries—these entities, patterns, agents only imperfectly revealed to our particular filters—as supernatural matters little in the end. Debates that demand the natural/supernatural dichotomy are really distractions, albeit often very considerable ones. The real question is whether we will allow this detour to curtail our quest for new instances of spirit, pattern, relation, and connection.

Michael Ruse concludes his recent book with an affirmation of Hamlet’s conviction that “there are more things in heaven and earth . . . than are dreamt of in your philosophy.” This is true even if heaven is *in* earth and earth in heaven. The real question before the committed seekers of our age is not whether or not there exists some magical supernatural realm populated by category-mistake-daimonia, but whether we will allow Hamlet’s “things” and our pursuit of them to bring us wonder, life, and hope.

Or, will the naturalist insistence on “blind, inert” matter at the core of existence conquer hope with its pervasive disenchantment? Or, will supernaturalist refuge in the divine whim—that “science-stopping” puff of smoke—persuade us of the futility of delving further? It is my hope that the distractions of misdirected dialogue will not squeeze the

life and vision out of us. It is my hope that we will take heart with Kentucky poet Wendell Berry in his celebration of another line from Shakespeare, "Thy life's a miracle. Speak yet again."

WORKS CITED

- Berry, Wendell. *Life is a Miracle: An Essay against Modern Superstition*. (Washington, DC: Counterpoint, 2000).
- Hartshorne, Charles and Paul Weiss, eds. *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931-1935).
- Kloesel, Christian and Nathan Houser, eds. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings, 1867-1893*. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1992).
- Ratzsch, Del. *Nature, Design and Science: The Status of Design in Natural Science*. (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001).

Study of the Discrimination of Same and Different in Musical Statements

Marshall P. Forrester

Study Overview

Music aptitude tests such as the *Advanced Measures of Music Audiation* (AMMA, Gordon, 1989a) assess aptitude by measuring the ability to discriminate same and different in two unfamiliar musical statements. As demonstrated by raw score increases in music aptitude test scores, even after the age at which aptitude is theorized to stabilize, the ability to discriminate same and different in two unfamiliar musical statements continues to increase with chronological age (Gordon, 1989c). While Gordon (1989c) has attributed this increase in ability to “maturation,” the source of the increase is unknown.

Unfamiliar music is used in aptitude tests in order to measure the ability of subjects to infer whether musical statements are the same or different (Gordon, 1988a). Unfamiliar music is defined as “unfamiliar and familiar patterns in unfamiliar order” (Gordon, 1988a, 340). While the musical statements as a whole in aptitude tests are unfamiliar, some of the patterns within those musical statements may be familiar to examinees, due to experience and education in music. Studies regarding the effect of extent of pattern familiarity on the ability to infer whether musical statements are the same or different were not found in the research literature.

Also not found in the professional literature were studies regarding the relationship between imitation of musical patterns and the point at which these patterns begin to be audiated, or understood. Gordon’s (1988a) *music learning theory* is based on a skill learning sequence taxonomy by which patterns become familiar, which includes the levels of aural/oral and verbal association within discrimination or rote learning. The verbal association level involves the coupling of signs, or proper names, with the sounds learned at the aural/oral level. Theory is that audiation is learned within this skill learning sequence.

There are contradictions, however, regarding the level of skill learning sequence at which audiation may occur. Gordon (1988a) implies that students must be “taught the verbal association level of learning as a basis for learning how to audiate” (290), but also that students should be “taught audiation before [the verbal association idiom of] sign” (296). Can audiation be taught before verbal association, or is verbal association the basis for audiation? Or, does audiation occur, to a different extent, at both the aural/oral and verbal association levels of skill learning sequence?

The purpose of this study was two-fold. Because there are contradictions in the theories of skill learning sequence and how audiation occurs within skill learning sequence (Gordon, 1988a), one purpose was to investigate the relationship between pattern imitation, at different levels of skill learning sequence, and audiation, as measured by extent of music pattern familiarity. Because certain patterns used in unfamiliar aptitude test items may be familiar to examinees, another purpose was to investigate the relationship between extent of pattern familiarity and music aptitude test scores.

Participants in the study included 135 undergraduate band and choir members at Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee. Subjects were assigned randomly to three treatment groups and one control group, blocked only according to the number of music majors and nonmusic majors in each group. Subjects in the three treatment groups received recordings of the thirty selected patterns, while the control group did not receive a recording or participate in any form of treatment. The first treatment group imitated the patterns with solfege syllables, which corresponds to the verbal association level of skill learning sequence. The second imitated the patterns with neutral syllables, which corresponds to the aural/oral level of skill learning sequence. And the third imitated the patterns mentally (silently, with no vocal response), which corresponds to the aural level of skill learning sequence.

Patterns imitated were selected directly from AMMA antecedent statements. Patterns were selected to provide a sense of tonal and rhythmic completeness, but were not more than fifty percent of the length of the corresponding AMMA antecedent statement. AMMA antecedent statements and patterns were selected for imitation. Subjects were instructed to listen to the recording and imitate the complete set of thirty patterns five times per week for five weeks. Subjects were provided a log booklet on which to record the frequency of pattern imitation. Any subject not completing the imitation of the set of thirty patterns at least 20 times over five weeks was excluded from the study.

The *Advanced Measures of Music Audiation* (AMMA, Gordon, 1989a) was administered to obtain music aptitude pretreatment and posttreatment scores. Before and after the five-week treatment, subjects were tape-recorded singing the thirty selected patterns. A researcher-designed rating scale, with five criteria in both tonal and rhythm dimensions, was used to measure extent of pattern familiarity on the tape recordings. Three judges evaluated the tonal dimension, while three additional judges evaluated the rhythm dimension. All six judges were music faculty members in the music department at Carson-Newman College.

For all statistical tests, the alpha level of confidence was $p \leq .05$. A one-way analysis of variance was used to examine posttreatment rating scale composite scores for any effect due to type of pattern imitation (treatment group). Although at a level approaching statistical significance, the effect of type of pattern imitation on posttreatment rating scale scores was not statistically significant ($p = .184$). An exploratory *post hoc* comparison of combined treatment group means and a weighted control group mean revealed that the control group mean was significantly lower than the combined treatment group means ($t = 2.18$, $p < .05$).

To determine the effect extent of pattern familiarity has on music aptitude test scores, a regression analysis was performed, with pretreatment AMMA scores and posttreatment rating scale composite scores serving as the independent variables, and posttreatment AMMA scores serving as the dependent variable. Because the effect of the treatment on aptitude test scores above and beyond any pretreatment levels of music aptitude was in question, pretreatment AMMA scores were entered into the regression equation before posttreatment rating scale composite scores. The regression equation was found to be statistically significant, accounting for 32.7% of the variance in posttreatment AMMA scores. The contributions of both independent variables to the equation were found to be statistically significant, with standardized coefficients beta of $\beta = .365$ for pretreatment AMMA scores and $\beta = .323$ for posttreatment rating scale composite scores.

To complete the causal path model two additional regression analyses were conducted. The first regression equation, in which pretreatment AMMA scores accounted for 15.3% of the variance in pretreatment rating scale scores, was found to be statistically significant. In the second regression equation, pretreatment AMMA scores, pretreatment rating scale composite scores, and type of pattern imitation served as the independent variables, and posttreatment rating scale composite scores served as the dependent variable. The regression equation was found to be statistically significant, accounting for 76.6%

of the variance in posttreatment rating scale composite scores. However, the pretreatment rating scale composite scores variable was the only statistically significant contributor to the equation, with a standardized coefficient beta of $\beta = 0.845$.

To determine possible main effects and interaction of type of pattern imitation and academic major on extent of pattern familiarity, a two-way analysis of variance was performed. A statistically significant main effect was found for major, as well as a statistically significant interaction between major and type of imitation. Type of pattern imitation was found to have a main effect which, while approaching statistical significance ($p = .094$), was not within the predetermined alpha level of confidence.

Conclusion

In this study, the aural, aural/oral, and verbal association treatment groups scored higher on the posttreatment rating scale than the control group. While a planned comparison of all treatment group means versus a weighted control group mean indicated that there was a significant difference in treatment versus no treatment, the differences in individual group means, found through analysis of the variance in posttreatment rating scale scores, exhibited only a trend ($p = .184$). Therefore, any generalization beyond the study must be made with caution. The conclusion was drawn, however, that pattern imitation at all levels of skill learning sequence increases the extent of pattern familiarity. Additionally, pattern imitation at the aural, aural/oral, or verbal association level *may* increase extent of pattern familiarity.

In this study, the regression of pretreatment music aptitude test scores and posttreatment rating scale scores on posttreatment music aptitude test scores was found to be statistically significant. Additionally, posttreatment rating scale scores were found to be a significant contributor to this regression equation. From these two findings, the conclusion was drawn that extent of pattern familiarity affects music aptitude test score.

Discussion

The results of the current study appear to be substantiated by the results of other studies. In the current study, extent of pattern familiarity was found to have an effect on music aptitude test scores. Pat-

tern familiarity has been shown to increase the accuracy and speed of same and different discrimination tasks (Wicklegren, 1969; Fiske, 1987). Also, Estrella (1992) concluded that tonal audiation ability, as measured by the AMMA, can be improved through specialized training in tonal audiation.

Karma (1975) proposed that music aptitude may be dependent upon sensory discrimination, the ability to structure acoustic material, and personality variables and concluded that musical aptitude may be explained in part by ability to structure acoustic material, either verbally or spatially. If extent of pattern familiarity contributes to ability to structure acoustic material, the findings of the current study may support Karma's theory.

Based on findings from previous studies, the possibility exists that pattern familiarity contributes to more accurate encoding of music aptitude test items. While perception, storage, and retrieval may function similarly for musicians and nonmusicians (Brand & Brunsted, 1981; Kauffman & Carlsen, 1989), evidence exists that encoding functions differently in musicians when compared with nonmusicians (Kauffman & Carlsen, 1989). In addition, Wickelgren (1969) proposed that same/different judgments regarding paired stimuli are actually comparisons of the encoding or memory trace of the first stimulus to the perceptual trace of the second stimulus. Therefore, if encoding functions at higher levels in musicians, such increased ability may be responsible for higher aptitude test scores among musicians, despite otherwise equal ability in perception as compared with nonmusicians.

The results of the current study also indicate that music aptitude test scores are dependent upon both a person's aptitude and extent of pattern familiarity. This finding seems to corroborate Gordon's (1988a) statement that "how well a student learns to audiate depends not only upon his music aptitudes, but also upon the extent of the tonal pattern and rhythmic pattern vocabularies that he uses as he performs and listens to music" (39). By definition, the *Advanced Measures of Music Audiation* (Gordon, 1989c) measures audiation, which, as stated above, depends on music aptitude and extent of pattern vocabularies.

In the current study, subjects became more familiar with patterns that were a part of the AMMA, contributing to a treatment effect of 14 or 18 percentile points in AMMA scores for music and nonmusic majors, respectively. While the effect of extent of pattern familiarity was found to be statistically significant, that such a relatively small treatment effect was observed seems to support McCrystal's (1995) conclusion that the AMMA is somewhat resistant to the effects of instruction. Additionally, Babiak (1990) found significant differences in

aperture test scores after pattern imitation treatments; however, Babiak concluded that the differences were of no practical significance.

Nevo (1976) found that item and procedural familiarity improved aptitude test scores by as much as one-third of a standard deviation, which he determined to be of "practical" significance. Because the observed aptitude test mean increase of 14 to 18 percentile points in the current study is not of a magnitude large enough to convert a "low" score into a "high" score, the current results may be deemed of less practical significance, especially considering McCrystal's (1995) conclusion that the predictive validity qualities of the AMMA are strongest for high- and low-scorers. That is, the demonstrated predictive validity qualities of the AMMA for high- and low-scorers would not be diminished, even when considering the magnitude of the effect of pattern familiarity found in the current study.

Sloboda (1985) stated that achievement is best measured with familiar music while aptitude is most accurately measured with unfamiliar music. However, Gordon (1988a) defined unfamiliar music as familiar and unfamiliar patterns in unfamiliar order. The treatment effect observed in the current study may be an indication of the effect of the size and extent of a person's *familiar* pattern vocabulary on the ability to encode *unfamiliar* music. Because a large vocabulary of familiar patterns may be assumed of a person educated or experienced in music, it is quite possible that scores on tests of music audiation, such as the AMMA, are somewhat less reflective of the true aptitude of a musician when compared with the scores of a nonmusician. If this is the case, identical scores for musician and nonmusician examinees may be measures of different combinations of abilities.

Embretson (1993) theorized that similar aptitude scores are the product of various levels of differing cognitive abilities. For a musician, a score on a music audiation test may be a reflection of aptitude and achievement, the latter in the form of familiar pattern vocabulary. For a nonmusician, achievement could not possibly affect audiation scores to the same extent, precisely because achievement (i.e., pattern vocabulary) is not present to the same extent in a nonmusician as compared to a musician.

Gordon (1989c) has attributed the phenomenon of higher AMMA score means among musicians to a self-selection process whereby those with higher aptitude will choose to major in music more often than those with lower aptitude. However, if AMMA scores are reflective of both aptitude and extent of pattern vocabulary, the difference in mean scores between musicians and nonmusicians could be due in part to differences in extent of pattern vocabulary between the two groups. It is conceivable, therefore, that self-selection to a music major

may be based on greater *audiation* abilities, and not necessarily exclusively on higher levels of aptitude.

What, then, are the *relative* effects of aptitude and extent of pattern vocabulary on a person's score on a test of audiation such as the AMMA? Estrella (1992) recommended that "if a longitudinal predictive validity study were performed with students involved in audiation-based training, it might be necessary to determine whether initial audiation ability or the improvement in audiation resulting from audiation-based training was most related to the final music achievement score." Similarly, the investigator in the current study evaluated the final music *aptitude* scores in light of initial levels of music aptitude and concluding levels of extent of pattern familiarity. Initial music aptitude scores and final levels of extent of pattern familiarity together explained approximately one-third of the variance in final music aptitude scores, with both being approximately equal in relative contribution to the prediction of music aptitude scores.

The treatment effect observed in the current study should also be interpreted after the consideration of any "ceiling" effect. Subjects were members of collegiate performing ensembles, and no doubt had been exposed to a variety of patterns in various tonalities and meters through experiences in those and other ensembles. This pattern familiarity may have affected initial levels of audiation as measured by the AMMA before any treatment began. It is interesting to note, however, that nonmusic majors had posttreatment levels of extent of pattern familiarity ($\bar{X} = 9.3$) and music aptitude test scores ($\bar{X} = 79^{\text{th}}$ percentile) similar to pretreatment levels of both measures for music majors ($\bar{X} = 9.6$ and 78^{th} percentile, respectively).

Future Research

The results of the current study indicate possible future areas of research. The increase in aptitude test scores due to the pattern imitation treatment was observed immediately after five weeks of pattern imitation treatment. A measure of the relative permanence of this observed change would contribute to an increased understanding of the nature of the change. Specifically, a less permanent treatment effect would tend to indicate that the observed change in aptitude test scores was due to imitation rather than audiation, and, conversely, a more permanent change may indicate that increased levels of audiation were the source of the observed increase.

Also, the use of collegiate performing ensemble members as subjects in the current study may have contributed to a smaller treat-

ment effect, because those musicians may have already possessed higher levels of pattern familiarity before treatment than nonmusicians. Replication of the current study with a sample of subjects who have not received formal education in music or participated in ensembles may indicate the extent of a “ceiling” effect, if any, in the current study.

Investigation of other factors that may contribute to music aptitude test scores is another area with potential for future research. A factor analysis study of the 5,250 undergraduate and graduate students who participated in the national standardization program of the AMMA led Gordon (1991) to conclude that the ability to detect “same” and “different” in music was the leading factor contributing to music aptitude score.

The investigation of other, more cognitive musical factors is possible through the manipulation of treatments in future studies. For example, what is the effect on music aptitude test scores of an increased ability to recognize form in music? Some of the AMMA items clearly depend upon the proper encoding and perception of form in order to select the correct answer. Also, an understanding of form may assist in the utilization of pattern vocabulary in a discrimination task.

A current area of study in psychometric research is trait “modifiability.” Embretson (1993) theorized that similar composite aptitude scores are the product of various levels of differing cognitive abilities, and cited evidence that some of the cognitive components of spatial aptitude are modifiable with training. Feuerstein (1979) demonstrated the modifiability of abstract reasoning and other cognitive traits. If musically specific factors, which contribute to aptitude test scores, are isolated through research studies, the modifiability of these traits should be investigated.

Current theory (Gordon, 1988a) explains increases in stabilized music aptitude raw scores by maturation only. Studies of the various traits that contribute to music aptitude and their modifiability could clarify understanding of this occurrence. Embretson (1993) explored the effect of various latent cognitive processing abilities on correct item response. Similar research into the latent traits, which contribute to music aptitude test scores, may enhance understanding of music learning theories.

“Tell me some such fiction . . . shew me examples:” The Protestant “Word” and Saving Fictions

Jennifer Wallace Hall

Poised atop the title page to *The Countess of Montgomery’s Urania* (1621), a cartouche distinguishes the epic romance as being “Written by the right honorable the Lady Mary Wroath. Daughter to the right Noble Robert Earle of Leicester. And Neece to the ever famous, and renowned Sir Phillips Sidney knight. And to the most excelent Lady Mary Countess of Pembroke late deceased.” Quite noticeably, Lady Mary Sidney Wroth immediately identifies herself as a Sidney and appears to offer *Urania* as yet another contribution to the family’s literary, religious, and political heritage.

During the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James, the Sidney family was well known for its desire to champion Protestantly controlled politics and to unite Europe into a peaceful union of Christian states. Wroth had been raised hearing romantic depictions of her uncle Philip Sidney’s sacrificial death on the battlefield in Zutphen and had witnessed her father Robert Sidney’s often frustrating service as a foreign diplomat for both Queen Elizabeth and King James. Though evidence suggests that Wroth herself had a great interest in the proper behavior of those leading Protestant nations, she was limited by gender in the degree to which she could freely offer her own opinions regarding such matters.

Thus Wroth constructed her *Urania*, the first work of fiction by an Englishwoman (1621; first modern edition 1995), as a narrative site in which to engage imaginatively with her own interests and concerns. In the realm of fiction, unfettered by gender, Wroth was free from the repercussions she could expect as a woman interested in offering commentary on the public and private behavior demanded of Christian leaders.

Although Mary Sidney Wroth was determined to be a critical voice for the Sidney family, she was nonetheless well aware of the controversies she might face as a woman writing, especially as a woman writing fiction. Wroth was familiar with men such as Juan Luis Vives

who warned that “a woman should avoid these books [fictions and romances] as she would a viper or a scorpion” (78). In *The Education of a Christian Woman*, Vives even insisted that a woman’s mind is “unsettled, roving without direction, and I know not where her instability will lead her” (59). According to Vives, reading fiction leads unstable women astray from the path of virtue, for fiction’s “venomous allurements and enticements little by little” cause them to lose all “mental equilibrium” and become “attracted by indecency” (74-5). To combat such suspicions and to justify her act of writing a fiction, Wroth models *Urania*’s narratives on the foremost power afforded individuals in her Protestant tradition--active engagement with the written and spoken “Word.” Both in her own act of writing and in the text itself, Wroth emulates Protestant salvation stories in which an individual engages with divine Word, contemplates that Word, and is then lead to insight, to knowledge, and, finally, to salvation.

Similarly, Wroth’s characters are educated, empowered, and “saved” from undesirable behavior as they write and share their words with others. Ultimately, Wroth insinuates that careful and contemplative readers can also learn proper modes of behavior by reading *Urania*, for, like scriptural Word, it is “something more exactly related then a fixion” (*Urania* 505). The text is not merely a romance of erotic passion or escape but a book “hung” from “a Pillar of Gold” (*Urania* 455)--an enlightening fiction in which a thoughtful, active reader can discover truths about herself and about the qualities demanded of Protestant leadership. Thus *Urania*’s characters celebrate the educative power of fictions and storytelling and often beg of each other, “Tell me some such fiction. . . . shew me examples” (*Urania* 225).

To appreciate fully Wroth’s writing as the means of motivating proper behavior, one must recognize the logocentric nature of Mary Wroth’s Protestantism. In his important study, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, Peter Lake lucidly points out that emergent Protestantism embraced a “word centered piety” rather than one centered on the traditional sacraments privileged by the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Protestant church under James enthusiastically embraced Article Six of the *Articles of Faith* that insists on the primacy of scripture to teach and to reveal divine truth. This privileging of the Word, declares literary historian Daniel Doerksen, was the unifying factor of the church under James, for despite other confessional disputes, all Protestants shared the belief that scripture is *the* means of affirming and testing one’s faith

(15).¹ This belief in the power and primacy of the Word is indeed both a theological and epistemological common ground for the Sidneys, Mary Wroth, and King James.

Still, neither the Sidneys nor James was responsible for the genesis of such a conviction. From its very inception, the Protestant Reformation viewed scripture as not merely a repository of doctrine but as an actual living, evolving, and efficacious power. Leaders of the movement adamantly insisted that scripture itself celebrates the causative potential of words and stories to inspire lives of active virtue. Leaders could point out that John the Apostle had proclaimed scripture's creative and illuminating force:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. (John 1:1-5)

To John and to Protestant confessors who read his works, the Word is not merely a recording of God; it is God himself, a physical manifestation of God's divine being through which the reader experiences and learns divine truths. Each individual who carefully and responsibly reads scripture will be shown the path of virtue that leads to salvation. Additionally, through the Word, each Christian is given a weapon with which to fight and ultimately destroy evil. Scripture is the "sword of the Spirit" (Ephesians 6:17) that is not static or dead but "quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Hebrews 4:12). With this "sword" of scripture, Christians, according to Reform Protestants, are given both a vehicle through which God and His truths are revealed and a means of combating evil.

To Protestant minds, then, actively reading the Word of God became the ultimate sacramental experience, an experience available to each person who carefully and prayerfully reads scripture and the accounts of lives found therein. In *From Shadow to Compromise: Old*

¹Daniel Doerksen reminds us in *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne, and the English Church before Laud* that during the Reformation the term "protest" signified "to affirm" long before it meant "to register dissent" (15).

Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther, James Preus reveals that many Reformation Protestants believed scripture, unlike ceremonial sacrament, actually places the reader *coram deo*, that is face-to-face with or in the heart of God (190). Preus explains that Martin Luther believed that the Word of God *is* the “sacrament” (241); it is the “efficacious” and “causative” means of knowing God and self (208, 239), for it propels the reader into a direct encounter with divinity and divine truth. In the Protestant understanding, words are vehicles for spiritual action, education, and self-evaluation. Accordingly, reading the Word becomes imperative for spiritual growth. Importantly, Luther contended that proper meditation on scriptural word must be a lifelong process through which believers “strive eternally to understand and to do” the will of God (Preus 222). As a believer reads scripture, she is inspired to evaluate and to reevaluate her own spiritual state and then allows that state to be transformed by the truths revealed to her.

Gradually, such Word-centered theology was emulated by those Protestants writing fiction, poetry, and drama (like Mary Wroth) who desired to mirror the metamorphic and sacramental power of effectively written words. Barbara Lewalski has shown that Protestant writers hoped to advance personal examination through their words. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, religious lyrics became a mode of self-discovery, a “private mode” of writing that strove to “discover and express the various and vacillating spiritual conditions and emotions the soul experiences in meditation, prayer, and praise” (Lewalski 4). Just as reading scripture is educative and experiential, so too is writing or reading poetry because it allows individuals to undergo an “analysis of spiritual states” (5).

According to Lewalski, Protestant writers and poets purposely imitated scriptural stories of salvation and regeneration in hopes of allowing readers to experience and to affirm both events repetitively through their writings (18). Still yet, mirroring the concept of scripture as a sword with which to wage war against vice, Protestant writers aspired to enable individuals to “picture spiritual conflicts,” evaluate those conflicts, and avoid replicating such battles in reality (Doerksen 122). With each new encounter with the written word, the poet or reader experiences (again and again and again) a specific spiritual moment of rebirth or victory over evil. The words become a sacramental experience always available for the active poet and reader.

The Sidneys were no doubt familiar with such convictions regarding the power of scriptural and literary words, and the foundation of their beliefs may be found in the work of Philip Melanchthon who viewed all literature as potentially efficacious, truth containing, and educative. Though best known as the father of the modern German

educational system and as Martin Luther's "co-laborer" and scribe (La Fontaine 28), Melanchthon (1497-1560) was also the mentor of Hubert Languet, mentor of Philip and Robert Sidney, mentors of Lady Mary Wroth. A true humanist, Melanchthon insisted that the discipline that most empowers individuals to learn truth is not philosophy or theology but rhetoric. Without the study of rhetoric, one is unable to discuss reasonably divine truth, for as Melanchthon lucidly asks in his *Elementorum Rhetorices Libri Duo*, "How can anyone speak about religion, or the nature of things, or the law, in fact about any aspect of life, unless he has been instructed in the particular subject matter with which these things are conceived? (79)²

As professor at Wittenberg, Melanchthon insisted that students study the power invested in words and how words can be structured either to reveal or subvert truth. All words are, according to Melanchthon, a "power" and "force" that can make God "immediately present to the reader" (Schneider 102, 34). Scripture itself is not mere doctrine but a "grand elocutionary event between God and honest people. It is *sacra oratio*, not a theologian's lexicon or dictionary" (237). Through careful study of this sacred rhetoric, one enters into a conversation with God, a conversation that gives meaning, insight, and direction. Further, a dedicated scholar can learn to emulate scripture's rhetoric in his own writing, thus achieving new insights and knowledge.

True to his humanism, Melanchthon also contended that one can learn sacred rhetoric from literature. For instance, in his preface to his 1516 edition of Terence's comedies, Melanchthon praises the qualities of classical drama, for it gives the reader a "model of living [*vivendi formam*]" (qtd. in Schneider 37). Reading such models, one is "allured" towards virtue and experiences the true purpose of literature--to "use it as a looking glass for directing life [*ceu regundae vitae speculo utamur*]" (37). Thus the goal of carefully constructed rhetoric, be it dramatic, poetic, fictional, or scriptural, is to teach and inspire virtuous action. Poetry can teach virtue, while an "invented subject"--

²Melanchthon early in his career openly refuted Pico della Mirandola by claiming rhetoric to be superior to philosophy, for "wisdom must be transmitted, not just contemplated" (La Fontaine 1). Ironically, as Sister Mary Joan La Fontaine elucidates, this man, who was eventually considered the "public statesman of Protestantism" (Schneider 108), actually "subordinated philosophy and theology to rhetoric because he believed wisdom is useless unless it can be declared and explained to ordinary people in clear and intelligible terms" (La Fontaine 3).

like fiction--can “unleash a power of [its] own” and transform lives (Schneider 76).

Ultimately, words written in such a tradition, as Deborah Shuger observes, function “more [as] a gerund than a noun, more a thinking than a thought,” for such texts are never static (16). They are acutely *doing* something--exploring meaning--not stating an indisputable fact. Ultimately, they challenge the careful reader of scripture, poetry, drama, and even of romance to participate in a divine conservation with godly truths, with God himself.

Under the direction of Hubert Languet, Melanchthon's disciple, the Sidneys learned the powerful use of *sacra oratio* to further the Protestant cause. Philip Sidney clearly viewed fiction as a means of dynamically compelling a reader's will toward purposeful action, and it was he who initiated the literary pursuits that became the hallmark of the Sidney family in his 1595 treatise *The Defense of Poesy*. Echoing the teachings of Melanchthon, Sidney insisted that poetry has little to do with meaningless ornament and rhyme. Instead poetry is that writing, be it rhymed or in prose, fiction or nonfiction, that can “[illuminate] and [figure] forth” images of “all virtues, vices, and passions” that “lie dark before the imaginative and judging pow'r” of poetry creates a “speaking picture” (Sidney 107). By creating such vivid, “speaking” pictures, the poet is able to “make” a world not as it is or has been but “what may be and should be” (102); he challenges the reader to analyze characters and situations and thus to participate in “the exercises of the mind” that lead to true knowledge and convicted action (98).

In his quest to “teach and delight,” the poet, according to Sidney, accomplishes what historians, philosophers, and polemicists cannot. He incites men to virtuous action. First he inspires “knowledge of a man's self, in the ethic and politic consideration” (Sidney 104). Second, he fashions images of the world that humans are capable of creating, a world better even than that of Nature, for “Her world is brazen, [while] the poets only deliver a golden” (100). Finally, just as scripture sustains one in spiritual battle, the poet's work offers a weapon with which individuals can win the postlapsarian battle fought between “our erected wit [that] maketh us know what perfection is” and “our infected will [that] keepeth us from reaching unto it” (101). The end of poetry is to reform the individual by “purifying [his or her] wit”:

This purifying of wit, this enriching of memory, enabling of judgment, and enlarging of conceit, which commonly we call learning, under what name soever it come forth, or to what immediate end soever it be directed, the final end is to lead and draw us to as high a perfection as our degenerate souls,

made worse by their clayey lodgings, can be capable of . . . to know, and by knowledge to lift up the mind from the dungeon of the body to the enjoying his own divine essence. (104)

Ultimately, however, the individual must freely choose to engage with the poet's words, to contemplate their meaning, and to motivate herself to undertake virtuous action. True to the active nature of the Protestant ideal, an individual cannot be forced to choose the path of virtue. True, "the ending end of all earthly learning [should be] virtuous action" (104), but unlike polemic, history, or theology, poetry does not didactically present one, incontestable course of proper action: "But the poet . . . never affirmeth. The poet never maketh any circle about your imagination to conjure you to believe for true what he writes" (124).

The reader is left to examine autonomously the images and choices presented and then to follow the action her conscience leads her to undertake. Therefore, Sidney contends the "force" and "power" of this "right" use of poetry can serve as a powerful weapon in the Protestant cause, for it can vicariously train Protestant leaders in proper action and choice before they must engage in such duties outside literature's boundaries (125-6). In essence, one can be saved from destructive behavior by studying images of proper and improper behavior in poetry or fiction—similar to the goals implicit in the study of scripture and scriptural exempla.

With such a heritage in mind, one can easily regard *Urania* as Wroth's own exploration of fiction's force and power, for *Urania* clearly reveals how the written or spoken word can promote personal understanding as well as inspire individual, committed action in both the private and public realms. As Uranian characters tell, retell, and contemplate--or as they write, rewrite, and share their own stories--they are able to observe and to test their many available options before choosing any irrevocable recourse into action.

For example, the instructive and saving nature of *Urania*'s "kind" and "loving discourse" (*Urania* 147) is exemplified in the logocentric education of Pamphilia, who is princess of Morea and eventually sovereign ruler of her own country. In the character of Pamphilia, Wroth represents her own use of words to question and to test personal, religious, and political choice.³ For example, throughout the romance

³Wroth's work does reflect the tradition of emblematic literature in which a picture and motto are used to teach a moral lesson. However, while Wroth's work is at times emblematic, her focus goes beyond creating a visual image and delivering a moral message. In-

Wroth's heroine faces an obstacle in her personal and her political life--her unrequited love for Amphilanthus, Prince of Naples, King of the Romans, and future Holy Roman Emperor. As a noble princess and queen, Pamphilia cannot afford to reveal an unhealthy passion to her people--or so Protestant thinkers like Wroth believed.

Indeed, the Uranian narrator reveals that only alone can Pamphilia "breath out her passions, which to none shee would discover, resolving rather so to perish, then that any third should know shee could be subject to affection" (62). Yet Pamphilia does embrace a "third" in which she confides and explores her passion in order to determine whether it is of noble or excessive character; she embraces the only means available for analyzing her love for Amphilanthus--writing poetry and participating in storytelling. By engaging with such words, a mirroring of Protestant engagement with the scriptural "Word," Pamphilia educates herself as to the nature of true, noble, and constant love as well as the qualities demanded of a successful ruler. In effect, she undertakes a sacred contemplation of her own conscience and of her political duties through the words she creates and encounters in the romance and thus avoid taking irrevocable actions that could destroy her rule.

When we first meet Pamphilia we are informed that she is a "ceaseless mourning soule," for the man she loves, Amphilanthus, loves another (*Urania* 62). Succumbing to passion, Pamphilia yearns to share her feelings with Amphilanthus but instead privately retires into her bed, "taking a little Cabinet with her, wherein she had many papers" (62). In this cabinet--a locked, secretive mirror of Pamphilia's own enclosed mind--she enshrines her verses that have been written during attempts to seek understanding and resolution to her confusion. Pamphilia, "being excellent in writing," confesses that her words, "Heart drops distilling like a new cut-vine[,] / Weep for the paines that doe my soule oppresse" (62-3, lines 1-2). Reading and writing verse, she admits that her "Silly woes" (5) are "in such excesse" (6) that she has "failld" to "avoid offense" and has given into passion. In weakness, her heart "pity doth implore" (18). Safe in the realm of words, Pam-

stead, she explores the process of how words educate, reveal choices, combat despair, and bring insight. As her characters write and share stories with others or as they write privately to explore confusion, Wroth studies the efficacious and causative nature of words. Pamphilia is not offered as an emblematic representation of virtue. Instead, Pamphilia's words become a vehicle through which readers learn to appreciate the power of language, discourse, writing, and reading to educate themselves and to work through conflict.

philia freely records her distress. Rereading her verse, however, Pamphilia recognizes that such passion is indeed foolish and threatens to enslave her, and she subsequently spurns the emotion:

Fie passion . . . how foolish canst thou make us? And when with much pain and businesse thou hast gain'd us, now dost thou then dispose us into folly, making our choicest wits testimonies to our faces of our weakenesses, and . . . bring my owne hands to witness against me, unblushingly showing my idlenesses to mee. (63)

Thus “tooke she the new-writ lines, and as soone almost as shee had given them life, shee likewise gave them buriall” (63). Pamphilia clearly recognizes the efficacious nature of words, of her words, and in this forthright act of confessional writing, contemplation, and self-editing, she vividly illustrates the power Wroth believes writing possesses. Pamphilia can avoid an irrevocable, self-destructive outburst of emotion by first allowing herself to experience that emotion through her words and actively deeming it undesirable and destructive both for a Christian woman and a Christian queen.

Such self-exploration and censorship continue, for Pamphilia recognizes that, despite her best efforts, love “dost master [her]” (*Urania* 63). As the romance progresses, she continues to educate herself through her writing on how to balance a desire for love with her duty as queen. Thus as we observe Pamphilia succumbing again and again to despair, we gradually discern that true learning is indeed a painful and arduous process—one that, as Luther said of scriptural study, must take, quite literally, a lifetime.

As we persist through the massive romance, we very often witness Pamphilia recording her moments of confusion on paper in her secret cabinet or into the bark of ash trees in her private garden in order to remind herself of former resolve and to work through present uncertainties. In fact, the topography of her garden, in which she often writes, vividly reflects Pamphilia’s uncertainties about love, for like love, the garden is “delicately contriv’d into strange, and delightfull walkes” (90). With words, Pamphilia attempts to create a controlled path through her emotions of love just as the gardener contrives walks through the natural environs of her garden. As a gardener learns to control nature comprised of “Plaine,” “Wood,” “fine hills” and “delicate Valleyes” (90), Pamphilia, too, seeks to tame her passion for Amphilanthus through the tool of the written word.

In her garden, Pamphilia finds yet another place of private introspection in which she can explore her emotions in writing—not this

time her bedroom cabinet but a thick enclosure of trees whose tops are “joyning so close” that “Phoebus durst not there shew his face” (*Urania* 91). In this bower, hidden by trees and supported by a “greene Velvet Carpet” of grass, Pamphilia suffers the pangs of love and thus “complaining, fearing, and loving, [she is] the most distressed, secret, and constant Lover that ever Venus, or her blind Sonne bestowed a wound or dart upon” (92).

Inconsolable, Pamphilia once again turns to the written word to explore her pain. This time, instead of paper and pen, the heroine takes a knife and begins “to ingrave [a sonnet] in the barke of one of those fayre and straight Ashes.” The poetically carved tree “accompan[ies] her teares” with sap and thus offers her the “third party” she so desperately seeks--the party that will “part taste my paine” (92). Pamphilia declares in her sonnet that the carved tree will “out-live me, and testifie my woes” that must for now be kept private (92, line 14). A poem added later to the ash tree insists that the love recorded there will continue to be as “A Diamond pure and hard, an unshak’t tree” (146, line 33). Each sonnet, each engagement with her own thoughts through the written word aids Pamphilia in combating what she gradually deems to be “disorderly passions” (92).

Meditating upon her own words, she promises herself that she will strive to “keepe still [my] soule from thought of change,” to remain constant to her growing knowledge of noble and liberating love, and to spurn love that imprisons and debilitates (92). Determined to hide her passion from others, Pamphilia glories in the freedom poetry affords her, for she knows that, even if her verses are discovered, she can avoid the charges of over-indulgence or passionate excess. After all, as she proclaims, “many Poets write as well by imitation, as by sence of passion; therefore this is no prooffe against me” (94). The power of the word to convict and to save is once again affirmed by Wroth and her Protestant ideal.

As we have seen, Pamphilia employs writing to explore privately her own passions. However, through her words and those of others, she also evaluates her political duties as princess of Morea and eventually as queen of Pamphilia. In the midst of exploring love, Pamphilia learns that she is to be crowned queen of her own country. As she prepares for her journey and for her new position as a Christian ruler, Pamphilia still struggles with her unresolved passion for the absent Amphilanthus and worries about its effect on her ability to rule well. Surprisingly, she finds comfort in a most unexpected source--the words of Antissia, her rival for Amphilanthus’ love and herself the princess of Romania. Coming upon Antissia in the “Garden Woods,” Pamphilia overhears her rival’s song of despair:

Stay mine eye, these floods of teares
 Seeme but follies weakly growing,
 Babes at nurse such wayling beares,
 Frowardnesse such drops bestowing. . . . (147, lines 1-4)

Comparing herself to Niobe, Antissia predicts that she too will be “made a rock” from which “heavn drops downe teares” (11).⁴ Antissia is incapacitated by a passion that threatens to immobilize her literally and figuratively, thus leading her to abandon her duties to her people. Hearing Antissia’s words, Pamphilia straightaway recognizes her own condition and gains insight once again into the nature of excessive love; she does not desire to figure forth the image, as does Antissia, of a debilitated, lovesick ruler. Thus revealed is yet another level of the power of words (in this case the words of another) to educate and to lead one to knowledge and resolution. Recognizing the similarity in her and Antissia’s states of despair, Pamphilia is able to offer the advice needed to achieve a healthy love and balance in life:

Sweete Antissia, leave these dolorous complaints. . . . melancholy, the nurse of such passions being glad, when her authoritie is esteemed, and yeilded to. . . . and truely [melancholy] is enough to spoile any, so strangely it growes upon one, and so pleasing is the snare, as till it hath ruind one, no fault is found with it, but like death, embraced by the ancient brave men, like honour and delight. This I have found and smarted with it; leave it then, and nip it in the bud, lest it blow to overthrow your life and happinesse. . . . (147)

In such “kind” and “loving discourse,” the two women pass the night, and both women manage to progress one step forward in their educations about love, constancy, and the responsibilities implicit in a royal life. Once again, the power of words to save from despair and to engender conviction is vividly demonstrated.

Part of a complex network of distinct voices, Pamphilia is not only a poet and participant in “loving discourse.” She also becomes both teller of and audience to the stories of countless characters in her continuous journey towards insight and resolved action. In the intersection and interaction of these stories, choices emerge and true resolution becomes possible. For example, Pamphilia gradually learns the importance of self-mastery and autonomy, not only through poems and “shared discourse,” but also through the storytelling of Alarina.

Visiting the Metelin court of her brother and sister-in-law, Philarchos and Orilena, Pamphilia once again falls into despondency

⁴In Greek mythology, Niobe was turned into stone after losing her children and became a mountain whose tears were streams.

over her hidden love for Amphilanthus. In an effort to comfort herself, she “did write, and then went shee to bed, and tooke a Candle, and so read awhile; but all these were but as lime-twiggs, to hold fast her thoughts to love” (216). At this point in Pamphilia’s education, the power of the written word fails to comfort her. Once again, however, the efficacy of the word, this time in the form of storytelling, is proven, for the next day during a hunt, Pamphilia comes upon a nymph “of all perfections that wer chast” (216). Enraptured by the nymph’s countenance, Pamphilia entreats her “to tell me all your story” (217).

The nymph reveals that she was once the content shepherdess Alarina who fell in love at the “young, and ignorant” age of fourteen. She confesses that, privately and unbeknownst to the man, she became “his slave, and such a slave . . . [that] my health alterd” (218). Secretly, she continued to love him for five years, during which time he married another. As fate would have it, Alarina’s love was eventually revealed, and for two years thereafter “delightfull games he did invent” that allowed them to explore their love (219). An inconstant man, however, her lover eventually became enraptured with a beautiful servant during a pastoral festival for May Day, and “This woman yet allur’d my love to change, and what was worse, to scorn me” (220).

Alarina admits to Pamphilia that this rejection led her to declare herself “worthlesse for outward parts to be looked on” (220). Falsely believing that beauty and the acceptance of a lover are the gauges of one’s worth as a woman, Alarina reveals that she carefully wrote a letter—one that she tells her audience, “I read, I corrected, and often staid with blots”—and insisted that her lover honor her. The nymph explains to Pamphilia that “I could not silent be, nor yet could speake” (222), and thus writing, by insinuation, is once again proclaimed to be an appropriate means of seeking resolution to volatile situations. Still, despite the eloquence of her letter, her lover was “displeased” and “continued in his peremptory course of hating me” (221, 223).

Though difficult, in this time of despair and contemplation, Alarina discovers her true worth. Further yet, in Alarina’s story of self-discovery, Pamphilia herself encounters the questions that she too must answer about her love, about her own self-worth, and about her fear of autonomy. Alarina describes a symbolic moment in which she ascends a hill overlooking a pastoral valley; she then “sat downe in a stone of mighty height, which like a chaire in just proportion, did give mee roome and ease” (223). The seat is, however, precarious, “for the height was great” and one could “see the bottome [of the valley] directly under” (223). Positioned midway between heaven and earth, Alarina at this moment figures a powerful image—one of a woman with an active

choice to be made between a life of despondency or death and one of fulfillment and peace, a situation to which Pamphilia, in her private despair, easily relates. Alarina's words effectively lead Pamphilia (and readers of the romance) on her own spiritual ascent, and they position Pamphilia to evaluate her own despair.

As Alarina's story continues, its words allow Pamphilia to experience a sacramental moment of cleansing that achieves the goal of many Protestant writers--to create experiential moments of rebirth in their texts. Looking into the valley, Alarina witnesses "some folkes" who are drinking from a spring. After asking if the spring "were medicinal," Alarina is informed that it is actually a "divine and sacred water, which did cure all harmes" (223). If she drinks from the spring "Seven times . . . and thrice seven dayes," she will procure "Quiet of spirit, comfort in this life" (223).

As Alarina undertakes this purgative ceremony, one that allows Pamphilia and the reader to also experience baptism and death-to-self, she is gradually awakened to a new life.⁵ This life is one in which she feels her "whole condition alterd, [for she] grew free, and free from love, to which [she] was late a slave" (224). Alarina in a moment of epiphanic clarity recognizes the most important lesson of her life: "I love my selfe, my selfe now loveth me" (224). Gone are the days in which she measured her self-worth by the love of another; gone are the days in which her identity is dependent on another. Instead, Alarina, self-confident and autonomous, becomes a nymph of Diana and adopts a new name, Silviana.

Alarina's words have effectively allowed Pamphilia to examine the purgative and edifying nature of baptism, and Pamphilia praises the happiness the nymph has achieved through the ceremony that engenders her ability "to master your self" (224). Still, the "excellent Queene" wonders if the nymph has seen her lover since her rebirth. Again reflecting the autonomy she so cherishes, Silviana admits that, while she has seen her love, her "heart [is] so free from love" that it does not pain to see him. The nymph celebrates her new life:

[N]ow am I free my selfe, void of those troubles, love provoked in me; I can with quietnes heare all his acts, see him

⁵This ritualistic baptism is a compelling echo of Lutheran and Philippist thought concerning the sacramental nature of words. In this scene, the sacrament of baptism is made perpetually efficacious through the medium of words. Readers can experience with Alarina again (again and again) the glories and regeneration associated with baptism.

this day intolerably fond of one I hated, then change to a new; all that mooves not me, save only that I out of pity, pity their ill haps. (224)

Pamphilia is humbled and amazed by the nymph's happiness and confidence. In fact, she declares, "I cannot yet believe . . . but you love him still, for all this liberall and excellent discourse" (224). Faced with Pamphilia's assertion, Silviana does not deny that her love for the man might still exist, but she does declare that "I never will live houre . . . to hate him" (225). With this statement, Silviana asserts that giving in to hate will only denigrate her self-worth and virtue, thus making her equal to or even worse than the man who has rejected her.

Such is a lesson Pamphilia must learn as well, for she is only beginning to understand that one's own actions and *reactions* to adversity determine her worth as woman and queen, not those actions of a lover who might give or withhold true and constant love. In her private retreat, Pamphilia chastises herself and admits that she must cherish Alarina/Silviana's words and view the woman as a model to emulate, a woman of worth:

"Pamphilia," said she, "can thy great spirit permit thee to bee bound, when such as Alarina can have strength to master, and command even love it selfe? Scorne such servilitie, where subjects soveraignize; never let so meane a thing ore-rule thy greatest power; either command like thy self, or fall downe, vassal in despaire. Why should fond love insult, or venture in thy sight? Let his babish tricks be priz'd by creatures under thee, but disdain thou such a government. Shall blindnes master thee, and guide thee? looke then sure to fall. Shall wayward folly rule thee? looke to be despis'd. Shall foolish wantonnes intice thee? hate such vice. Shall children make thee follow their vaine tricks? scorne then thy selfe, and all such vanities." (225)

With such admonition in mind, Pamphilia continues to fashion the resolve and confidence she needs to be a virtuous and noble woman and queen. Inspired by the story of another, Pamphilia has been compelled to re-evaluate her own passion for Amphilanthus, her self-worth, and her obligations to her people.

Thus, with her readers, Pamphilia continues to contemplate the stories she has been told and the passions discovered in her own writing, and these words continuously inspire her to model the strength needed to be a respected ruler. The stories of others become a weapon

with which she fights despair and strives to make active choices that will fortify her personal and political life. Interestingly, as Pamphilia learns such lessons, the readers, too, are being educated through the fiction generated by Mary Sidney Wroth. We too learn that, though in love, a person must continue to fulfill duty and responsibility, for even in passionate despair, Pamphilia knows she must never abandon her obligations as Morean princess and Pamphilian queen.

For example, as the romance continues and as Pamphilia views the mirror images of herself and of her situation in the stories of others, she develops a deeper conviction that queenly duty must supersede passion. After truly contemplating the stories, Pamphilia boldly refuses her father's suggestions regarding marriage by insisting that "his Majestie had once married her before, which was to the Kingdome of Pamphilia, from which Husband shee could not bee divorced, nor ever would have other" (262). Pamphilia has witnessed, in fiction, how love can debilitate and consume a woman, and thus, as queen, she contends that "my people looke for me, and I must needs be with them" (262). She has, in effect, "married her selfe to them," and there is, therefore, no place in her life for the complications of a husband--unless, of course, it is a husband whom her people desire to help lead them (264).⁶ She believes or hopes this husband will be Amphilanthus whose political reputation is without question.

Ultimately, then, Pamphilia's continuous quest to comprehend love, marriage, and queenship slowly merges into one culminating concern: Is her love for Amphilanthus one that will strengthen her country, her rule, and her virtue or is it one that will weaken her ability to serve her country well? Will Amphilanthus prove to be a lover with whom she can maintain her self and her godly rule, or will he prove another example of the inconstant and repressive men she has encountered in poetry, fiction, and conversation?

With these questions looming, Pamphilia turns back to words--fictive and poetic--for insight and salvation. In fact, Pamphilia can continue her exploration of these questions regarding love and leadership only through the power of words and stories, for after learning of Pamphilia's love, Amphilanthus must leave to engage in battles throughout Europe. Distraught by long absence and plagued with ru-

⁶Roberts points out that Pamphilia's speech echoes that of Queen Elizabeth I in 1559: "Yea, to satisfy you, I have already joynd my self in Marriage to an Husband, namely the Kingdom of England. And behold (said she, which I marvell ye have forgotten,) the Pledge of this my Wedlock and Marriage with my Kingdom" (see *Urania* 747, commentary 262.31-33).

mors of Amphilanthus's infidelity, Pamphilia often allows herself to fall into the despair that she has vowed to avoid, for unfortunately, Pamphilia does not always remember the "lessons learned" from the fictions with which she has engaged—just as students of scripture often turn from lessons earlier accomplished.

Still, however, we also see her attempting to re-educate, to regenerate herself once again, through the word. Yet again, Wroth's romance makes it clear that learning is a continual process and that complete resolution to life's questions may never be possible. One may feel she knows the whole story but must, in fact, be willing to continue to explore, to learn, and to act upon truths as they develop and reveal themselves more fully. As Luther had insisted of scriptural study, engaging with the "word" consistently and repetitively leads to new insights, and those who desire to be truly educated must be willing to learn new lessons as they are added to knowledge already gained.

For example, as her narrative continues, Wroth assures us that Alarina/Silviana's story is one that Pamphilia holds in her mind's collection of educative stories. On a return visit to Arcadia where she first met Alarina/Silviana, Pamphilia discovers "inscriptions in the barke" of the forest trees and bushes that are the "letters intertwined of Alarina, and her love" (482). Feeling a communal sympathy with the nymph whose story so inspired her, Pamphilia "set hers, and her deere love" under those of the nymph (482). The image of Pamphilia's name intertwined with that of Silviana is a vivid picture of the intimate connection that Pamphilia feels for her fellow storyteller and lover.

At that moment, Pamphilia truly believes that she has conclusively learned the lesson of Silviana's story and that both women should remain stubbornly virtuous and proud of their chastity and autonomy. Suddenly, however, Pamphilia is shocked to see Alarina approaching the grove, dressed in the attire of a bride, "crowned with Roses" (482). Shocked, isolated and rejected, Pamphilia retires into her chamber and wonders why "alone" she must "suffer glory in such martyrdome"(482)--dishonorably, Pamphilia is taking pride in and embracing her position as victim of love rather than exploring how her feelings of love, reciprocated or not, can ennoble her. Still, knowing that she should not form her final judgment of Alarina before speaking with her, Pamphilia invites the former nymph to meet her in the garden walks to discuss her change of appearance and, presumably, of heart.

Although Pamphilia begins their meeting by "taxing" Alarina "for her lightnesse in change," she soon is forced to reconsider the lessons learned from her previous encounter with the nymph (482). Once again words are shown to be alive, regenerative, and capable of revealing new perspectives. The fact is that Pamphilia has not learned fully

the lesson found in Alarina's story, for Alarina's final insights--the final chapter of *her* romance--are not that one must always be autonomous but that one must be *able* to live autonomously and that one can accept and respect love that is freely given.

True, Alarina has accepted the return of her lover, but she insists that she has not changed; she is still "free" but now also fortunate because "I have my love tyed by his owne, and marriage vowes" (483). Her "Returning love" brings her pure happiness because now the nature of her love is not one of need and desperation but of mutuality and respect. Her lover now loves of his own volition, not of force, and recognizes Alarina's merits as an individual. In fine, Alarina contends that while she once believed she was completely fulfilled during her autonomy, she now recognizes that it was actually the necessary step towards a greater goal--a mutual and completing love.

Like it or not, according to Alarina, we all may be "fine creatures alone in our imaginations; but otherwise poore miserable captives to love" (483). We are made to love and to seek a partner in life; in fact, the belief that one does not need love is vain and foolish, and Alarina suggests that Pamphilia must reject the pride she takes in her solitude. She must realize that love can actually strengthen her virtue and position as woman and queen. If she is to live up to her noble nature, Pamphilia must cease in denying her feelings for Amphilanthus and be willing to accept the possibility that he is not the lover destined to complement and fulfill her purpose as woman and queen:

Flatter not your selfe deere Princesse, for believe it, the greater your minde is, and the braver your spirit, the more, and stronger are your passions, the violence of which though diversly cast, and determined, will turne still to the government of love; and the truer your subjects are to you, the firmer will be your loyalty to him. (483)

Alarina's story had earlier taught Pamphilia that she must not fear autonomy, and now the storyteller also reveals that one should not be ashamed to love, if that love is mutual and edifying and if it complements one's qualities rather than destroys them. Yes, a woman must be confident in her ability to live alone, but once this goal is accomplished she can and should join herself to a partner in love, if that love is true. With this new revelation to ponder, the women turn "to discourse of Poetry" as Alarina recites "merry songs" and Pamphilia "straines . . . of lamentation" (484).

Once again Pamphilia is inspired to analyze and to emulate the truths she has encountered in the story of another. She returns to Pam-

philia and vows not to let love incapacitate her and her duty as queen. The Uranian narrator assures us that “she lost not her selfe; for her government continued just and brave, like that Lady she was, wherein she shewed her heart was not to be stirr’d, though her private fortunes shooke round about her” (484). Pamphilia resolves to avail herself of true love, to continue to learn of its nature, and to meet the fear she has of rejection with honest self-esteem.

And thus Pamphilia’s quest to become the image of godly woman and ruler continues. While as readers we witness Amphilanthus’s infidelities, his inconstancy, and, admittedly, his glories, we are also made painfully aware that true knowledge, that true education, is a slow, arduous, and unpredictable process. We learn to accumulate knowledge with each and every story, word, or poem Pamphilia encounters. Just as students of scripture must be active readers, as active readers of this fiction, we, too, are challenged to piece together the words scattered throughout *Urania* and to construct and build a full understanding of love and of its relation to duty.

Like Pamphilia, we become editors of the words that we encounter, co-writers as it were, with this fictional queen who must learn through the power of language, words, and stories to separate truth from falsehood and bring resolution to uncertainty. Pamphilia’s education is, in truth, never fully resolved, yet the moments of clarity she achieves are quite distinct and worthy of consideration. As we read, we realize that perhaps Mary Sidney Wroth is revealing to us the vanity of believing we can achieve static truth, that we must be willing to continue, throughout life, to explore questions of import--be they personal, political, or religious. Like her uncle, Wroth “never affirmeth” but challenges and trusts our willingness to seek understanding and resolution.

In conclusion, perhaps one of the most prophetic and insightful moments of clarity achieved by the queen, and one that clearly proves Wroth’s contention that logocentric education is an endless process, is found near the end of the romance. Amphilanthus strangely disappears from Pamphilia’s court, and upon searching for her lost lover, the queen comes upon a blood trail that leads to

a Crowne of mighty stones, in the mid’st one greater then all the rest, and on that the Armour of Amphilanthus, the Sheild, the Sword . . . and the armour was hacked, and cut in many places, besides all bloody, and the blood as fresh, as if but newly shed. . . (581)

Nearby lies Amphilanthus’s dead horse, “an infinite and huge Boare slain,” and “a Gentleman of excellent proportion dead also”

(581). Aided by Philarchos, Pamphilia searches for Amphilanthus, believing he, too, must be dead. The two collect his armor and proceed to adorn the Crowne of stone with these “rich ornaments” in order to pay homage to the fallen hero. They are unable, however, to remove Amphilanthus’s sword from a stone in which it is embedded and out of which “smoake, and fire suddenly to flie out” (583). Realizing that she is witnessing “some Inchantment,” Pamphilia ventures forward and, spying a “ring of iron,” opens the stone that reveals “a place like a Hell of flames, and fire, and as if many walking and throwing pieces of men and women up and downe the flames, partly burnt . . .” (583).

As she surveys this “hell of deceit,” Pamphilia watches as Amphilanthus’s other lovers, Musalina and Lucenia, participate in the Emperor’s fiery punishment. As Musalina sits in a “Chaire of Gold,” she takes a sword from Lucenia and proceeds toward Amphilanthus who stands before the women “with his heart ript open, and Pamphilia written in it” (583). Musalina prepares to “[raze] that name out, and so his heart as the wound to perish” (583). Courageously, Pamphilia attempts to stop this fiery eradication of her love. Determined that neither “flames, fier, Hell itself” can “keepe her from passing through to him,” Pamphilia is dumbfounded when she is “thrown out againe in a swoond, and the doore shut” upon her attempt to enter the flame (583). Wroth’s familiarity with scriptural symbol is clear, for echoes of the Psalms reverberate in this scene: “Create in me a new heart, O God” (Psalm 51).⁷ The question is, is it Pamphilia or Amphilanthus or who needs a new heart?

When Pamphilia “[comes] to herself,” she discovers that, once again, the written word has manifested itself as a teacher and testament to truth. Written upon the stone are the following words:

Faithfull lovers keepe from hence
 None but false ones here can enter:
 This conclusion hath from whence
 Falsehood flowes: and such may venter. (584)

⁷This razing of Amphilanthus’s heart has interesting parallels to regenerative patterns in other Protestant works. Barbara Lewalski points out that the “bruising and preparation” of the heart is an important part of the Christian’s “process of afflicting, pricking, and purging his own heart by meditating intently upon his own sins and God’s Law” (21). The ultimate point is that it is the individual and God, not a third party, who must purge and recreate the believer’s heart.

The veracity of the words--that she is faithful but Amphilanthus is not--assertively registers in Pamphilia's mind. For the first time, the queen fully "perceived what this was, and so as sadly as before resolved, shee returned to the Court, where more like a religious, then a Court life, she lived some yeares" (584). At this moment, Pamphilia achieves the resolution she has sought. Yet, as in the past, resolution proves elusive, for at the conclusion of the romance, when a repentant Amphilanthus returns, Pamphilia "ranne unto him, forgiving, nay forgetting all injuries, [and] he seeing her threw downe his helme, with open armes received her, and with all unfained affection embraced her, and well might he joyfully do it" (660).

Thus Wroth's *Urania* ends with "all now merry, contented, nothing amisee; greife forsaken, sadnes cast off, Pamphilia is the Queene of all content; Amphilanthus joying worthily in her; And" (661). Breaking off with the seductive "And," Wroth insinuates that Pamphilia's education will continue; in fact, it is not until the end of the recently published Part II of *Urania* that Pamphilia fully learns that her love for Amphilanthus is not compatible with her position as Queen.⁸ Thus she marries the Tartarian king, and, as Josephine Roberts notes, eventually discovers "a revolutionary model of male-female relations" ("Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*: A Response to Jacobean Censorship" 128). Pamphilia and Amphilanthus realize that women and men in the personal, political, and religious realms exist as "youke fellowes, noe superior, nor commaunding power butt in love between united harts" (*Urania II* 381).

By consistently demonstrating the power of words and of storytelling to lead one toward understanding, Wroth clearly justifies her use of writing to explore her larger questions regarding proper behavior for Christian leaders. True, Pamphilia's education as lover and queen is never fully completed; her questions are never definitively resolved. However, through words--poetry, shared discourse, storytelling--she is able to gain growing insights into the desirable and undesirable, the beneficent and the destructive, the many faces of love and duty that a woman and queen must face.

Implicitly, then, Wroth's own fictive questioning and exploration are just that--attempts toward insight and resolution. Just as neither

⁸*The Second Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania (Urania II)* was written sometime between 1621 and 1630. However, Wroth apparently never sought to publish the manuscript continuation. Under the fine scholarship of the late Josephine Roberts, Suzanne Gossett, and Janel Mueller, *Urania II* was made available in published form for the first time in 1999.

Pamphilia nor Mary Wroth may ever discover the definitive answers they so fervently seek, so too Wroth's Protestant tradition insists that such is the nature of all pursuits for Truth. Humans will never attain full insight or resolution into the mysteries of God, of faith, or of Christian duty. However, committing oneself to a lifetime of reasonable study will bring one a step closer to the goal of divine understanding.

Works Cited

- Doerksen, Daniel W. *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne, and the English Church before Laud*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1997.
- La Fontaine, Sister Mary Joan. Introduction. *A Critical Translation of Philip Melancthon's Elementorum Rhetorices Libri Duo*. Dissertation of U of Michigan, 1968.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.
- Melancthon, Philip. *A Critical Translation of Philip Melancthon's Elementorum Rhetorices Libri Duo*. Trans. Mary Joan La Fontaine. Diss. U of Michigan, 1968.
- Preus, James Samuel. *From Shadow to Promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1969.
- Roberts, Josephine. "Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*: A Response to Jacobean Censorship." *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts*. Ed. W. Speed Hill. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993. 125-29.
- Schneider, John. *Philip Melancthon's Rhetorical Construal of Biblical Authority: Oratio Sacra*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen P, 1990.

- Shuger, Debora Kuller. *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture*. Berkeley: U of California P,
- Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry: or, the Defense of Poesy*. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. London: Nelson, 1965.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *The Education of a Christian Woman*. Ed. and Trans. Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000.
- Wroth, Mary. *The First Part of the Countess of Pembroke's Urania*. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995.
- . *The Second Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Eds. Josephine A. Roberts, Suzanne Gossett, and Janel Mueller. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999.

True to Twelfth-Century Form: Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*

David S. King

The last thirty years of the twelfth century rank among the most vibrant in French literary history. Romance was then undergoing a rapid transformation, as history, hagiography, and fiction were beginning to acquire separate identities. Chrétien de Troyes and Gautier d'Arras among were the principals behind this literary innovation in France. Their work cast the romance die for decades, if not centuries, to come.¹ However, with the Renaissance, the urge to imitate classical models gave ascendancy to lyric poetry and theater. As a consequence, the romance tradition faded from glory; the French reading public began to consider courtly and chivalric tales as, at best, quaint relics from their barbarian past.

When interest in medieval narrative renewed in the late nineteenth century, critics accustomed to Aristotelian notions of form, though they valued the content of Chrétien's and Gautier's romances, found their compositions terribly wanting. Neither romancer, nor any medieval poet for that matter, paid heed to classical ideals of seamless-ness, logical sequence, uniqueness of intrigue, or "the idea, for example, that properly constructed narrative has a beginning, middle, and

¹According to William Calin, for example, "Chrétien de Troyes . . . and Gautier d'Arras . . . form a 'classical generation' that bursts upon the scene with a splendor unique in medieval letters. Their contribution to Western culture, by 'inventing' the courtly romance genre and by raising it to a level of artistic perfection, is incalculable" (*The French Tradition and the Literature of Medieval England* 57-58). Yves Lefèvre expresses similar admiration for Gautier's work: "Chrétien's unequaled and legitimate prestige should in no way diminish Gautier's merit and especially not the very real interest that his two works represent for the history of French romance" (*Le Roman français jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle* 269). Corinne Pierreville echoes Lefèvre's sentiments in her recent study, *Gautier d'Arras, l'autre chrétien*.

end" (Ryding 9). Nonetheless, by the late twentieth century the critical imagination began better to grasp medieval aesthetics. Chrétien's multi-part romances and his interlacing of narrative threads became objects of admiration. Gautier's romances, and *Eracle* in particular, have yet to achieve the same level of critical understanding.²

One of Gautier's most admiring critics, Paul Zumthor, explains the apparent lack of cohesion in *Eracle* by invoking the poet's attachment to oral tradition. He characterizes the poem as "a patchwork very carefully conceived but piece by piece, as the whole builds and expands" (194).³ But despite Zumthor's professed admiration of Gautier's achievement, the "patchwork" characterization in fact does inadequate justice to Gautier's poetic skill. For *Eracle's* cohesion consists of more than the "unity in performance" that Zumthor ascribes to the romance.

Although Gautier does self-consciously call attention to the seams between episodes in his romance, a careful examination of the text indicates he was intent on more than patching pieces together. He follows an analogical approach to narrative composition, much like that of Chrétien and other medieval poets (see Lacy's *The Craft of Chrétien de Troyes: An Essay on Narrative Art*). That is to say, Gautier balances the multiformity of his romance with analogical counterweight. He achieves narrative cohesion by means of repeated symbolic, visual, and structural motifs that, in turn, echo his thematic schemes.

Whereas Gautier's method of composition conforms to medieval norms, his blend of material is unusual. *Eracle* reads at turns like a saint's life, a *fabliau*, a courtly love story, and *chanson de geste*. As the romance begins, an angel informs the hero's parents, Miriados and Cassine, that they will be blessed with a child because of their exemplary faith. Because of God's gift, the child Eracle will possess unlimited knowledge of stones, horses, and women. When Miriados dies, Cassine gives away their estate and sells Eracle into slavery. His owner,

²Several critics have expressed dissatisfaction with the composition of *Eracle*, among them Faral, Raynaud de Lage, and Renzi.

³I translated critical commentary from Faral, Fourier, Leffèvre, Wolfzettel, and Zumthor from French into English, and from German to English for Becker. In the interest of good scholarship, I present Gautier's text in the original Old French; the accompanying translations are my own, although I did consult Anthony Gythiel's "*Ille et Galeron and Eracle: Two Twelfth-Century French Romances Translated with an Introduction*." Diss. U of Detroit, 1972.

the Roman emperor Laïs, scoffs at the boy's avowed talents. Eracle repeatedly demonstrates his superior knowledge of stones and horses.

Finally, accepting Eracle's gifts as authentic, Laïs asks the boy to choose him a wife. The task proves difficult; nevertheless, the hero finds a suitable bride, Athanaïs. Emperor and empire are happy with Eracle's choice, but duty calls the emperor away to war. Contrary to Eracle's advice, Laïs puts Athanaïs under guard. Corrupted by this distrust, she falls in love with the noble Paridés, and a matchmaker facilitates their secret tryst. As soon as the lovers consummate their relationship, Eracle apprises Laïs of his wife's transgression. The emperor returns to Rome to punish Athanaïs, but at Eracle's insistence, he settles for a divorce.

Finally, word of Eracle's wisdom spreads; and the people of Constantinople call on him to be their emperor. They live in fear of the Persian king Cosroé, who has killed their previous emperor and stolen part of the True Cross. An angel calls Eracle to arms against the evil pagan. On the strength of his prayers, Eracle defeats Cosroé's son in single combat. Many of the pagan soldiers convert to Christianity on the spot, whereupon they dispatch their recalcitrant comrades. Eracle then crosses Persia unopposed, eviscerates the pagan king, and liberates the stolen portion of the True Cross. After returning the holy relic to Jerusalem, the hero retreats into a quiet life as the Christian emperor of Constantinople

So unconventional is this overall scheme that it has engendered conflicting interpretations of the romance's character. Some scholars choose to see *Eracle's* composition as analogous to that of numerous bipartite narratives, such as *Beowulf*, or Chrétien's *Erec et Enide* and *Cligés*. Edmond Faral, for example, insists that the romance forms a two-part story. His division offers a rather lopsided result, since part two as he sees it, "the story of the Cross," begins at verse 5120, at which point only some twelve hundred verses remain. He bases this conclusion on a distinction he draws between what he terms elements of, and true divisions in, Gautier's story:

The Athanaïs story, despite the special development that it receives, is an integral part of the narrative relating to Eracle's three gifts. And if one must introduce divisions within the first 5119 verses, there would be three: the tale of the stones (-1252), the tale of the horses (-1933), the tale of women (-5119). ("D'Un 'Passionaire' latin" 514)

Such a scheme would yield an awkward four-part narrative, or five-part if one counts Faral's further subdivision of the "second part"

into "the discovery of the Cross " and "the conquest of the Cross." One can perhaps understand Faral's preference for the simpler if still un-gainly two-part division in light of his focus on Gautier's sources. Whereas he demonstrates convincingly that Gautier borrowed the True Cross portion of his romance from a Latin Passionary (514-30), he acknowledges the story of Eracle's divinatory gifts and of Athanaïs's predicament--the stuff of "the first part"--as Oriental material (531). Though he suggests that Gautier also discovered this Greek fare via Roman channels, he can offer no documentary evidence of such a transmission. In any event, one can see that Faral's view of Eracle's composition corresponds to the distinctions he makes within the source material. Such a partition is no doubt convenient for Faral's purposes, but seems to owe more to his enumeration of sources than to the actual structuring of Gautier's work. As we shall soon see, there are many more ways to parse the first 5119 verses of *Eracle* than Faral suggests.⁴

Similarly, Anthime Fourrier separates the romance into two parts, but he acknowledges the initial segment dealing with Eracle's conception and childhood that Faral glazes over. This acknowledgment would seem to make a bipartite interpretation problematic. However, Fourrier simply frames all that precedes the Athanaïs love story as "preparation" and all that follows as "appendix" (*Le Courant réaliste* 261-62). The resulting structure is hardly less lopsided than that suggested by Faral; indeed, Fourrier complains that Gautier's disproportionate love story "disturbs the balance of his work " (262). Whereas the love intrigue consumes 4319 verses, according to Fourrier, only 1658 treat the "principal theme."⁵

⁴This secondary interest in the division of Gautier's text itself is all the more obvious in Becker's study "Von den Erzählern neben und nach Chrestien de Troyes." He seems to buy into Faral's idea: "Gautier's second romance also divides in two parts that do not necessarily belong together. They also derive from two different sources. The first part draws on, with understandable poetic license, the story of Queen Eudokia, which must have known from the *Chronicon paschale*" (286). . . . He continues: "Now we know, thanks to E. Faral's convincing article, that the direct source for the key part is to be found in liturgical readings dealing with the discovery of the Cross and the exaltation of the Cross" (290).

⁵By Fourrier's count the story of Eracle's adventures includes his conception and childhood (258 verses), the Crusade for the True Cross (1319 verses), and the end of the hero's life (81 verses); the secondary plot extends from line 259 to line 5120.

Yet, one could just as easily assign the imbalance to Fourrier's own arbitrary splicing. The Athanaïs episode disrupts the hero's story precisely because Eracle is absent from the 2194 verses at the center of the romance, yet Athanaïs does not appear in much of what Fourrier considers part of the love intrigue: namely, the test of Eracle's knowledge of stones (518 verses) and horses (627 verses), and most of the wife-choosing pageant (682 verses).⁶ The first two tests have nothing to do with Athanaïs in particular, and the pageant comes to an end before Eracle actually discovers the emperor's future wife.

Although the pageant certainly paves the way for this discovery, and the first two tests act as preparation for the third, all three tests serve likewise as preparation for Eracle's religious crusade. Indeed, without these feats he would not rise to a position of prominence at the Roman court, the requisite condition to his assuming duty as Christian emperor of Byzantium. But then, even if one accepts Fourrier's fusion of the tests and love intrigue, his two-theme model with its "*pièce de résistance*," (261) a romance surrounded by preamble and appendix, sounds suspiciously unlike a two-part composition.

In other words, the shift in narrative focus from Eracle, to the empress, and back to Eracle lends itself instead to a three-way division. The romance's *matières*, the saint's life introduction, the blend of fabliau and lay at the center, and the culminating epic crusade create a similar impression of the romance's architecture.⁷ Tripartition has indeed proved to be the more popular critical method of reading *Eracle*.⁸ And given the explicitly religious current that informs the romance, the arrangement would make perfect sense. Two more difficult compositional questions, however, remain: first, what exactly do these three parts consist of; and second, a question integrally linked to the first, how well do these parts hold together?

William Calin and Norris Lacy, for example, have addressed these questions and arrived at different conclusions on both counts

⁶The figure for the pageant is my own calculation, in which verse 1893 marks the beginning of the contest and verse 2575 as the moment when Eracle first sees Athanaïs.

⁷This is precisely the blurring of the terms "partie" and "élément" that Faral objects to; however, his objection seems arbitrary, since he does not explain what he finds objectionable (see "D'un 'passionnaire' latin" 514).

⁸Calin, Eley, Raynaud de Lage, Lacy, Stevenson, and Wolfzettel, among others, count three parts to *Eracle*.

(Calin, "Structure and Meaning in the *Eracle* by Gautier d'Arras" *Symposium* 275-87; Lacy, "The Form of Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*" *Modern Philology* 227-32). Calin sees the romance as segmented along its elemental lines. His scheme casts the first part, "a fairy-tale with Oriental motif," as including all of Eracle's tests and the imperial marriage. Part two begins only as Laïs must leave for a distant part of the empire (v. 2968);⁹ part three, "a religious chronicle treated as a *chanson de geste* (Calin 275)," Gautier's only unambiguously marked segment, begins with verse 5120. Calin's view thus yields an unusually well balanced distribution of material. The arrangement does little to diminish the "disparity in content," but Calin considers the "eclectic mixture" a strength in light of Eracle's journey:

We never really lose sight of the hero, of his struggles and triumphs as a worker of miracles, a jurist, and a warrior. In fact, the poem's unity of conception rests on its never-ending concern with the hero's personal entelechy. Disparity in theme and style only serves to emphasize the variety of human life and universal richness of Eracle's quest. The fairy tale, epic, and courtly romance each contribute to the total human picture, a microcosm of the great medieval macrocosmic world-view. (286-87)

However, Calin's suggestion of "unity" through Eracle's "personal" development proves unconvincing, given the static nature of the hero's character. Whereas Eracle rises in stature from slave to emperor, he begins and ends the romance as God's chosen stalwart. His divine anointment from birth leaves him no room to grow. Furthermore, Calin's claim that "we never really lose sight of the hero" takes too little account of Eracle's absence from nearly all of the "courtly romance" (vv. 2969-5120).¹⁰ Indeed, *Eracle* seems to represent the rare case of a romance in which the hero cannot function as a unifying element.

⁹Calin is not so specific, but he implies a division at this point by saying: "The courtly tone of the romance's second 'element'--how the emperor, compelled to leave Rome on a long military campaign, keeps Athanaïs prisoner in a tower, and how she commits adultery with a young nobleman--contrasts sharply with the scenes we have already discussed" (281).

¹⁰Gautier more or less absents Eracle from the scene between verses 3223 to 4735, where Eracle returns with the emperor to Rome.

Lacy, on the other hand, directly addresses the puzzle that Calin passes over, namely that of Eracle's absence, or why Gautier included the courtly love story in the middle of Eracle's adventures. In effect, Lacy solves the puzzle by denying the mysterious middle its status as the "full central section" of the romance. This shift in emphasis requires that he discount the importance of Gautier's hinge work at verse 2746.¹¹ Here, just before Athanaïs's wedding to the emperor, the poet declares "Huimais commencera li contes"¹² [Here the story begins]." Lacy deduces the romance's architecture instead through clues offered in "theme, locus, and tone" (229). Accordingly, the center does not consist solely of the adultery episode, but rather includes all of Eracle's fame-winning feats at the emperor's court. The arrangement makes for an extended second part and a brief introduction but reveals, according to Lacy, a "remarkably coherent architecture" (231).

In fact, this coherence rests, Lacy tells us, in no small part on the extended episode that offers "a balanced and symmetrical structure of its own" (231). Like the triptych form of the romance as a whole, this second section subdivides into three smaller parts "presenting largely parallel structures" (230). Each of these parts corresponds to one of Gautier's three gifts of knowledge. First, the hero must prove his knowledge of stones; the emperor, therefore, has all the gem dealers of the empire display their wares for Eracle's perusal. Eracle walks quickly past the precious stones; he then delights in his discovery of an apparently worthless rock, which he purchases for many times the asking price. Confronted with this dubious choice of stone, the emperor curses his diviner for bringing this humiliation. Eracle, however, succeeds in demonstrating the stone's protective charms against water, fire, and sword.¹³ The third segment of the first test thus itself entails a further three-part subdivision.

Even after this evidence of Eracle's wisdom, the doubting emperor remains wary. The ensuing test of the hero's equine knowledge follows the pattern of the first test. All the horse traders must offer their stock for inspection. Eracle ignores the obvious choices and selects a foal at the margins of the fair. Once again he insists on a price far

¹¹In addition to Raynaud de Lage, Calin, and Zumthor accept 2746 as the beginning of the second part.

¹²All verses cited in this study are from Guy Raynaud de Lage's 1976 critical edition.

¹³For Calin's comments on the meaning of the three tests, see "Structure and Meaning" (278).

higher than the seller demands. The emperor reproaches the prodigy for his apparent foolishness, to which Eracle responds by suggesting another test. Like the proof of the stone, this event invokes the magic number as Eracle races the foal against three other horses (Lacy 230). To be sure, Gautier does not simply repeat the form of the previous three-part proof. What distinguishes this race, other than the material tested, is the damage that Laïs's doubt exacts.¹⁴ The foal dies from overexertion, as Eracle warned that it would.

This misfortune seems to convince the emperor of Eracle's wisdom and to put an end to the testing phase. Although potential brides are assembled like so many stones or horses, Eracle inspects them with the assurance that the emperor will approve his choice. Eracle otherwise repeats the process as before; he dismisses the obvious candidates as unworthy. Only after he has gone beyond the pale of the contest does he find the ideal bride, a ten-year-old orphan. Her humble state would seem to make her an unlikely empress, but Eracle assures the emperor of the girl's impeccable virtue.¹⁵

This time, the emperor accepts Eracle's choice without question; indeed, he marries the girl almost immediately. Laïs's doubts surface only later in the section that Gautier identifies as the "li contes" (v. 2746), and the price he must pay for doubting Eracle's advice comes nearly two thousand verses thereafter. Here an understanding of Gautier's form proves crucial, according to Lacy, for the story of Athanaïs's fall from grace is actually the second half of what amounts to the third test of Eracle's gifts. "Although [the story] may be conspicuous for its length and detail," Lacy insists, "it is nonetheless apparent that the culmination of Eracle's ascension at court fully justifies the attention devoted to it" (231).

However, despite the "intricate and remarkably coherent architecture" that this tripartite center panel offers within Gautier's triptych, Lacy finds the whole wanting. The romance lacks cohesion, in his view, given the scarcity of analogical "counterpoise" to the romance's

¹⁴Eley portrays this doubt as a failure on a human plane, that is, as a lack of trust between Laïs and his adviser, Eracle. However, it is more appropriate to interpret this doubt as a flaw in Laïs's religious faith, given that Eracle's gifts are divine.

¹⁵Here the wisdom of Eracle is even more transparent to the audience, given the girl's resemblance to the hero. Not only is she a ten-year-old orphan like Eracle, but her father--like Miriados--was once a wealthy senator (vv. 2624-27).

"contrary structural forces." The "diversity of episodic matter" overwhelms rather than engages "the audience's interest," particularly in the first and third panels (231-32). Not that Gautier erred in choosing such diverse components as hagiography, courtly love, and epic crusade for his romance. After all, Lacy points out, the poet's famous contemporary succeeded in melding Perceval's Grail quest and Gauvain's comical wanderings into a cohesive whole in *Perceval ou le Conte du Graal*. Gautier simply did not prove entirely equal to the delicate integrative task that his choice of *matière* demanded, or so Lacy asserts (232).¹⁶

Along these lines, another of Lacy's nuances merits mention. When qualifying the competence that Gautier demonstrates in his architecture, Lacy confesses that "[t]here is an inevitable selectivity involved in the analysis of form, and we risk disguising as much as we elucidate" in such an undertaking (231). Here he admits to concealing *Eracle's* flaws. Yet paradoxically, while praising Gautier's architectural arrangement, Lacy in fact disguises the poem's analogical structure. Let us not forget that Lacy sets out to explain the romance's greatest compositional riddle: why Gautier inserted the courtly love intrigue into the middle of *Eracle's* adventures. And in this vein, he incorporates the tests of *Eracle's* gifts into the romance's center section. Based purely on thematic concerns, the fusion makes sense. However, in the process of solving the puzzle by framing the adulterous affair as an extension of *Eracle's* wife-choosing pageant, Lacy empties the first section of much of its analogical rapport with the romance's third and final section.

This claim, of course, supposes a certain division of the poem, but not one that requires any new discernment. One need only take the divisions as Gautier appears to indicate them--that is, accept "huimais commencera li contes" (v. 2746) as indicating the beginning of part two and "Si vos dirons d'Eracle humais [And now we will talk about Eracle]" (v. 5092) or "Signor, nos lisons en latin [My lords, we read in Latin]" (v. 5119) as the start of part three.¹⁷ As Lacy suggests, we are

¹⁶To be precise, Lacy says that "Gautier did not err by creating tonal, temporal, or thematic disparities . . . but they do place a considerable strain on the author's technique, and the experience of most readers suggests Gautier set himself a task to which his abilities were not in every case equal. Thus, to my mind, *Eracle* is something less than an unqualified masterpiece; at the same time, it is far more successful than certain critics have thought it" (232).

¹⁷One could also, as Zumthor indicates, mark the beginning of part three as "Bon me seroit huimais a dire / coment fu puis et rois et

not obliged to interpret these signposts as indicators of "structural component[s]," but they do offer the advantage of separating the poem into roughly equal parts.¹⁸ This distinction might seem a trivial matter when one reads the text.

Yet, Gautier most likely composed his work with listeners, rather than readers, in mind.¹⁹ In this regard, Gautier's signposts seem to offer logical pauses or intermissions for an oral performance. How long such a performance would have lasted is difficult to know; however, Zumthor has at least offered instructive speculation on this question:

I experimented by reading aloud two five hundred verse samples, with a minimum of expressivity, with indispensable pauses, accompanying it all with a few gestures: through extrapolation, I concluded that a public reading of the entire romance would require a little more than four hours--much longer if the reader mimed certain passages, as the text earnestly invites us to do here and there (for the dialogues in particular). ("L'écriture et la voix" 195)

Following this general time estimate, Zumthor allots approximately an hour and three quarters for the performance of verses 1-2745, ninety minutes for verses 2746-5091, and one hour for verses 5092-6570. Needless to say, he avoids drawing any concrete conclusions from these projections, but the outline for an oral performance at least makes the tripartite division, and a fairly even one, seem more likely given the limits of any audience's attention span.

That said, Zumthor does not use this speculation to forward an argument for cohesion--indeed he sees the poem's unity exclusively as

sire [It suits me now to say how he became king and emperor]" (vv. 5110-11).

¹⁸Evidently, I cannot agree with Lacy's assertion that if we take line 2746 as an architectural marker "our disapprobation" of Gautier's structure "is virtually assured" (229).

¹⁹Traditionally, scholars have assumed that romancers wrote with the expectation that their works would be read aloud to an audience. Recently, some scholars have begun to question whether this assumption is universally valid for twelfth-century romance. However, the traditional assumption certainly seems to pertain for *Eracle*; Zumthor, at any rate, makes a strong case (see "L'écriture et la voix").

a matter of oral performance.²⁰ However, the division that Gautier appears to indicate, and that Zumthor suggests we follow, yields symmetrical first and third parts--a design that offers just the counterpoise that Lacy was looking for but could not find.

This symmetry manifests itself from the beginning of each end panel of the triptych (see appendix). Each opens with a preamble. In the first case, this preface consists of Eracle's divinely aided conception and childhood (vv. 115-652);²¹ in the second, Gautier recounts the story of the True Cross as discovered by St. Helena (vv. 5119-5215). Some critics see these episodes, especially the latter, as disruptive to the narrative flow.²² But they are essential to setting the pious tone in the first instance and reintroducing it in the second. They also announce the Trinitarian form of the first part, in that Eracle receives the three gifts that he must later demonstrate in convincing fashion, and of the third part, given that the three newly-uncovered crosses signal the three segments of Eracle's epic--his crusade in Persia, his post-victory humbling at Jerusalem, and the summary of his charitable life in Constantinople.²³

What is more, each of the three segments in the first and third parts offers a metaphorical correspondence with its opposite number. For example, the first segment of the first part, the search for the precious stone--"symbol of moral values, attribute of religious worship" (Wolfzettel 123)--foreshadows Eracle's search for a more obvious holy

²⁰Zumthor claims that *Eracle's* form "is economical: finalizing and ideal, in so much as the entire text can, as an oeuvre, constitute a whole. But the threads that make up the framework of the narrative, multiplying, crossing over, sketch a still unfinished hieroglyph . . . a picture that tone of voice and décor alone complete as in a performance" (195).

²¹The first 114 lines consist of Gautier's praise of his patrons and a summary of the romance as a whole, the Athanaïs episode excluded.

²²See, for example, Lacy p. 232, n.

²³Although the operative theme in *Eracle* may appear to manifest a dual nature--as indicated in the struggle between good and evil, faith and doubt, or more aptly believers and unbelievers, one must not forget the romance's peripheral third figure, the Almighty. In this light, Gautier's choice of Trinitarian form is in harmony with his Christian allegory.

relic, the True Cross in the first segment of part three. The proofs of the stone's value against water, fire, and sword likewise reflect elements of Eracle's crusade. For the first proof, Eracle has himself submerged in the Tiber; thanks to the stone, he emerges hale and hearty, his faith in God vindicated (vv. 925-99).

Some 4000 verses later, Eracle's crusade begins in earnest as he faces off against Cosroé the Younger. The two knights cross swords over water, in this case the Danube river. Here Eracle lacks the stone itself, for Gautier wishes to emphasize that Eracle owes his protection to his faith alone. His wholly unprotected pagan enemy, who refuses several chances to convert and save himself, inevitably loses the battle. Eracle crowns this triumph of faith by throwing the slain unbeliever into the river. The posthumous baptism for Cosroé recalls the hero's more auspicious dunking; indeed, it provides the obvious conclusion to the message delivered in the earlier scene: if faith preserves, then disbelief destroys.

In the second proof of the stone, Eracle walks into a fire yet emerges unscathed. Again, though ostensibly the stone protects Eracle, it is his superior faith that gives him the courage to defy the flames. God has, after all, given him knowledge but has shown him no evidence of the stone's power. Gautier contrasts Eracle's example with the plight of less estimable Christians who succumb to Cosroé's ersatz divinity.²⁴ They enter his palace to worship before the Cross only to find that Cosroé tortures and burns them to death (vv. 5255-58). The scene at once reminds us of Eracle's earlier invulnerability to flame and projects an image of the pagan king as the devil incarnate. Eracle proceeds to eliminate this satanic figure and liberate the portion of the True Cross. He thereby elevates himself to the pinnacle of Christian knight-hood--"et par se grant cevalerie / est sainte Glise el mont florie [and thanks to his great chivalry the holy Church now flourishes]" (vv. 6513-14)--a triumph of faith forecast by all of Eracle's tests.

As a triumph of arms, however, Eracle's successful crusade is nowhere more clearly presaged than by the third proof of the stone, for here Eracle proves himself invulnerable to the sword. The sergeant-at-arms hacks away but cannot land a blow (vv. 1223-31). In essence, Eracle represents the ideal Christian warrior, Gautier suggests, since he wears a suit of armor that is impervious to the forces of evil.

²⁴Gautier indeed blames the Christians for their plight: "li terre u Dius prist naissement / afebloia molt durement / por le pecié as crestiens [the land, where Jesus was born, was mightily weakened by the sins of Christians]" (vv. 5213-15).

Not that Eracle is without human frailty; indeed, the second segment of the romance's epic panel drives this point home with a vengeance. Flushed with victory, Eracle forgets the source of his prowess; he behaves as if the victory is his own. His extravagant thoughts and clothes reveal his swelling pride (vv. 6134-40), but Gautier insists more on a third manifestation of sin--Eracle's mode of transportation. Whereas Eracle approaches Jerusalem "sor un ceval d'Espagne sor / qui valt plus de cent onces d'or [on a sorrel Spanish steed that is worth more than one hundred ounces of gold]" (vv. 6125-26), Jesus, the poet reminds us, rode into the city on "le plus vil bieste c'on puist dire, / por demoustrer humelité / qui doit estre en humanité [the lowliest beast one can name in order to remind us of the humility that men must show]" (vv. 6110-12). Thus despite the horse's usual appropriateness as an emblem of the warrior class, here for the Christian knight the animal proves profanatory. The Almighty blocks Eracle's passage, until the hero shows his contrition and exchanges his horse for a mule.

This notion of nobility tarnished by pride arises much earlier, namely in the horse race. The noblest of nobles, Laïs, demands that Eracle's chosen horse prove its speed. Given that the warning against this trial comes from none other than God's messenger, the emperor's insistence amounts to an impious lack of humility. Indeed, the emperor's pride consumes what could have been the finest symbol of chivalry, had it not been pushed too far. "Car cose trop desmesuree / ne puet avoir longe duree [For without moderation nothing can last long]" (vv. 1757-58), the narrator intones as one of the competing horses expires as well. The proverb applies equally well to Eracle's equine extravagance near the walls of Jerusalem. Eracle is indeed a warrior hero, but one who misappropriates credit for his heroic deeds. In the end, his pride, like the emperor's, proves as hollow as the bones of the autopsied foal.

At first glance, the third segment of part one and its counterpart in part three would appear to have little connection, thematic or metaphoric, with each other. The former consists of the wife-picking contest, whereas the latter recounts Eracle's post-crusade life in Constantinople, a womanless episode. This divergence is, however, superficial, for the two segments share the same moral underpinning. What some critics have misleadingly labeled a "beauty contest" is not about beauty at all, at least not in the aesthetic sense, unless one understands by that label the beauty of the soul. None of the pretenders to the emperor's hand lacks any sensual charm; they all do, however, suffer from one or several moral handicaps, Athanaïs, the non-contestant excepted.

The competition represents instead a search for virtue. Eracle initiates precisely the same quest for himself after rescuing the Cross; that is, he sets about reclaiming the Christian virtues from which he

strayed, albeit briefly, during the crusade. As emperor of Constantinople, Eracle "Molt par ama justice et foi / et molt essauça nostre loi; / grans biens fist tant con il vesqui [loved greatly justice and faith, exalted our law, and did great works as long as he lived]" (vv. 6455-57). Thus as a matter of moral current, the two segments reflect similar tonal, and indeed, thematic thrusts.

Moreover, although the final segment of the romance presents no female characters per se, here Gautier does impart maternal overtones to Eracle's role. Such overtones may seem at odds with the emperor's newfound warrior status. But given Gautier's effort to represent the three essential divisions of medieval society--oratores, the sacerdotal; bellatores, the martial; and aratores, the maternal--this last aspect in fact serves to round out the hero's development.²⁵ Since the functions resonate through Eracle's gifts as well as through the romance's form, it stands to reason that they would all find an echo in Eracle the ruler. By this point, Eracle has fulfilled his warrior function and satisfied most of his sacerdotal duties. One could read his nurturing function, that is, his stewardship of subjects and Church, as a paternal affair.

However, as aratores, Eracle's role extends to the care for the souls of his own parents. His method in this endeavor, the practice of extravagant charity--"et quant li fius en ot pooir / por aus dona molt grant avoir [and when he had it within his power, he gave great gifts for their benefit]" (vv. 6467-68)--identifies him with his mother, for she adopted the same divestment program to win repose for Miriados in paradise (vv. 280-334). In drawing this resemblance between mother and son, Gautier also manages to forge an analogical link between the romance's end and its beginning in the preamble to part one.

To be sure, this linkage begins long before the conclusion of Eracle's life in Constantinople. In the second segment, as Eracle recovers from his fit of pride, he mirrors more of his mother's self-abnegation: "En son dos a le haire mise [he put a hairshirt on his back]" (v. 6242), exactly as Cassine had done after selling Eracle to the senechal: "haire desous ses dras viestoit [she wore a hairshirt underneath her clothes]" (v. 649). Moreover, Eracle learns of his need for humility from the very authority that sent him crusading, a messenger angel, an attention-grabbing motif that likewise emerges twice in the story of Eracle's birth and infancy (vv. 144-78 and vv. 229-43). Here, in the first instance, the angel offers Cassine divine instructions on how to con-

²⁵See Wolfzettel's "La Recherche de l'universel" (123) and Griswald's *Archéologie de l'épopée médiévale. Structures trifonctionnelles et mythes indo-européens dans le cycle des Narbonnais*.

ceive a child, then later on how to raise it.²⁶ The analogical thread could hardly be clearer or more pious.

Indeed, all the elements of the first and third parts of *Eracle* sound a pious note. Yet for all the cohesion that this harmony of image, form, and theme lends to most of the poem, it raises an inevitable question about the material that stands between verses 2746 and 5092: namely, how does this portion fit into Gautier's scheme? As a matter of theme, this second part poses no real difficulty. It represents, as Lacy and Fourrier indicate, a demonstration of Eracle's knowledge of women, an extended test analogous to the proofs of the stone and the foal. And like the imprudent horse race that the emperor demands, it is a test that proves the destructive power of doubt.

The religious message implicit in the corruption of Athanaïs, however, does not reveal itself with great immediacy throughout her story. In fact, Eracle, who as God's representative constitutes the romance's most patent emblem of religious feeling, figures only at the margins of this episode. The pious tone evident in the surrounding panels of the triptych is noticeably absent here. Nevertheless, one should not read this tonal shift as an arbitrary or ill-considered digression.

Although this story does have an edge that is at turns comic or courtly, or both, it does not amount to a simple humorous intermission or a love story added after the fact.²⁷ Rather, to make sense of this episode in the scheme of the romance, one must see the Athanaïs narrative as the reverse image of the other parts, particularly of part one. Here Gautier provides the impious anti-example to Eracle's dutiful good works. He introduces a change of pace but without, thereby, disturbing the romance's cohesion.

The key to this alteration lies first with the change of cast. Gautier replaces the righteous but stolid hero with the old woman, a wily character who proves charming in her brashness.²⁸ During Eracle's extended absence, this old woman takes over the role of imperial advice-giver. As a consequence, the nature of the advice given undergoes a transformation as well. Whereas Eracle preaches forbearance to the emperor, the old woman counsels the empress in self-indulgence. Eracle attempts to instill virtue in a flawed man; the go-between, on the

²⁶According to Lacy, these motifs are too few and far between (231-32).

²⁷The latter characterization is Fourrier's suggestion (262).

²⁸See Nathan Love's "Polite Address and Characterization by Speech in Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*."

contrary, helps corrupt a woman of extraordinary virtue. Whereas Eracle facilitates Laïs's entry into holy matrimony, the old woman abets Athanaïs's adultery and precipitates a divorce.

Certainly, this woman's charm belies her true role as an instrument of faithlessness, for, in short, she amounts to the second panel's villain in disguise. Indeed, one might say that, given the light-heartedness with which Gautier treats the old woman, he disguises her nature all too effectively. So buried is her anti-Christian propensity that modern readers, at least, are likely to miss it. The didactic message is, nonetheless, the same here as elsewhere in the romance. But it is perhaps unfair to blame Gautier for an excess of subtlety or an uneven application of the same. That is to say, because Gautier states his pious message so plainly in the first and third parts of his poem, can we legitimately reproach him for delivering that same message in more subtle tones in the Athanaïs episode?

Not that tone is the sole culprit in the disguise; this episode diverges from the other two in structure as well. Unlike that of its companions, the construction here does not lend itself to any obvious tripartition. Following the development of the empress's corruption, one could divide the whole sequentially into stages, for example: first, Athanaïs's descent into anger at her husband; second, the blossoming of her love for Paridés and his for her; third, the consummation of their passion and the ensuing consequences; or more simply, the awakening of a mutual passion, the old woman's intervention, and finally the adultery and subsequent divorce. Neither scheme, however, offers even a remotely symmetrical or artful presentation.

Furthermore, to arrive at these configurations, one must omit or gloss over certain pieces that would spoil the convenient tripartition. Certainly, the third segment in both examples could just as easily stand as two discrete elements. On the other hand, the trio of characters involved in the love story--Athanaïs, Paridés, and the old woman--suggests an echo of Eracle's three tests and the three segments of his imperial reign.

This conceit, however, requires that one ignore the presence of Eracle and the emperor at the episode's beginning and end. What is more, the trio occupies the same scene only at the moment of the lovers' unholy alliance (vv. 4599-604). It seems unlikely that Gautier would expressly evoke the Trinity at such a moment. Indeed, given the nonsacred tone of the episode, it stands to reason that Gautier would seek to avoid such allusions altogether between verses 2746 and 5092.

What then does Gautier provide in the way of analogical clues to this episode's place in *Eracle*? He obviously abstains from messenger angels, hair shirts, or other explicitly Christian motifs that follow

the hero in the romance's surrounding material. But one would expect some reminder that the poem speaks to virtue, other than the vice displayed by the lovers and the old woman. And in this regard, Gautier does not disappoint.

However, rather than indulge in ethereal images, he opts for a more mundane monument to virtue--Athanaï's prison tower. As a metaphor for virtue, as Gautier understands the term, the tower could scarcely be more apropos. For, whereas the tower purportedly represents an aspiration toward virtue, Gautier associates it with sinful behavior. He thus provides a reminder of human limitations, of the inevitable moral failures of even the most virtuous people.

Gautier outlines a more precise metaphorical meaning for the tower during the wife-picking competition, the third segment of part one. As Eracle sets his eyes on a particularly nubile competitor, he pauses to consider her worth. The narrator explains:

ele est pucele encor, por voir,
 si l'en doit on bon gré savoir,
 con cele qui n'est pas conquise
 por çou que n'a esté requisite,
 [she is still a virgin, this is true, and one must give her that
 much; she has not been corrupted because no one has really
 tried]. (vv. 2377-80).

to which he adds snidely:

Je ne vi onques nule tor
 rendre sans plait et sans estor.
 [I myself have never seen a tower given up without protest or
 a fight]. (vv. 2381-82).

Gautier thereby defines the tower as representing chastity and fidelity.²⁹ The image is at once sexual and military, portending both the violence that Athanaï's infidelity will do to the empire and the danger implicit in the emperor's siege campaign. Here in spite of her present virtue, the "virgin" fails to pass muster, for

Eracles voit bien que le rose

²⁹Given that female virtue is at issue here, the phallic image of the tower may seem incongruous, but not if one considers that chastity and fidelity are virtues valued in women by men, as will become clear later, when Laïs imprisons his wife.

n'est pas de tel palis enclose
 qu'il se fust ja un mois tenus,
 tes i peüst estre venus.

[Eracle saw that the rose would not be protected by walls and it would not last a month if the right someone were to pass nearby]. (vv. 2383-86).

Gautier thus manages to hint at Athanaïs's future, adulterous "Mr. Right," Paridés.

In part two, the tower takes on more than metaphorical proportions. As he leaves to fight in a distant part of the empire, Laïs has Athanaïs imprisoned "en le tor [in a tower]" (v. 3173) under the watchful eyes of twenty-four knights. Although Gautier repeats the same image, in this case, the tower's meaning undergoes a subtle but important shift. "Le tor" represents the jealous husband's effort to preserve the woman's virtue rather than hers to protect it. Eracle warns that this effort will prove counterproductive, but the emperor refuses to listen. As Eracle and the emperor make their exit, the tower becomes the focus and locus of most of part two. Athanaïs, her fidelity so poorly rewarded, rapidly becomes embittered. As a result, she falls in love with another man.

Even as Gautier shifts attention from her to Paridés and the old woman, he insists on his chosen image. Indeed, as the adulterous plot thickens, Gautier no longer identifies the heroine by her proper name or title. She becomes instead "cele de le tor [the woman in the tower]" (v. 3848) or "le dame del doignon [the lady of the castle keep]" (v. 4000). To commit their sin, "le dame del doignon" and Paridés must, of course, meet outside of the tower and away from her entourage. Nonetheless, Gautier manages to draw a visual link between the seat of virtue and the site of sin. The lovers transgress in what amounts to the subterranean counterpart to the tower, a "sousterin" or tunnel dug under the old woman's house. This nether worldly space, however, holds no claim to virtue.³⁰ Alternatively, one could interpret the tunnel simply as the tower submerged, as the symbol more deeply rooted in the dirt of the world and of human flesh.³¹

³⁰That this sinful place also suggests the female sex, whereas the tower is plainly phallic, comes as no surprise given the misogynist humor that Gautier displays in the wife-picking contest.

³¹Readers familiar with *Cligés* will no doubt remember the tower in which the hero hides Fenice from her husband. It is difficult to know, however, what to make of this intertextuality, since we do not

The Athanaïs affair resolved, the tower indeed disappears from view in favor of the religious motifs concordant with Eracle's crusade. The tower does not, however, disappear permanently. Once the crusade has ended and Eracle has passed away, the soaring image of the tower reemerges. As a monument to their emperor's feats as a Christian hero, the people of Constantinople erect a "molt grant piler [very tall pillar]" (v. 6487), crowned with a statue of Eracle: "Sor un cheval seoit li sire / tel con il ot quant il venqui / le fil au fol qui relenqui / Diu [seated on a horse like the one he rode when he vanquished the son of that lunatic who abandoned God]" (vv. 6494-97). Gautier then proceeds to call the structure a tower, saying: "De biel tor est doit bien estre [A beautiful tower it is, as it must be]" (v. 6503).

Whereas this pillar and statue represent a celebration of Christian virtue, the virtues celebrated do not appear at first blush to be those associated with the towers of parts one and two. One would suppose that this monument commemorates Eracle, the warrior, not female sexual virtue. And indeed it does on one level. However, the "tor" or "doignon," though it serves as a symbol of chastity, also has undeniable military overtones. Furthermore, the heroics in question are not of the "chevalerie jongleur [frivolous knighthood]" but of Christian knighthood. In this sense, the monument represents Eracle's faithful service to the Church, just as the tower of part two imposes faithfulness on Athanaïs. And, in essence, this monument reminds us of Eracle's marriage to the Church.

Moreover, the monument is the only tangible legacy that Eracle leaves Constantinople. Gautier mentions no wife or children issued from this Christian emperor. The "molt grant piler" therefore constitutes a reminder of the hero's chaste life. Thus, Gautier does succeed here in creating a metaphoric and visual analogue with the tower that figures so prominently in the Athanaïs story, and the portentous one that arises at the end of part one.

Evidently, one cannot deny that Gautier took great care to bridge the tonal disparity and apparent thematic difference between the secular center of his triptych and his pious beginning and terminal panels. To be sure, Gautier did not assemble this tripartite design without some awkwardness. For example, although parts one and three comport in their religious feeling, and the second part supplies an appropriately unsacred foil to their piety, Gautier does hit a false note in this complicated tonal play. Whereas part one is pious but fanciful history, Eracle's

know whether Chrétien borrowed from Gautier, Gautier from Chrétien, or whether they each arrived at this topos independently. Wilmotte and Heinermann have argued this point and come to different conclusions.

crusade with its True Cross connection touches on real sacred history. Consequently, Gautier reaches such a solemn pitch that he overwhelms the comic undercurrent of his romance.

Further awkwardness results not from digressions or from a lack of repeated images, motifs, and themes, as Lacy argues ("The Form of Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*" 231). The problem arises, on the contrary, from Gautier's over-dependence on analogical elements. Where the hero is concerned, it seems that Gautier substitutes these compositional tools for real storytelling. The proofs of the stone's value and Eracle's knowledge of horses in part one do indeed help the listener anticipate the hero's role as crusading warrior in part three.

This announcement takes place, however, on a purely symbolic level. Yet Gautier asks us to accept his ten-year-old boy advisor of the first part as a twenty-four-year-old warrior, who heaves a conquered adversary into a river and beheads a pagan king, in the third part.³² Here one cannot escape the feeling that Gautier has prepared us inadequately for this transformation. Rather than show the hero as a fighter, which he could easily have done during the emperor's siege campaign, Gautier settles for a summary announcement: because the emperor is so pleased with Eracle's advice, he makes the boy a knight (vv. 2893-95).

In fairness to Gautier, one must admit that he does not strain our credulity to the limit. He does not transform Eracle into an unrecognizable shape. Eracle the knight hardly resembles a Roland or Lancelot in his prowess. The Crusader fights only once and would lose but for his last-minute prayer. Thus Gautier does, at least, remain faithful to his vision of Eracle as religious messenger--though in the end one in an ill-fitting suit of armor.

These are not, however, architectural shortcomings. With *Eracle*, Gautier skillfully executes his design. Whether on the large or small scale, his structural patterns underscore his thematic intention. In this romance, the Almighty makes his presence felt in no uncertain terms, from the hero's birth to his Cross-saving crusade. Gautier accordingly fashions the story in Trinitarian form. Indeed, the first of three parts subdivides into three parts each corresponding to one of Eracle's gifts and each of these segments again subdivides into three smaller episodes.

³²He is at least twenty-four by the time of the crusade, given that he was ten when sold to the emperor, that Athanaïs and Laïs spent seven happy years together before the latter's departure (v. 2935), and that Eracle spends seven years as emperor of Constantinople before an angel rousts him from his passivity (v. 5285).

Moreover, the third part of the romance likewise parses into three segments, each offering a metaphoric correspondence with one of Eracle's gifts. Gautier also ties the beginning and end of his romance together with repeated religious motifs, angels, hair shirts, and extravagant charity. As a change of pace between the pious end panels of his triptych, Gautier presents the obverse to Eracle's acts of faith--the old woman's faithless pandering. In keeping with this panel's secular character, Gautier avoids the three-part form that marks the other stories. He does, however, attach this love story to Eracle's adventures at court and his later adventures on crusade by means of--as it were--a towering image. Without a doubt, those seeking a seamless composition or a single intrigue in this romance will meet with disappointment. Gautier's architectural aesthetic does not follow an Aristotelian model of composition. Eracle offers, nonetheless, sufficient analogues of all sorts among its diverse parts so that even today's readers--careful ones at least--may appreciate this romance as an artful, coherent narrative.

Appendix

Part I: Tests of Eracle's Gifts (vv. 1-2745)

Preamble: Eracle's conception and childhood.

Test 1: Knowledge of Stones--Eracle ignores precious gems and chooses an unlikely rock. The emperor casts doubt on Eracle's wisdom.

- i) proof by water
- ii) proof by fire
- iii) proof by sword

Test 2: Knowledge of Horses--Eracle passes up horses to choose a foal. Eracle races his choice against three competitors.

Test 3: Knowledge of Women--the bridal pageant provides no winner. Eracle finds Athanaïs outside of the contest.

Part II: The Love Story (vv. 2746-5092/5119)

In Eracle's absence, the old woman takes over the role of advice-giver; she undoes the hero's good works, aiding and abetting the empress's adultery. Eracle tells the emperor what his wife has done. Eracle convinces Laïs to spare the adulterers, for it is Laïs's lack of faith that has destroyed Athanaïs's virtue.

Part III: Eracle's Crusade (vv. 5093/5120-6570)

Preamble: St. Helena discovers the True Cross.

Segment 1: Eracle seeks to regain the Cross.

- i) Eracle crosses swords with Cosroé the Younger.
- ii) Eracle kills his adversary and throws the corpse into the Danube.
- iii) Eracle slays Cosroé, the pagan king who tortured and burned Christians.

Segment 2: Eracle tries to enter Jerusalem on horseback, but divine intervention blocks his passage until he adopts a more humble posture.

Segment 3: Eracle seeks a life of virtue; he imitates his mother's example of charity.

Works Cited

- Becker, Philipp August. "Von Erzählern neben und nach Chrestien de Troyes." *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 55 (1935): 269-92.
- Calin, William C. *The French Tradition and the Literature of Medieval England*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994.
- , "Structure and Meaning in *Eracle* by Gautier d'Arras." *Symposium* 16 (1962): 275-87.
- Eley, Penny. "Patterns of Faith and Doubt: Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle* and *Ille et Galeron*." *French Studies* 43 (1989): 257-70.
- Faral, Edmond. "D'un 'passionnaire' latin à un roman français: quelques sources immédiates du roman d'*Eracle*." *Romania* 46 (1920): 512-36.
- Fourrier, Anthime. "Gautier d'Arras." *Le Courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen âge*. Paris: Nizet, 1960, 179-313.
- Gautier d'Arras. *Eracle*. Ed. Guy Raynaud de Lage. Paris: Champion, 1976.
- Grisward, Joël. *Archéologie de l'épopée médiévale. Structures trifonctionnelles et mythes indo-européens dans le cycle des Narbonnais*. Paris: Payot, 1981.
- Gythiel, Anthony P. "*Ille et Galeron* and *Eracle*: Two Twelfth-Century French Romances. Translated with an Introduction." Diss. U of Detroit, 1972.
- Heinermann, Th. "Zur Zeitbestimmung der Werke Gautiers von Arras und zu seiner Stellung zu Chrétien de Troyes." *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache* 59 (1935): 237-45.
- Lacy, Norris J. *The Craft of Chrétien de Troyes: an Essay on Narrative Art*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
- , "The Form of Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*." *Modern Philology* 83 (1986): 227-32.

- Lefèvre, Yves. "Autres romans du XIIe siècle." *Le Roman français jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle*. Ed. Jean Frappier, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1978, 265-91.
- Love, Nathan. "Polite Address and Characterization by Speech in Gautier d'Arras's *Eracle*." *Romance Quarterly* 35 1 (1988): 21-29.
- Pierreville, Corinne. *Gautier d'Arras, l'autre chrétien*. Paris: Champion, 2001.
- Raynaud de Lage, Guy. "La Religion d'*Eracle*." *Mélange de langue et de littérature médiévales offertes à Pierre le Gentil*. Paris: S.E.D.E.S. et C.D.U., 1973, 707-13.
- Renzi, Lorenzo. *Tradizione cortese e realismo in Gautier d'Arras*. Padua: A. Milani, 1964.
- Ryding, William. *Structure in Medieval Narrative*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- Stevenson, W. H. "Der Einfluss des Gautier d'Arras auf die altfranzösische Kunstepik, insbesondere auf den Abenteuerroman." Diss. U of Göttingen, 1910.
- Wilmotte, Maurice. *L'Evolution du roman français aux environs de 1150*. Paris: Bouillon, 1903.
- Wolfzettel, Friedrich. "La Recherche de l'universel: pour une nouvelle lecture des romans de Gautier d'Arras." *Cahier de Civilisation Médiévale* 33 2 (1990): 113-31.
- Zumthor, Paul. "L'écriture et la voix: le roman d'*Eracle*." *The Craft of Fiction: Essays in Medieval Poetics*. Ed. Leigh A. Arrathoon. Rochester, Michigan: Solaris, 1984, 161-209.

Will There Always Be a South? Tradition, Modernity, and Memory

[Carlyle Marney Lecture, Nov. 12, 2001]

Wayne Flynt

Near the end of the past decade a high school in north Alabama experienced one of the South's periodic confrontations over the Confederate battle flag. The principal banned display of the flag as racially divisive. Two white students defied the ban. They drove their pickup trucks onto the school parking lot with the disputed flag flying in the wind. The two students were summoned to the principal's office, where they insisted their act of defiance was a celebration of Southern heritage rather than a racial statement. The astute principal responded by asking the boys who was president of the Confederacy. Silence. Pressed for an answer one boy offered the name of Robert E. Lee and the other "Stonewall" Jackson. The principal suspended both.

I obviously don't know exactly what the principal had in mind when he asked the question. But one possibility is the connection between current tradition and historical memory. If one claims to govern his life by high regard for Confederate heritage, it isn't an extravagant expectation that one at least know the name of the nation's only president. The debate between tradition and modernity is not new. I merely propose to reexamine the debate from a new perspective, the literary quality of memory.

First, let's define terms. Tradition is the way life once was, or at least the way we perceive it to have been. Modernity is the way tradition is being altered. And *memory* is the process by which we define tradition and reconcile it with modernity. If, for instance, our memory of Southern tradition is so narrow that it includes only whites, can blacks who live in Tennessee be Southerners? Can the 100,000 Hispanics, 25,000 Koreans, 11,000 Indochinese and 10,000 Indians who lived in Atlanta in 1990 consider themselves to be Southerners? If we define tradition ethnically, either we must maintain white traditions at the expense of the material benefits of a pluralistic, multiracial society, or

white Southerners must betray their traditions in order to build a more prosperous future.

My premise is simple. By concentrating on the nature of tradition and the challenge of modernity, instead of on the process of memory, we have misdefined the debate. If memory is perceived like a photograph that captures a particular moment in the past, then there is hardly any way to reconcile tradition and modernity. We are reduced to static, artificial parodies of tradition: elegant, leisurely Old South gentlemen, beautiful, hoop-skirted belles, happy darkies, opulent plantations, and Confederate battle flags. Late-nineteenth-century historians and writers of fiction—both romantics such as Thomas Nelson Page and local colorists such as Joel Chandler Harris—contributed to static images of tradition. So did Margaret Mitchell four decades later. And their influence was lasting.

The 1991 Southern Life Poll by the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* noted that more Southerners than Northerners believe that the Civil War was fought over some issue other than slavery and that the Confederate flag represents Southern heritage, not racism. Southerners are also much more likely than Northerners to have visited a Civil War battlefield (58 percent to 42 percent). So strong is such static memory that 16 percent of all Southerners polled believed their region would be better off as a separate nation.

Obviously, such static memory defines “Southernness” in race-specific ways. The same poll noted that Southern whites are more likely to visit Civil War battlefields than Southern blacks, just as they seem more enamored with the Confederate flag as a symbol of the Ole Miss football team.

Most Southern whites who utilize static memory of tradition understand full well the exclusiveness of such a definition. The president of the Georgia Committee to Save the State Flag in the early 1990s told a native Georgian, who was the great-grandson of a slave: “I don’t expect everybody to have the same connection to Southern heritage that Southerners do.”¹

That same month, February 1993, Auburn University reached an agreement with the local chapter of Kappa Alpha fraternity to discontinue its annual Old South parade, which had been plagued in recent years by racial conflict. A bitter staff writer for Auburn University’s campus newspaper reacted to the parade’s cessation in his column:

Yes, strike the rebel banner from the Capitol; this is the New South. We must now embrace homosexuality, save the whales and the spotted owls, and follow whatever agenda is set by Duff, Tabitha Soren, and the president [that] MTV and *Rolling Stone* elected.

Alas, our KAs, our Southern gentlemen, were compelled to bow to the rhetoric of the New South hypesters and end the 76-year-old Auburn celebration of our Confederate ancestors.² In case you missed the modernity in this column, the student used a longer form of the term: “New South hypesters.” We need a context for his anger. Some months earlier Governor Jim Folsom, at the urging of advocates of modernity, had lowered the Confederate battle flag that had flown over Alabama’s capital since the administration of George Wallace. Folsom took it down because the flag allegedly caused businesses to avoid locating in Alabama. Surely everyone understands the symbolism of trying to sell a state so renowned for racial conflict. But if not, promoting Alabama has been somewhat like being the head football coach at Vanderbilt: you can sell the program, but not easily.

The most dramatic payoff of the “New South hypesters” in what I call the Germanization of Dixie occurred in 1993 when Mercedes-Benz selected Vance, Alabama (a rural community that contained many unemployed coal miners) for its first overseas assembly plant. On the day he announced the plant, with a miniature Mercedes hood ornament stuck in his lapel, Governor Folsom promised a “new day for Alabama, a day when we move to the forefront of economic development.” So ecstatic was the Birmingham Metropolitan Development Board, that it spent \$75,000 to erect a huge Mercedes hood ornament atop the scoreboard at Legion Field. Now *that* is what I call a mixed metaphor. They officially combined Alabama’s two chief religions: football and economic development.

But back to my young journalist friend at Auburn. It is not that he necessarily opposes the acquisition of the Mercedes factory. He just grieves over the loss of Southern traditions necessary to recruit it. Obviously white Southerners have experienced lots of that sort of angst, ambiguity, and double-mindedness. The South is changing. Bill Clinton’s South was and is as enlightened about race as other regions and economically more attuned to Lear jets than to mechanical cotton pickers. Southern politicians don’t even have a monopoly on fornication or adultery.

In a series of essays for *The New York Times* and in a later book Peter Applebome described another change in the South. He told how whites and blacks joined together to rebuild the Spring Hill Free Will Baptist Church near Smithdale, Mississippi, a church that three drunken white youths had burned. Applebome’s paper had already announced in January 1992 that the most segregated schools in America were in Illinois, New York, Michigan, New Jersey, California, Maryland, Wisconsin, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut.

Modernity in the midst of racial tradition can be seen everywhere. Cynthia Tucker, a Monroeville, Alabama native and the first black female editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, wrote in the early 1990s that when she heard Lee Collins, a white defender of Georgia's Confederate flag, tell a black state senator that only Southerners could understand the Southern heritage, she bristled:

Well, I have news for Collins. . . . I'm a Southerner, too, as Southern as funeral home fans, collard greens, and Ray Charles. I'm as Southern as magnolias, Jack Daniels, and cane syrup. My father lies buried in Southern soil, as does his father and his father's father before him. I fully expect to one day be laid to rest beneath a Southern sky.

My ancestors, as far back as I can trace them, tilled the soil of the Deep South, first for white slave owners and later for themselves, eventually owning property that they left to their children and grandchildren. That land—my birthright—calls me as surely as sweet honey-suckle calls to hummingbirds.

* * * * *

I love the South . . . the South is my home. . . .

Any discussion of Southern history is just so much foolish denial unless it is also a discussion of African Americans, who are part and parcel of what the South has been, has become and is yet to be. I do understand my heritage—all of it. I also understand that the current Georgia flag, which is not as old as I am, represents a recent and ignominious part of that heritage.³

In defense of both my young Alabama friends, the Auburn student and Cynthia Tucker, let me make two comments. The Southern tradition must be defined broadly enough to allow blacks who live below the Mason-Dixon line to be Southerners. Hispanics, too, and Indians, Moslems and Japanese. In fact, if Southernness consists of traditional practices and beliefs such as preference for traditional foods, Fundamentalist religion, extended family, and rootedness in the region, blacks are the most Southern of all Southerners according to polling data. At the same time let me say a word in defense of Cynthia Tucker's aspiring journalist colleague at Auburn. He simply worries that in our attempt to modernize, the South may pay too high a price.

This concern is neither new nor inappropriate. A former colleague of mine at Auburn remembered a piece of folklore from his childhood in Southeast Georgia. The business leaders and modernizers in the little hamlet of Ohoppee were determined to persuade a new railroad to run track through their town. A farmer nearby feared for the safety of his livestock, who might wander onto the tracks and be killed,

and that the noise would prevent their cows from producing milk. The modernizers tried to persuade him no harm would come to the town, and that the railroad would create jobs.

When the project was completed, the town fathers invited their cynical neighbor to come into the village for the first train visit. He agreed. The train arrived and departed without incident, and the townsfolk engaged in some good-natured ribbing: "See, there, no harm, no damage or destruction from the train!"

"Yeah," said the unconvinced farmer. "But suppose that thing had come through town sideways?"

In a manner of speaking, traditional Southerners are always expecting progress to "come through town sideways." And sometimes it does. Just ask any environmentalist. Just ask downtown merchants in a small town that has just acquired a new Wal-Mart. Just ask residents of Auburn, Alabama or Jefferson City, Tennessee whose main access highways could just as well be in Maine, Minnesota, or New Mexico.

If we are wise, memory teaches us that tradition is not always wrong and modernity is not always right. Flannery O'Connor, one of the South's premier twentieth-century writers from Milledgeville, Georgia, once received a letter from an aspiring young novelist. Although originally from the South, the writer proclaimed the liberating freedom of her new Midwestern home. Less provincialism. Less prejudice against intellectuals. O'Connor was unconvinced. Severing a writer from her region denies her the most important sources of memory, O'Connor wrote. And provincialism is often in the eye of the beholder. O'Connor recalled an incident when the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce sent its Tokyo counterpart a bag of grits. Some months later the Atlanta chamber received a note of appreciation from the Japanese. The recipients announced that they had received and planted the grits, but that they had not come up yet. The incident inspired O'Connor to proclaim that her motto in life was: "When in Rome, do as you done in Milledgeville."

As another antidote to an excess of modernism, let me contrast Southern provincialism with American modernism. Each sacrifices something for the sake of those things more highly valued. New Yorkers probably know far more about post-modernist poetry than Southerners. But I will bet few Southerners would have made the mistake I found in the January 1984 *New York Times*.

Auburn had just beaten Michigan in the fiftieth-anniversary Sugar Bowl. Bo Jackson had bludgeoned Michigan's stubborn defense in a bruising (and boring) ground game. I opened my post-New Year's Day *Times* to read the account of the game. I should have known better.

The sports section of the *Times* devotes more space to water polo than Southern football.

Instead of game coverage, the sports section featured an essay by Ira Berkow on religion at Southern football games. Had he known more about the South, he would have understood that we don't have religion at college football games. In the South, college football ***IS*** the religion. But he made an even more fundamental mistake, the kind even a cynical, secular, thrice-divorced, beer-guzzling, Knoxville, Tennessee sports columnist would never make (not to mention a beautician or a truck driver). Here is the eighth paragraph of his column:

Sometimes these fans----there is a mixture of kids and adults---also bring signs, or banners, often written on bed sheets, and a few even have biblical chapter and verse, like 'Job 3:16'---the mention of which, it seems, is to give the stamp of celestial approval to football.

As I finished reading the column, I smiled in quiet contemplation of tens-of-thousands of puzzled and Biblical-illiterate New Yorkers scouring their Bibles for the mystical football wisdom found in Job 3:16: "Or why was I not hidden in the ground like a stubborn child, like an infant who never saw the light of day?"

I confess I have told this story at several large state universities around the country and have concluded from the delayed and nervous laughter of some of the PhDs present that they had not a clue as to the cultural provincialism of Mr. Berkow. But among non-PhD audiences, the laughter is usually sidesplitting and obviously makes a point: ordinary Southerners may be religiously intolerant and narrow-minded, but they know that any time they see chapter three, verse 16 associated with the Bible, the reference is to John and not to Job. The problem then is not the elimination of either tradition or modernity, but of balancing them.

Sociologist John Shelton Reed has noted that our glib assumption that the modernity of the "Bulldozer Revolution" would destroy Southern traditionalism has proven inaccurate. It has indeed undermined racism, agrarianism, and parochialism. But it has also produced a large, well- educated, urban middle class with a strong sense of regional identity, better symbolized by trendy *Southern Living* magazine and Robert Trent Jones golf courses than a lyncher's rope, more devoted to a sense of community and kin than racial exclusiveness.

* * * * *

How do Southerners integrate tradition and modernity? There are lots of superficial answers to that question. The Birmingham area, which now sports a Mercedes-Benz factory to go with its world-famous

medical center and international arts festival, also boasts an automobile dealership named “Dixie Nissan.” On a trip back to the city I spotted a pickup truck defiantly driven by an obviously prosperous businessman. His bumper sported a politically incorrect retro sticker. On one side was a Confederate flag. On the other side were the words “Don’t blame us. We voted for Jefferson Davis.”

Once, driving through the racially divided town of Wedowee in Randolph County, Alabama, I spotted a new motel with the ostentatious name “The Old English Inn,” but underneath that—reassuring evidence I had not been transported to the British Midlands—was a sign: “Bass boat for sale.”

Traditions and modernity coexist in other ways as well. In a region where schools have opened in Nashville and Atlanta to help students eliminate their Southern accents, I am pleased to report that Alabama, according to the 1993 Southern Life Poll, had the highest percentage of honey-tongued drawlers (57 percent) of any Southern state. Alabama also had the highest percentage of residents who had never left Dixie a single time (26 percent). Kinship still meant something (three-fourths of all Southerners lived within a thirty-minute drive of close relatives). And more than 90 percent of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina described themselves as Southerners (that is, 90 percent of the combined black and white population, I remind you).

Believe it or not, the most popular names listed on Alabama birth certificates for girls born in 1990, among all our new industry and declining rural life, were Ashley, Brittany, and Jessica. More significantly, according to the 1994 editions of the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, seven of the top ten states in percentage of income donated to charity (including Tennessee) were “Southern or border Southern” states. Asked to explain why, one expert explained: “There is a deeply Southern tradition of reaching out and helping your neighbor.”⁴

Such high value placed on traditions is healthy. But it can lead to a certain chip-on-the-shoulder defensiveness when one’s traditions are unfairly ridiculed or attacked. In late September 1994, G. Scott Thomas of Buffalo, New York, wrote a book entitled *The Rating Guide to Life in America’s Fifty States*. Mississippi flunked. So did Alabama. Vermont received a perfect score of 100. Louisiana ranked 50th with a score of zero. Alabama scored 15 on the 100-point scale, to inch ahead of Mississippi for 48th place. Tennessee scored better but not by much.

Despite the fact that it’s nice that all these Deep South states now have Louisiana to kick around, the book offended Alabamians. The state’s ranking was sometimes predictable: F in Education, Children and Families, Female and Racial Equality, Business, Personal Fi-

nances and Politics. But Alabama even received a D for History, C for terrain and an F in Sports (no professional teams and few Olympic athletes).

A friend of mine who edited the *Birmingham News* had a bit of fun at the Vermonters' expense. He noted that anyone can trash a state by picking the categories to be analyzed. Here is his list that put Alabama first among the fifty states:

Fishing: A-
 Large, semi-nude iron statues: A+
 Hunting: B+
 Traffic: A-
 Trees: A
 Barbecue: B+
 Scuppernongs and Peaches: A
 Rich plaintiff lawyers: A
 Rich defense lawyers: A-
 German-owned automobile factories: A
 Football stadium hood ornaments: A+
 College football: A-
 Weather/Fall: A+
 Weather/Winter: B
 Weather/Spring: A
 Weather/Summer: C-
 Auto Racing: A-
 Dog Racing: A-
 Mullet tossing: A
 Confederate Statues: A
 State workers' days off: A
 Real People: A
 Road builders: A
 Writers who do rating books: F

For a more profound and less defensive reconciliation of tradition and modernity, we would do well to read Southern literature.

Both historians and writers of fiction are practitioners of the art of memory, memory in the sense of specific personal experience and deflected, distant memory. In fact, I believe that the best history, like the best fiction, is often the product, at least partially of personal memory. Mississippi writer Willie Morris captured one such poignant personal memory from the South's most famous historian, C. Vann Woodward. As Woodward and several fellow historians walked along the highway with Martin Luther King, Jr., during the Selma-to-

Montgomery march in 1965, he observed the sullen resentment of the “red-necks lined up, hate all over their faces, distrust and misunderstanding in their eyes. And I’ll have to admit something. A little part of me was there with them.”⁵

If I may be so immodest, I will also mention my own book, *Poor But Proud*, a book about poor whites. Critics almost uniformly have mentioned the passion of the book. If that is its strength, it is not because of distant, academic memory, of hundreds of hours spent in archives and libraries. It is because of personal memory, of hundreds of conversations with my grandfather, a sharecropper, and with my uncles, aunts, and parents about how hard it was to make a decent life with little education and no advantages.

Historians, like writers of fiction, can use memory to freeze time, to enthrone tradition, to restrict and narrow the meaning of Southernness. In fact, an entire generation of white Southern historians used historical memory in that way between 1865 and the 1950s. So did a fair number of Southern writers, including Erskine Caldwell and William Alexander Percy. In *Lanterns on the Levee* this is the way a Mississippi Delta aristocrat depicted the region’s poor whites: spiritually and intellectually they were inferior to Negroes, who they hated: they were the type of people Percy wrote, who “lynch Negroes, mistake hoodlumism for wit, and cunning for intelligence, that attend revivals and fight and fornicate in the bushes afterward.”⁶ The Mississippian received impressive intellectual support from North Carolina journalist Wilbur J. Cash. In *The Mind of the South*, Cash wrote that Southern poor white males “mainly passed [their lives] on their backsides in the shade of a tree, communing with their hounds and a jug of what, with a fine feeling for words, has been named ‘bust head.’”

If there is one region of America that ought to understand and resist such stereotypes, it is the South. All of us, black and white, ought to know better, if only because so many of our ancestors are like the ones Percy described. Only a little more than half-a-century ago half the South’s farmers and sixty-five percent of those who cultivated cotton were landless peasants, barely able to read and write, and caught up in nearly a century of cyclical, downward mobility. Southern whites were the people called “poor white trash” and genetically incapable, the ones who scored even lower on intelligence tests than black Northerners, the ones subjected to jokes about incest and cultural degeneracy.

Poor whites moved into the middle class—thanks to the quasi-welfare state, federal farm subsidies, Hill-Burton Act hospitals, TVA, rural electrical cooperatives, the National Defense Education Act, federal aid to schools, and other “income-redistribution programs” (which term is a euphemism for taking taxes from rich Yankees and spending

them on poor Southerners). But as they moved into the middle class, poor whites lost the capacity and the will to remember. Memory was too painful, and so many poor white Southerners replaced memory with mythology. They prospered because they worked harder. They were the deserving poor, not shiftless, lazy, undeserving blacks or poor white trash. In time they forgot they ever were poor, despising even the term “poor white” and expunging it from memory as they entered middle class respectability.

If we read Flannery O’Connor, Will Campbell, Eudora Welty, Marjorie Kinnon Rawlings, Clyde Edgerton, William Faulkner, Harry Crews, and a host of other Southern writers, what a much more complex and intelligent rendering of poor folks’ lives we receive. Just as Eudora Welty’s Mississippi photographs from the 1930s depict a different variety of poor whites from Walker Evans’ photographs taken at the same time barely a hundred miles away in Hale County, Alabama, so do her poor whites in *A Curtain of Green* differ from those of her contemporary Delta writer William Alexander Percy.

One of America’s chief tasks for our times is to make sense out of why it is that the richest country in the world has for two decades experienced a quickening rate of economic inequality, a growth in poverty and sharper class divisions, a national rate of child poverty by the mid 1990s that reached 23 percent, compared to a 1969 rate of only 14 percent. If that is one of the nation’s great unsolved riddles, then the answer to the riddle may be locked up within the memory of Southerners. Perhaps it is not poverty itself that so misshapes the human condition, but whether we allow it to distort us.

My favorite pop psychologist, Scott Peck, began a best-selling book with the single line: “Life is difficult.” Despite September 11, 2001, I doubt that most Americans of my generation or younger really believe that. One reason for America’s cynicism about politics, family dysfunction, its unwillingness to sacrifice short-term self-interest for long-term security, refusal to submerge personal and group interests for the sake of the commonweal, is because most Americans believe deep in their souls that life is pretty simple, pretty easy.

Southern writers believe no such thing, nor do the best of them romanticize poverty. They depict the poor in a kaleidoscope of colors, not in simple grays, blacks and whites. Welty, O’Connor, Faulkner, Crews, Campbell and many others remind us that hard times teach lessons impossible to learn from easy times. Strength of family, kin, and community; dignity in the face of desperation; endurance amidst deprivation; occasional comic relief appearing in subplots because, deep down, life hurts too much to cry. It may be, as Flannery O’Connor argued, that Southerners write about freaks because they can still recog-

nize them. But my hunch is that Southerners' memories supply our freaks with names and faces, makes them kin to us; and our comprehension of the stunting and debilitating effect of poverty allows each one of us to be like C. Vann Woodward on that road outside Selma. When we remember all the hateful freaks, all the gap-toothed, hooded Klansmen, all the incestuous, alcoholic, pew-jumping, snake-handling, poison-drinking Pentecostals, we know deep down in our memories: "*a little part of me was there with them.*"

Just as the collective memory of Southern historians and writers can help the nation rethink what it means to be just. Harper Lee used her own family history to craft a South where people were judged on their merits, not by the color of their skin. Her 1960 Pulitzer Prize-winning novel *To Kill a Mockingbird* is used in schools around the world to teach tolerance of people who are different.

By memory neither do these writers nor I mean memory in the static sense. Eudora Welty describes precisely what I mean in *One Writer's Beginning*.⁷ What is most important to the writer, she argues, is memory and confluence, which are related. "As you have seen, I am a writer who came of a sheltered life. A sheltered life can be a daring life as well. For all serious daring starts within." "Memory," she adds, "is a living thing—it too is in transit. But during its moment, all that is remembered joins, and lives—the old and the young, the past and the present, the living and the dead."

Without this kind of memory we are like the poor white, uneducated, unsophisticated Chisom family, come for Clinton McKelva's funeral in *The Optimist's Daughter*. Eudora Welty writes of them: "They might have come out of that night in the hospital room—out of all times of trouble, past or future—the great, interrelated family of those who never know the meaning of what has happened to them."⁸ Or we may be more like the proud, educated, affluent Fairchild family in *Delta Wedding*: "They were never too busy for anything, they were generously and almost seriously of the moment: the past . . . was a private, dull matter that would be forgotten except by aunts."⁹

Literary memory can do more than glorify tradition. It can puncture and ridicule pompous and artificial tradition. Mobile writer Eugene Walter has a character in *The Untidy Pilgrim* say: I don't think a person ought to let their minds go roaming up and down around useless questions or answers. Like I don't think people should look at themselves too much in mirrors. I think you should be able to close up your mind like a box or a book and not be troubled.¹⁰

That is the same wisdom found in a country music song by Bobby Field entitled "Is That All There Is?" One line of the song la-

ments “You walked off the scene / When I couldn’t make your life like *Southern Living* magazine.”

Consider new ways of defining Southern tradition from our literature. Walker Percy, who directed the focus of Southern fiction away from barren tenant farms toward suburban golf courses and subdivisions, did not depart from Southern literary tradition. Like many writers before him, he lampooned a South turning materialistic, where “fortunes are made converting old slave quarters to condos and car salesmen dress up like Civil War generals.” The modern push for civil rights meant that the “good pagan’s answer” was no longer good enough for the South. The region instead needed Christianity’s belief in the “sacred right which must be accorded the individual.”¹¹ In a time when racial injustice can be attributed not to unjust laws, but to old habits of the heart, Percy’s vision may be the only way to create a just society. The Southern sense of manners and community must transcend America’s sense of racial differentness.

Flannery O’Connor reminds us in *A Habit of Being* that there are multiple ways to divide up people: black-white, Northern-Southern, male-female. She suggests another possibility: On the subject of the feminist business, I just never think . . . of qualities that are specifically feminine or masculine. I suppose I divide people into two classes: the Irksome and the Non-Irksome without regard to sex. Yes, and there are the Medium Irksome and the Rare Irksome.

I like her typology of the human family.

The call of a new generation of Southern writers—Vicki Covington, Elizabeth Dewberry Vaughn, Dori Sanders, Tina McElroy Ansa, just to mention a few—for more meaningful religious values, a renewed sense of family and place, speaks well for the constructive role of memory. This is not memory frozen in time and enslaved to a mythological past. It is memory alive, engaging, changing, integrating modernity and tradition, memory that is historically inclusive rather than exclusive.

Can the South survive prosperity, urbanization, immigration, racial justice, and a two-party political system? I will relay four memories and let you decide for yourselves.

At the age of 29, Jimmy Carter had a wonderful job as senior naval officer for a crew building one of the first nuclear submarines. But his father had terminal cancer, and he returned home to be with him. Carter later wrote about the impact of that visit:

I saw what his life meant to the people of Plains and that area. He was in the Lions Club. He was on the county school board and the hospital authority. The farmers around there, both black and

white, looked upon him as a leader. He was a Sunday School teacher. His whole life was immersed in that community, and people depended on him.

I compared my life, if I could become chief of naval operations, with what my father's life meant, and I decided my life could mean more in Plains.

Many years later, in February, 1993, I heard Rosalynn Carter speak in Birmingham. After her speech a questioner asked: "What aspects of Southern culture were most important to you as First Lady?" Despite all the small-mindedness, intolerance and meanness of that community, she responded: "My community, the people of Plains, and how they loved me. My church and my religion. I'm glad I grew up in the Bible Belt."

Norma Bailey was an acquaintance of mine from Hazelhurst, Mississippi. Her husband was a senior executive for the largest aggregate company in the world with headquarters in Birmingham. For many years they lived in Maryland. Toward the end of her life, the Baileys returned South to Birmingham. They noticed little difference: just one large city compared to another. Same traffic. Same malls. Same crime and trouble. Shortly after arriving, she had a minor car accident at a busy intersection. The lady who ran into her got out and introduced herself: "Hi. I'm Judy Smith."

Norma replied: "So nice to meet you. I'm Norma Bailey."

Smith asked if she lived in Birmingham.

"Yes, we just moved here," Bailey responded. "We lived in Maryland before, but I am from Mississippi originally."

"Oh, really?" Smith said. "What part?"

"Hazelhurst."

"Oh, do you know the . . . ?"

After a long and cordial conversation, Bailey suggested: "Don't you think we had better call the police?" Norma Bailey told me that it was only after that conversation that she knew she had truly come home to the South.

Before his untimely death last year, I heard Eric Lincoln, an African-American professor of religion at Duke University, say the same thing in a different way about growing up in the Tennessee Valley. He had experienced many terrible, haunting injustices in his childhood, from his father's white landlord and from small-town merchants, he said, but "I never met a fisherman who wasn't kind, white or black. And those relationships never got talked about. The South that is going to matter ultimately is the South where people feel for each other."

Will there always be a South? It depends.

If your memory of the South is a flag on the top of a pole, or a hierarchical society where women and blacks know their places and remain in them, where selfish ways of thinking enthrone low taxes and strangle public schools, where poverty and poor education cripple our economy as race does our politics, then the likelihood is no.

Some day most of us will decide that we pay too high a price for the endurance of such traditions. But if memory is more fluid, if it envisions a South where people could actually eat the fish they caught in our rivers, where magnificent forests afford a range for bald eagles and bear, a place to hunt and hike, where neighborliness and good manners apply to interracial as well as intra-racial relations, where strong values forged by Christian faith sustain even the poorest families, where hard lessons learned from great pain remind people of the indomitable capacity of the human spirit, if this is the function of memory, then I believe and earnestly hope there will always be a South.

Endnotes

¹Rheta Grimsley Johnson, "Old South Tradition is Dead, Years Late," *Birmingham Post-Herald*, February 8, 1993.

²*The Auburn Plainsman*, February 4, 1993.

³Cynthia Tucker, "It's My South, Too, You Know," *The Birmingham News*, August 7, 1994.

⁴*Birmingham News*, November 24, 1994.

⁵Willie Morris, *North Toward Home*, pp. 398-399.

⁶*Lanterns on the Levee*, pp. 20 and 149.

⁷*One Writer's Beginning*, p. 104.

⁸*The Optimist's Daughter*, p. 103.

⁹_____, p. 15.

¹⁰_____, pp. 36-37.

¹¹*Newsweek*, May 21, 1990; *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 14, 1990.

"Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary Revisited"

[Special Sesquicentennial Lecture, Sept. 13, 2001]

Walter B. Shurden

Almost three decades ago—to be exact, 27 years ago—I delivered an address to the faculty of this college entitled “Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary.” This morning I want to revisit that address, updating where I think appropriate, deleting where necessary, and revising in general.

One hundred and fifty Septembers ago this college set out with the ununiversal, unecumenical, and unexciting name of "Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary." There is meaning in that name. For the name identified much about this 1851 infant. It tells us something about who they were in 1851 and, likewise, about who you are or might be or maybe should be in 2001.

Let the preacher in me break the name into bits, offer some analysis as to what it meant in the original language (which in this instance was East Tennessee-ese), note some developments in each of the areas, and venture an opinion concerning the present and future in light of the past.

Mossy Creek

First, "Mossy Creek." Professor Ed Freels of this faculty told me three decades ago that Mossy Creek was a trickle of water which began south of town, gathered a small amount of water from surrounding hills but most from a spring, ambled 5.3 miles, and dumped itself into the old Holston River.

In truth, however, Mossy Creek was more than a creek. It was a specific place, a specific area, and a specific people. In East Tennessee-ese the word Mossy Creek could be translated "very local" or "geographical parochialism."

One should not, however, feel condescending about this emphasis on localism. Your Founders intended it that way! They wanted you to know and everybody else to know that this was not Oxford or Harvard or the University of Tennessee; it was not even the Tennessee Baptist University. No sir! This was Mossy Creek U! The blueprint was to educate youngsters in this area, to be of service to churches in this place!

Localism was orthodoxy. The first president of the college was a Dandridge pastor. The first professor, and academic backbone of this college for a number of years, was Robert Reedy Bryan. He was homegrown, born and reared in Jefferson County. The first business agent of the college was mistakenly born 'way over in Blount County, but he got right and moved to Mossy Creek in 1842. The evolved name of Carson-Newman is rooted in two prominent families of Dandridge and Mossy Creek. Money for your educational beginnings came primarily from local folk. Bricks for the original three buildings were burned in a local kiln. And labor for the construction was donated by interested and enthusiastic, and without a doubt, uneducated, local people.

While this college, like most in the country, began with an understandable parochialism, we also need eyes to see the heroic that hangs over this heritage. And while you doubtless are correct to celebrate efforts to break free of the strictures of the cocoon of Mossy Creek and to become more comprehensive in your vision, wisdom would suggest that you never forget that your sense of place is one of your greatest strengths. You are who you are as a college partially because of where you are. There is no reason for either of those facts to be terribly disconcerting.

Where you are is in Jefferson County, Tennessee—in Appalachia, that region of these United States that every American is obligated to feel sorry for. Educational elitism is out of place here; educational excellence is not.

During almost all of my academic career, I have heard those terms—elitism and excellence—confused in educational circles by making them interchangeable. But elitism is not tantamount to excellence. And excellence is not restricted to the elite; excellence is not even guaranteed by elitism.

Excellence for Carson-Newman College has to do with what you do with the student who comes your way. I have often wondered if one way of distinguishing a “Christian” college from other colleges is by making education academically accessible to the deprived, not just the elite. Can Christian colleges borrow a biblical word and speak of “educational redemption”? Can we redefine excellence in education so

as to include the educationally deficient as well as the academically superior student?

A bouquet of compliments could well be tossed in the direction of the idea of your Developmental Education Program. That program goes back a long way. Page 60 of the 1974-76 Carson-Newman Catalog said that "the Achievement Studies Program at Carson-Newman College is designed for the student who is deficient in the basic skills."

You have reason as a faculty to be proud of being part of a college that has both an excellent Honors Program and a Developmental Education Program. When a faculty member here thirty years ago, I observed that some of our ablest colleagues labored in this program, a program which required trainloads of patience while returning a thimble full of campus prestige.

Maybe some of us who are focused on our research and our personal scholarship could be called to a new awareness of all such efforts at educational redemption, to a new sensitivity to the students involved, to a new commitment to its importance. Like most faculty members, I want to teach intellectually gifted students who are well prepared. That desire, however, may say far more about my personal ego than about the needs of my students. Could it be that the celebration of your sesquicentennial is a good time to catch a new vision of what this program might mean for some of your students and for the college itself?

As an intellectual center, Carson-Newman certainly cannot allow itself to be transformed into therapeutic halls, focusing primarily on the self-image of its students. You are here to challenge the way people think, to point to different windows out of which people can see the world afresh and anew. However, if you do something along the way to help students emerge with some newfound feeling of self-worth, Carson-Newman would have known a taste of excellence.

Mossy Creek Missionary

The second element in your first name was "missionary"—"Mossy Creek *Missionary* Baptist Seminary". Among mid-nineteenth century Baptists, the word "missionary" reflected an attitude and a posture, not simply an endorsement of the evangelistic enterprise. It meant, in the words of Dr. Isaac Newton Carr, that those who began this col-

lege were people "of courage and vision."¹ People "of courage and vision"—that's the kind of hagiographical platitude uttered about founders of anything and everything. And yet, if one knows the context of Baptist life in the early and mid-part of the 19th century, one recognizes the truth of Carr's description.

During the period of 1820-1845 Baptists in the frontier regions of Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana found themselves in the throes of a denominational fistfight. Often dubbed the "anti-missions" controversy, this fray could be described more accurately as the "anti-all-religious-organizations-beyond-the-local-church" controversy.²

The conservative view was simple: Baptists should not involve themselves in any extra-local ecclesiastical units. To do so, they argued, would rip the fabric of the cherished Baptist principle of local church independence. Suspicion of "new fangled societies," as one of the critics called them,³ overwhelmed some Baptists of the day, and eventually their paranoia gave birth to what is known as the Primitive or Hardshell Baptists.

What was it that put such fear in the hearts of these folk of the frontier? Societies and conventions! Missionary societies, Bible societies, Sunday school societies and education societies! All were villains, for they acted independently of local Baptist churches. Now is a good time to tell you that Carson-Newman College was launched by an organization known as the East Tennessee Baptist Education Society. Your Founders were the *progressives* of their age! People "of courage and vision," Dr. Carr called them.

Suspicion of societies and conventions was not the only issue that generated fear. Not only did some Baptists oppose missionary societies. They opposed missions! Not only did they oppose Sunday School societies. They opposed Sunday Schools! And not only did they oppose education societies! They opposed education, and especially

¹Isaac Newton Carr, *History of Carson-Newman College*, (Jefferson City, Tennessee: Carson-Newman College, 1959) p. 17.

²See my *Not A Silent People: Controversies That Have Shaped Southern Baptists*, (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Publishing Co, revised 1995) pp. 19-28.

³Daniel Parker used this designated. See O.W. Taylor, *Early Tennessee Baptists, 1769-1832*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Executive Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention, 1957) p. 184.

ministerial education. Now is a good time to tell you that Article Six of the East Tennessee Baptist Education Society read as follows:

We whose names are annexed, Wishing to promote education in general, and among the ministry in particular, agree to give our influence and contributions, in support thereof. . . .⁴

A brief application of this bit of Baptist history to Carson-Newman today. Your school, as was mine at Mercer University, was born in the tensions of denominational life. Baptist educational institutions—colleges and seminaries—have just about always been centers of tension within Baptist life. Liberals and conservatives, progressives and conservatives, moderates and fundamentalists—call them by whatever set of polarities you wish—they usually end by spilling each others' blood near some Baptist campus. And if blood simply must flow from some denominational altar, I suppose it is better that it cover significant rather than meaningless altars. Christian education—and all that implies or whatever it implies—is one of the high altars of our faith.

After coming to teach here in 1969 I came to think of Carson-Newman College as both a servant and a leader of Baptists not only in Tennessee but also in other states as well. This servant-leader tension creates some of the problems and much of the challenge of this school.⁵ Recognition of your role to lead and appreciation for the people who support you constitute twin realities of your existence.

Before being elected the first president of Carson-Newman, William Rogers, the former Dandridge pastor, worked for a few months as a "financial agent" (translated from the original language, that means Vice-President in charge of Development) for the proposed school. When he gave his financial report in the summer of 1851, he said that he had found "\$2,386.50 in bonds, notes, books, and cash in hand for the college; also the favor and good will of many friends, a spirit of improvement among the Baptists, a sentiment in favor of educating the ministry and 'some difficulties to contend with'."⁶

⁴As quoted in Carr, p. 17.

⁵The idea comes from Penrose St. Amant, "Theological Education and the Denominational Seminary," (*Review and Expositor: Special Inaugural Supplement*, April, 1960) p. 241.

⁶Carr, p. 10.

"Some difficulties to contend with!" Yes, one imagines so! One difficulty was drumming up support. But they worked at it and discovered some. Another was the need for a meeting place. And they built one. Another was meager resources. And, like Jesus, they gave thanks for the bread and fish of life, and set out to multiply them. Rogers didn't know what a seer he really was. For he was elected president on August 7, 1851, the next month the school opened, and two months later the young thirty-four year old first president of Carson-Newman College was dead.

"Some difficulties to contend with!" Like 1862, when Federal troops occupied the buildings and the young school closed for six years so the people could tend to their wars. Or like December 13, 1916, when fire destroyed the Administration Building. Or like January 16, 1974, when fire returned to wake us up and keep us up. Or like the later 1960's and early 1970's when higher education in general wobbled punch drunk and private education in particular appeared to be on the ropes. Or like the 1990s, when, as a result of courageous trustee policy, your funds were withheld from you.

"Some difficulties to contend with!" All of these that I have enumerated, and numberless others which I have not recounted, were difficulties—genuine two hundred pound difficulties. But one of those difficulties has been that of plugging this school into the heart of the people called Baptists without forfeiting what the educational mission of the school was all about.

I repeat myself for emphasis: recognition of your role to lead and appreciation for your support constitute twin realities of your existence. You simply must not be intimidated by every letter that comes from an individual Baptist or group of Baptists in this state or region. You must not be paralyzed by fear by every allegation made against you. Your responsibility to lead must fortify you to deal with your accusers with a forthright response on some occasions and with an honest confession on others and with benign neglect on yet others.

On the other hand, it is important to remember that all Baptists are not your critics. Scores of Baptist people out there support the serious work you do and they do not want that work impeded. Forgetting those people, even when others of the Baptist constituency rake you over the coals, will not further your cause. Leader-servant! That is the paradoxical tension in which you strive to do your work in a creative and productive manner.

Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist

The third feature of your first name was *Baptist*. To some that word means baptism by immersion by an ordained Baptist minister only. To some it means a folksiness in worship. To some it means biblical inerrancy. To some it means religious foot-dragging. But to some of us, who once laid hold of some meaning in its churches and there ran upon the holy in life, it means something for which we cannot apologize.

But to Carson-Newman it means a heritage and a help. Baptists came up with the idea for this school. They gave the idea legs, legs which first crawled, then toddled with childlike uncertainty, then ran with the vigor of youth.

Your roots run deep in Baptist soil, particularly among the Baptists of East Tennessee. They gave you your existence. Classes met for the first year in the local Baptist church. The nurture of the institution continued under Baptist auspices, and in 1918 the college conveyed all of its property to the Education Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention for the sum of \$1.00 in exchange for the "financial, denominational, and moral support" of the Tennessee Baptist Convention.⁷ Now, what that means is that you had 67 years of history before the Tennessee Baptist Convention became part of your governance. Like many other Baptist schools, you were Baptist long before you were owned by a Baptist convention. One does not have to be owned by or governed by a Baptist convention in order to proclaim itself Baptist.

Sometimes we forget that Baptists have not only "given" to C-N; they have "received" from C-N. Carson-Newman has produced some signally important Baptist leaders. One thinks of James Wood, former Executive-Director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in Washington, D.C. and a leading scholar on religious freedom in this country, Luther Joe Thompson, who served as minister of the influential First Baptist Church of Richmond, Virginia, and Carlyle Marney, one of the genuinely seminal Baptist thinkers of any age, and T. B. Maston, a man small of stature but big of soul, who took Baptists by the back of the neck and sought to shake their racism out of them. You would not be so arrogant as to take credit for all that those indi-

⁷See the "Contract of Carson-Newman College with the Educational Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention" printed in full, Carr, p. 389.

viduals became. It would be a serious oversight, however, to fail to note that they came through this place.

Has it been worth the dollar for the college, too! I hope so! A comparison of finances this college receives from its constituency with what colleges of other religious groups receive from their sponsors is a sobering experience. Doubtless, Baptists have provided you with significant denominational and moral support over the years.

However, a college's indebtedness to its constituency cannot allow the intellectual vocation of the college to be sacrificed. Since I gave this speech in 1974, the Baptist world has been turned literally upside down. Contrary to a widely held opinion, the chief threat to intellectual freedom on most Baptist campuses is not political correctness, though that tyranny is real and can be oppressive. The chief threat to intellectual creativity on Baptist campuses today is religious fundamentalism, whose basic epistemology refuses to allow another point of view. It simply must be resisted. It must be resisted for it knows no compromise. It must be resisted if the work of the Baptist college and university is to have something other than a mediocre intellectual life.

Well, what does it mean for you to advertise yourselves as a Christian college with a Baptist heritage? It means that you identify yourselves with the values and traditions of the Christian faith, that you find the clue to the human enterprise in the Carpenter of Nazareth.

To say that you are a Christian college is to imply a very significant responsibility. You are here, I hope, for more than to teach your disciplines. You are here, and it should be said out loud, to help alter the quality of some people's lives. This doesn't mean handing out tracts or manipulating a weak personality that trembles in awe of your authority; it doesn't mean crashing the citadel of privacy of a sophomore's soul. It doesn't even have to mean a required chapel and a double dose of religion courses. It means that you want to make a difference in somebody's future and that you hope to do life with a seriousness and a joy which are catching.

Carson-Newman advertises itself as a Christian college. Beyond that it finds its identity in the Baptist expression of Christendom. Does that mean denominational indoctrination? Of course not. Does it mean an uncritical acceptance of all things generally publicized as Baptist? I hope not. I think I've read enough Baptist history to know that we are on dangerous ground when we begin to speak of the Baptist position on almost anything! Does it mean that all of your staff, students and faculty must be Baptists? Of course not. You can cherish the diversity within Baptist educational institutions just as we cherish the competing points of views in a local Baptist church. What it does mean, I think, is that the basic thrust of this institution supports the principles

and traditions of historic Baptist life, and that you hope to strengthen Baptist churches, other Christian churches, and the larger world by producing a more liberally educated ministry and laity.

Let me conclude this section by flashing the yellow light of caution before Christian colleges in general and Carson-Newman in particular. Be wary of over promising! You are not a sanctuary of holiness; you are not twelve miles from any known sin; you are not even the hope of the world. You are a human community before you are a Christian community. You are neither super-human nor super-Christian. You are humans who advertise that you work at being Christian, and sometimes your work is admittedly shoddy!

This is one area where many of your supporters need not only better information but also a more sympathetic understanding. Too many friends of this college view you as a panacea for the problems of their young. Mistakenly, they view you as a kind of Christian reformatory, an institution that rebuilds all the disconnected parts of students' lives. But—just because some overexpect is no reason for you to underexpect. For shaping the quality of a life is something of why you are and what you are up to!

Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist *Seminary*

The final element in your first name was *seminary*. Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist *Seminary*. To say the least, "seminary," to those of us in the twenty-first century, constitutes a puzzling choice of name. It is even more puzzling when you study the history of education in this country, because the word was used to describe several types of educational institutions.

For example, "seminary" often referred to a female educational institution. "During the early decades of the nineteenth century the wealthier classes sent their daughters to the 'female seminaries'."⁸ The female seminary was something of a female counterpart to male academies. Certainly this was not the meaning of the Mossy Creek school, for girls were not admitted to this college for a number of years after its founding.

Today we think of a seminary as an institution for the professional training of candidates for the priesthood or ministry. But we cer-

⁸S. Alexander Rippa, *Education In A Free Society: An American History*, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1967, second edition) p. 238.

tainly cannot impose that definition upon Mossy Creek Seminary of 1851. It is true that East Tennessee Baptists wanted to promote education "among the ministry in particular." But it is equally true that Article IV of the East Tennessee Baptist Educational Society stated that they wanted "to promote education in general." Natural science, not theology, was the favorite course of the first teacher of this institution. And the first graduate of this school, who could boast Davy Crockett as a second cousin, was not a minister but a doctor. Apparently not until S. W. Tindell assumed the presidency of the college in the early 1880s was a religion department added to the college.⁹

On December 5, 1855, the Tennessee Legislature amended the original charter of this school and changed the name from Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary to Mossy Creek Baptist College. But this act implied no significant change at all in the character or nature of the school. Rather, it sought to bring the name of the school more in line with its original purpose that was "to promote education in general" and to promote a general education among the ministry in particular.

So this school was not originally a female preparatory school. Neither was it a theological seminary in our contemporary usage of the word. It was a school committed to general education, which is today "liberal" education. In this connection, the definition of *seminary* listed first in Webster's is helpful. Coming from a root word that means "seed," a seminary is "an environment in which something originates." It does not really matter what you are called—Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary, Mossy Creek Baptist College, Carson and Newman College, Carson-Newman College, or even Carson-Newman University—it does not matter. It does matter, however, and it matters immensely, that this academic community become "an environment in which something originates."

So what seed do you want to plant? What is it that you want to see originate in this place? What is it that you want to let happen here? A critical mind! That's what you want to happen here. A mind that subjects its study to a battery of probing and penetrating questions, a mind with a thinker as well as a memory, a mind that questions presuppositions as well as lists them—you want that, don't you?

And a cosmopolitan mind! You want the germination of a life that confesses the limitations of its past and the liberation of other cultures and other days and other people. But you want more! You want people to originate here who trust moments of mystery and ecstasy as

⁹Carr, p. 42.

well as hours of logical and rational thinking. You want people who can enjoy, not only describe or define, art and music and words.

The truth is, you want an awful lot to happen here. Traditionally, liberal arts colleges have advertised their products as "cultured persons." I would like to shift the focus just a bit without sacrificing that emphasis. Is it incurable and indefensible idealism to believe that a college education should help prepare one for a future of change? I suggest that C-N continue the tradition I witnessed here thirty years ago and seek to produce a "coping person," one who can know some stability, some serenity, some sanity in the presence of the high winds of change which will intimidate her future.

After spending most of my life and career around colleges and seminaries, I am convinced of this: the rapidity of change in our society plays into the hands of the liberally educated person and, therefore, the liberally educating institution. Career preparation and specific job training cannot be condescendingly whisked away. College graduates must eat, too!

But colleges and universities have produced enough graduates who knew the skills of their trade but grew to hate their jobs and who lacked the flexibility to evade a trapped situation. We have produced enough technicians void of the art of loving life. We must, therefore, strive to prepare human beings to cope with a future of vocational, personal, domestic and social change.

One of the central questions for a college today is how to educate one for a future of twists and turns, for a tomorrow riddled with the anxiety of having to begin again. Well the answer to that question goes to such mundane matters as faculty advising, to such lofty academic matters as basic requirements and the character of the curriculum, and to such professional concerns as how teachers teach and how honest they are about their own coping.

We cannot prepare people for change without facts, details and information. But we certainly cannot prepare them merely with facts and specialized information. On the wall of a teacher's lounge in a Naples, Florida, school is the old pedagogical dictum: "Know your stuff; know whom you are stuffing; then stuff them!" I offer a cautious demurral. The stuff we know will change. The ones we are stuffing will change. So stuffing students with academic stuff is just not enough in a world where both the students and the stuff change.

Conclusion

I have often asked my colleagues at Mercer this question: “What do you want to have happened to a student who walks across the stage and receives a diploma from Mercer University?” The longer I have hung around the academic yard the simpler the answer to that question becomes. Here is what I want: I want Mercer graduates to be able to read critically, think logically, communicate effectively (in both writing and speech), and to act compassionately.

In 1860, only nine years after Carson-Newman’s beginning, a quaint promotional item in a Baptist paper stated: “Those who wish to go to school may be assured that they can do as well as Mossy Creek as at any other institution.” I’m glad they thought it was true then. Some of you have worked for decades to make that true. I hope you will not grow weary in well doing, for you are, in the words of novelist Walker Percy, “up to something significant.”

The Feminine Potential

[Mother's Day Sermon, First Baptist Church]

Calvin S. Metcalf

In Genesis 1:27, it says, "So God created man in his own image. In the image of God he created him. Male and female he created them." Then if you will turn to Proverbs 31, I'm going to read those verses a little later in the sermon.

Today is Mother's Day. I guess it's the only day on the Christian calendar devoted entirely to women. There is just no biological way we can get around women's emphasis on this day. Now it is OK with most folk if we do not focus on anything other than motherhood for women. You see even today there are still folk around who think that women ought never to be in a position to threaten male superiority. And it's not just men who feel that way. Surprisingly, enough a lot of women push the submission idea almost to the point of surrender.

Other women are subtler and they use submission as a means of manipulation. Some of us in church leadership have made an interesting observation through the years that many women who overly exaggerate the role of male leadership themselves tend to wear the spiritual pants in the home. Now mind you somebody ought to. Shame on us husbands and fathers who will not join our wives in establishing a Godly home.

Now I know what Paul says about submission, about women and about wives. I do think, however, we need to look at the scriptures, all the scriptures, on the matter and not just pick and choose that which suits our own particular prejudice. When I look at the social conditions in Paul's day I think I can understand why he wrote what he did. In Corinth alone there were thousands of prostitutes, women serving in the temple of the goddess Diane. The immoral use of women was a strong feature in that pagan culture.

No wonder Paul told Christian women not to bob their hair and remain silent in the public meeting. He did not want them looking like nor acting like a bunch of temple prostitutes. Paul was making rules for women in a pagan culture that served sex on a religious platter. Paul did not want the worship of the true and living God mistaken

as another fertility cult with sexual orgies. Christianity would lift women from the state of semi-slavery and give them a way to serve God with their minds instead of their bodies. Christianity would encourage a moral setting for the family where both men and women could be mutually submissive to one another.

Let me propose some things for us to think about when we are considering the role of women and their potential. Jesus gave a lot more public attention to women than the customs of his day would permit a male to do. He sat by the well and conversed publicly with a woman of ill repute, which no rabbi of his day would do. He allowed a woman to wash his feet; an act frowned upon by his legalistic crowd. He touched them and healed them and encouraged them to go and sin no more. Women were some of his most loyal followers. What a rebel Jesus was for his day when it came to women.

Think with me about something else. Why did Peter quote from the prophet Joel in his Pentecost sermon about sons and daughters prophesying, if the spirit was never going to lead them to do so? Why did Paul tell Corinthian women to cover their heads when they prayed or prophesied, if they were not supposed to do it? What was the church role of such women as Dorcas and Lydia and Priscilla and Phoebe and others? What did Paul mean in Galatians 3:28 when he said, "There is neither male nor female. You are all one in Christ Jesus." Indeed we have a lot to think about and pray about and learn about as we seek the mind of Christ concerning the role of women in today's church. But no matter what our individual conclusions may be we will all have to admit there is a feminine contribution to our faith, which the Christian community needs to celebrate.

The role of women in the betterment of human kind is a well-documented fact. Their courage and stamina under extreme circumstances give female history a note of unsurpassing bravery. Although we live in a man's world there are women behind the scene and on the scene helping to keep things together. Therefore it is important to have Mother's Day not only to honor that special person in each of our lives but also to celebrate the maternal influence of all women.

The femaleness of life is a gift from God and is greatly needed in our society today. How sad to see this dainty, delicate aspect of human personality abused by men who are not sure of their own masculinity. How sad to see the feminine potential misused by women who have not found their self-worth in Christ. Church at its best captures both male and female expressions of godliness and we all become one in this bond of love.

Have you ever considered the male and female sides of God? Jesus expressed the maleness of God when he rebuked the demons and

the boisterous waves, when he verbally chastised the Pharisees and ran the moneychangers out of the temple. But he expressed the female side of God with his compassion for the multitudes, his tender attention to sick and hurting folk, and his ability to inspire love and sympathy. There is a sense in which Jesus expressed both femininity and masculinity at its best because he was God. Now to understand this means that we loose our paranoia about inclusive language. God transcends all our nouns and pronouns and our gender words because in a sense he is both.

Now having said this and since this is indeed a woman's day I want us to look, take a fresh look perhaps, at the Bible's sketch of womanhood at its best. And that's where we turn to Proverbs 31 beginning with verse 10. I want us to look at this as a healthy biblical concept of a good woman. In verse 10 we see a good woman defined by noble character. "A wife of noble character, who can find. She is worth far more than rubies." This is God's dream for every woman. It is not a vision of a second class citizen, but a first class human being. Her worth goes beyond her financial fortune. She has worth as a person. She carries herself with dignity. She does not see herself as the extension of her jewelry, or her house, or her car or her clothing. She does not find her worth in material things. She refuses to be a commodity sold in the market place to the highest bidder. Her self-respect comes from knowing she is created in the image of God.

Verse 11 and 12 tells us that a good woman inspires confidence. "Her husband has full confidence in her and lacks nothing of value. She brings him good, not harm, all the days of her life." The woman described here happens to be married. Her husband trusts her because he has confidence in her as a fellow human being. She gives him confidence by exuding confidence herself. This kind of woman does not have to be married because she has integrity within herself. People who know her know they are not going to be double-crossed because her word is her bond. She does not get her way by clever manipulation or by exploitative behavior. She has integrity and worth.

In verses 13 through 19 a good woman is described as being industrious. She is self-motivated. "She selects wool and flax and works with eager hands. She is like the merchant ships bringing her food from afar. She gets up while it is still dark. She provides food for her family and portions for her servant girls. She considers a field and buys it. Out of her earnings she plants a vineyard. She sets about her work vigorously. Her arms are strong for her tasks. She sees that her trading is profitable. And her lamp does not go out at night. In her hands she holds the distaff and grasps the spindle with her fingers."

Too often the church has defined a good woman as weak and helpless and dependent on a strong, creative, dominant man. We do not get this definition from the Bible. We get it from culture. These verses give us a picture of womanhood with strength and determination. Rid these verses of their ancient flavor and we have a profile of an amazingly liberated woman who has total freedom in the marketplace. The passage does not stereotype a woman confined to the home, refused access to the world of business, ideas and public service. You could not ask for a more contemporary woman than our text here describes. Replace the ancient, agricultural society with the technological realities of our day and you find a woman who understands computers. She studies the stock market and real estate. She is psychologically fit. She is no mousy person, hidden from contemporary realities.

Verse 20 we find a woman who is compassionate. "She opens her arms to the poor and extends her hands to the needy." Women throughout history have drawn attention to the needs of a hurting world. Men tend to analyze and seek solutions while women go about doing something. Where would missions be today if it were not for the women of our churches? Thank God for compassionate women who urge us men to get up and get going.

Verses 21 through 29 describe a woman of strength and dignity. "When it snows she has no fear for her household for all of them are clothed in scarlet. She makes coverings for her beds. She is clothed in fine linen and purple. Her husband is respected at the city gate where he takes his seat among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them and supplies the merchants with sashes. She is clothed with strength and dignity. She can laugh at the days to come. Has a sense of humor. She speaks with wisdom and faithful instruction is on her tongue. She watches over the affairs of her household and does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children arise and call her blessed. Her husband also and he praises her. Many women do noble things but you surpass them all."

It is interesting to note that this Proverbs woman has a good understanding of who she is. She has autonomy. She is not neurotically dependent on her husband or her parents or her children or anyone for that matter. She faces the world of trouble and difficulty with a sense of humor. She can laugh at the days to come. Verse 23 here seems to imply that because of whom she is her husband is a respected leader in the community. She adds to rather than takes away from his effectiveness as a person and as a leader. She runs the affairs of the home in such a way there is a climate of growth and productivity. She and her husband are free to give themselves to each other in a healthy interdependence. Her children are blessed by her wisdom and faithful instruction. This

woman serves her family, her community, and her God from a position of humble strength. She is free to fulfill her God-given role in life. She takes the initiative to be the best person she can be.

In verse thirty and following we read, “Charm is deceptive and beauty is fleeting but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised. Give her the reward she has earned, and let her works bring her praise at the city gate.” Here is a woman who is willing to look her age. She understands that time takes its toll on her youthful physical appearance. She does not in panic search for the fountain of youth in fad diets, makeup routines, and exaggerated surgeries. Heard the other day of a woman who had had so many facelifts that the skin on the bottom of her neck was up on her cheekbones. Of course this woman gives attention to her physical appearance. But she keeps it all in perspective. She develops along with her outward beauty an inner spiritual and intellectual beauty that makes her grow lovely growing old.

The conclusion of this topic is a woman described as trusting in the Lord. She has a growing relationship with her creator. Knowing that she is not perfect, she trusts God for the strength to live one day at a time in the context of forgiveness and grace. Her model is not the superficial celebrity who lives one dimensional as a sex object. This woman has life in perspective. She knows where she came from and she knows where she is going. This woman loves and serves God and her healthy love spills over into the lives of others.

These lessons about a godly woman are lessons for all of us to learn today regardless of our gender. Therefore may all of us regardless of our age, regardless of our sex make the necessary application and realize just as God has a plan for this significant woman described in Proverbs 31 he has a significant plan for all of us in his wonderful, marvelous, diverse kingdom. I invite you to a place today where you evaluate your life in the light of the evaluation of this good woman. And I would invite you to make whatever commitments you need to make, either privately or publicly, to your family, to your home, to your church, to your God.

From DNA to DEAN

[Address at Carson-Newman College, Nov. 1, 2001]

Arthur Peacocke

Some of you may well have been asking what does the extra E mean in the title "From DNA to Dean." Basically, the extra E simply stands for "everything else!" Yet others of you may have already detected that there is also a certain particularity in this title. For all living creatures start as DNA molecules (so, it could have been from "DNA to District Attorney," "to Duke," "to Débutante," or "to Dipsomaniac"--or even to "Dandelion, Dodo, or Dolphin"). Yet here we are, all starting life as strands of the genetic material DNA, meeting in a building whose very existence testifies that ideas and concepts are realities, yet of such a kind that I can even attempt to communicate some of my ideas and concepts to you through patterns of vibrations in the gas molecules of the air.

Are we nothing but DNA? Or, to put it another way, are we nothing but DNA's way of making more DNA? For, are we not, on the other hand, persons--centres of self-consciousness communicating by words and symbols our thoughts and feelings and intuitions, all of which are as real as DNA? Such questions cannot but dog the pathway of any trained and sensitive scientist concerned with the human condition. In my case, the attempt to respond to them has shaped not only my thinking but also my path through life.

First then, there is about me, as about you all, what we might call "the DNA story"--the accounts of our origins, where we came from and what we have inherited biologically, personally and culturally. With this I will begin.

I was young enough at the outbreak of war in 1939 and still in 1942 not to be called up into the armed forces. So, from a semi-suburban, semi-industrial, semi-rural town some twenty miles north-west of London, then still on the edge of fine open English countryside, I went "up" (as we say) to Oxford with a scholarship in natural science to "read" (i.e., study) chemistry. My interest in the subject had been roused mainly through some first-class teaching I had received at my

local “grammar school” where I had a non-fee-paying scholarship place.

My home was not at all bookish--my parents had left school at the ages of eleven and fourteen--but it was encouraging and enabling and the school provided as good an education as could have been found anywhere. The bombs were by that time falling, but the education persisted--disciplined and culturally broad at the hands of men, and a few women, with first class degrees from the best universities. I count myself lucky to have inherited a social system that was already providing such opportunities for those who did not come from academic, professional or wealthy backgrounds.

And so, by means of an Open Scholarship, again won by examination, to wartime Oxford--a society light years away from my domestic milieu and one that was already, under the impact of the war, very different from what it had been in the 1930s. The Oxford chemistry school at that time (in spite of Cambridge pretensions) had been for two decades pre-eminent in the country and outstanding in the world, vying with Harvard and Berkeley. The physical chemistry laboratory alone had five (or was it six?) Fellows of the Royal Society amongst its ordinary university lecturers and there were almost as many in the other chemistry laboratories. Incidentally, the year following my entry into Oxford a Miss Margaret Roberts, who later married one Dennis Thatcher, also entered the chemistry courses. (I must say I did not see much of her, although she could not fail to be noticeable, for there were only about three women among the 180 chemistry students.)

The Oxford Finals Honour School of Chemistry at that time was probably the most specialised course ever devised by a university. It was a four-year course entirely in chemistry during the last year of which one did research and wrote a thesis that was then also taken into account in assessing one's final class in the Honours School. Yet, Oxford chemists at that time prided themselves, not only on outstanding excellence in their subject (so they immodestly thought), but also on being wide-ranging and catholic in their interests. So I did all the usual things--I played rugby football and rowed, listened to music and went to concerts, argued about philosophy and religion, and I was even once President of the English Club, entertaining authors like Rebecca West and Dylan Thomas to dinner before they gave us their pearls of wisdom.

Physical chemistry appealed to me, and still does, because of its intellectual coherence and beauty, in particular kinetics, thermodynamics and quantum theory. My last scientific book¹ on the physical chemistry of biological organization, for example, is very much concerned with the irreversible thermodynamics of biological processes.

The research I did for my first degree and subsequently for a doctorate was in the Oxford Physical Chemistry Laboratory where my supervisor was, Sir Cyril Hinshelwood, a polymath--one of those wide-ranging products of the Oxford chemistry school who by then had received the Nobel Prize for his work on chemical kinetics.

I worked on the rate processes involved in the growth of bacteria and their inhibition by certain substances. For this work I obtained my first doctorate (D.Phil. degree) at, by American custom, the early age of twenty-four--so intensive was the educational process in England then (and still is for those who get thus far). I then took up a post in the University of Birmingham and in 1948 married the sister of a college friend--very conventional one might say, but it has lasted for over fifty-three years! (Note that in those days one did not usually marry until one had a job--or have children until one was married!)

In the eleven years at Birmingham, where I moved from being Assistant Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, I worked on something that had begun to interest me, namely the physical chemistry of DNA molecules. DNA at that time was only just becoming to be seen as a macromolecule, a very big molecule. People were not quite sure whether it had four units or ten units or a hundred. We now know, of course, that it has tens of thousands of units strung along two intertwined and complementary helical chains. There was some challenging physical chemistry to be done in relation to this extraordinary structure and I was able to engage in this with the simplest of equipment (a pH meter, for those of you in the know) but with a maximum of intellectual challenge.

In 1952, I was in Berkeley on a Rockefeller Fellowship, at the famous Virus Laboratory headed by W. M. Stanley of tobacco mosaic virus fame, when James Watson and Francis Crick announced the structure of DNA in the British journal *Nature*. Doing primarily physico-chemical work on DNA with results of some interest to the others (we were able to settle that the chains in DNA were not branched and that the hydrogen bonding proposed by Watson and Crick was the only kind present in the structure). I came to be, at that time, in close contact with those working on x-ray diffraction studies, the circles interacting with Watson and Crick. I was, fortunately, not so emotionally involved as the X-ray people in the events that swirled around that momentous discovery in the history of biology.

My scientific career flourished, I went back to Oxford to a Fellowship and a Lectureship, and there I continued to teach physical chemistry and do research in physical biochemistry. I pursued research into wider aspects of the physical chemistry of biological macromolecules and following, a fairly conventional scientific career--after some twenty-four years of such work, I had written some 120 papers and was

running a research group with ten or twelve post-graduates and post-doctoral students, and so on. Then at the age of forty-eight the Oxford scientist became a Cambridge “Dean,” the name given to the person in charge of a Cambridge college chapel, Clare College, in my case. How did this happen and why? In some ways, Cambridge was, I suppose, the last place in which I expected to find myself!

So, now I must tell the other story, running along all the time, parallel and intertwined with the one I have just told--just like the two complementary chains of DNA! I was brought up in a typical Church of England household, typical in the sense that the established Church of England was the church my family stayed away from, except for baptisms, weddings, and funerals (“4-wheelers”--in pram, wedding car, and hearse!) Adolescent schoolboy evangelical fervour soon gave way to a mild undergraduate agnosticism that I shared with most of my contemporaries.

Yet, we all went to college chapel (indeed scholars of my college, Exeter, had to do so being “on the Foundation,” as it was said). It was also the accepted convention--it was what most members of the college did on a Sunday evening--that everybody went to Chapel, went to dinner in Hall, had a glass of beer and then went into the main dining hall for music or poetry readings or play readings. I was at the college of Neville Coghill, famous later for his translations and productions of *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, and that had a lot to do with the cultural quality of our wartime college life (perhaps I should add that Richard Burton was a contemporary, a pupil of Coghill).

Religious and philosophical questions continuously crossed my mind. I rejected naïve biblical literalism and the penal/substitutionary theory of atonement (which I thought unintelligible and immoral and I still do so). The urging of such views by evangelical, “born-again” Christians in my undergraduate days was the chief cause of my alienation from all things religious, Christianity in particular, and of the temporary end of my attachment to the Christian faith. It took me some time to find out that other ways of thinking were possible for Christian believers. One of the turning points was hearing a sermon in the University Church by William Temple, by then Archbishop of Canterbury, and the most considerable philosopher-theologian to hold that office since Anselm. I came away aware as I had never been before that a reasonable case could be made out for Christian belief and that, although I still did not embrace it, it was an intellectually defensible and respectable position.

So, the door was re-opened. As a graduate student, doing the scientific research I described, questions kept pressing on me--sharpened and made more urgent personally by the transparent and

undogmatic faith of, Rosemary, my wife-to-be. How could one explain and account for what every scientific advance unveiled and reinforced, namely the inherent intelligibility and rationality of the natural world? Both the fact of its existence (the answer to the question one asks "Why is there anything at all?") and the manifest rationality of the natural world seemed to demand some kind of theistic affirmation to make any coherent sense of it all--and making sense of a wide range of data was just what my training and research experience were making my habitual intellectual practice. So the God-idea, you might say, pursued me.

Now the data that I then, and we still today, need to put together into some sort of pattern include human beings--with all their sublime achievements but also with all their degradations. Remember, by this time, it was now the late 1940s. My generation had seen, if only in film and photograph, what the Allied Forces had opened up in Dachau, Auschwitz and Belsen and we had looked down into the bottomless pit of the potentiality of human evil, which the 20th century has seen escalate with an enhanced power more than perhaps any other previous one.

So I tried, in my own naïve way, to come to grips with the problem of evil--a full intellectual solution may always elude one, though I am now able to narrow down and specify the problem better. It certainly became clearer then, and this still seems to me to be valid, that, even if the existence of evil raises baffling intellectual questions, and it certainly does, we have been shown how evil is to be overcome in reality and not just in theory. I began dimly to perceive what is sublimely expressed in the concluding stanza of Dante's *Paradiso*--where he describes his final vision of God:

High phantasy lost power and here broke off;
 Yet, as a wheel moves smoothly, free from jars,
 My will and my desire were turned by love,
 The love that moves the sun and the other stars.²

It is love that overcomes evil--and here is the nub of it--the one Creator God, whose existence as supreme rationality I had begun to be driven to recognise, was also, it became clearer to me, the One whose inner character is least misleadingly described as "Love" and whose outgoing activity is an expression of that same nature that shines through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus the Christ. So my quest proceeded. Looking back at my time as a graduate student I am just amazed how arrogantly I assumed I could learn little from the wise minds all within half a mile of me and ploughed my own furrow, reading my own books without asking any of the learned people around me

what they thought about these things. Perhaps one has to make one's own way--however meandering, it will always be one's own and maybe there are no short cuts.

In Birmingham, where I went to the post I told you about, I became rapidly disenchanted by the content of most sermons and the poverty of non-liturgical worship. Thus it was that I undertook more systematic study and even managed to get a degree in theology. I was deeply influenced (and still am) by the writings of judiciously reasonable theologians--William Temple, Charles Raven, Ian Ramsey, and Geoffrey Lampe. I could not then, and do not now--and here my formation (my *Bildung*) as a scientist comes out--accept any automatic authority of church or scripture *per se*. For me belief must meet the general criteria of reasonableness, of inference to the best explanation. This is still my position, coupled with a growing awareness of our dependence on the earliest witnesses to Jesus as the Christ and of our need to sit at the feet of the men and women of God of all ages, traditions and religions.

I was gradually relieved to find that the much battered and criticized Church of England (our part of the Anglican Communion) was theologically, philosophically and intellectually a very broad church providing the space in which to move and grow, feeding as it does on both catholic and reformed traditions and much influenced by the Eastern Orthodox churches. It has long had the habit of emphasizing the role in the formation of a securely based and stable faith of reason based on experience in sifting both scripture and tradition. Its reliance on this "three-legged stool" of Scripture-Tradition-Reason could in fact claim to be its own special distinctive feature (for the biblically and ecclesiastically conservative, though to be found within its ranks, are more explicitly and homogeneously to be found in other churches).

So I count myself fortunate that, at that stage of my quest, I had the chance of pursuing it within the ranks of a Christian church that is the reformed and the catholic Church of my own people--and one that had, and still has, the habit of allowing open inquiry into the reasonableness of faith in the light of modern, in my case scientific, knowledge.

Theological study showed me something I had not expected as a hard-line scientist--namely that the Christian church throughout the ages has, behind its shifting and variable façade, a very tough-minded intellectual tradition of its own, which makes the content of its thought a worthy and proper subject of university study--the message I had begun to pick up in that sermon of William Temple. Figures such as St. Paul, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, amongst

many others, are intellectual giants and simply cannot be ignored by any 20th-century seeker after intelligibility and meaning.

Naturally, I always found myself relating my scientific worldview to theological perspectives. I found I could not ignore the continuity and interchange in the human being between the physical, the mental, the aesthetic and the spiritual--those activities and the knowledge we gain from them, all modes of our being persons. And they all have a real reference. In theology, this meant I would place, and do still place, a strong emphasis on the sacramental (which is, in the realm of theology, the word that unites the physical, the mental, the aesthetic and the spiritual). I had for some ten years or so been what the Church of England calls a "Lay Reader" and so had been authorised to conduct non-sacramental public worship and to preach.

But this increasingly felt like trying to walk on one leg, especially as the synthesis of the scientific and Christian aspects of my life and thinking was occurring increasingly through the sacraments and the sacramental aspects of all of life. This meant I experienced a growing urge to celebrate sacramentally our unitary awareness of nature, humanity and God. I had already some years before, in my time at Birmingham begun to think of ordination to the priesthood as a "worker-priest," that is, in my case, a "priest-scientist," but the move back to Oxford had put that into cold storage. In the event, after some ups and downs professionally, and some twelve years after my beginning to think of it, I was ordained first to the diaconate and then to the priesthood in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, where--it so happens--I officiate at the moment as an Honorary Chaplain.

I naturally shared, and still share, all the average Englishman's conditioned reflexes towards, and suspicions of, the clergy as a class--so I was glad to become a priest but had no intention then, and still have not (I hope I have avoided it) of becoming a "clergyman." I would have stayed at Oxford but that Clare College, Cambridge, were looking for a Dean and offered me the post. I liked the idea of running a College Chapel that could be flexible and open, yet transmitting and educating a new generation in the incomparable liturgies and musical heritage not only of the Church of England but of the universal, that is, of the catholic church. Also I liked the idea of a post that would allow me what no University Faculty structure could--namely to work on the interface between science and theology. (Somehow I have always tended to be on boundaries--even in science I was between physical chemistry and biology, but this was now a larger and longer boundary).

Thus it was that for eleven years I came to teach in Cambridge University courses in the Divinity Faculty on the interaction of science and theology, and on physical biochemistry in the Biochemistry De-

partment. Anyone who has tried to jump faculty boundary lines will realise how exceptional this was, certainly in Britain. Only a University that is both a corporate entity in itself and constitutionally also a federation of independent colleges, as are--almost uniquely--Oxford and Cambridge, could have afforded me such a possibility.

As it happened, although Cambridge gave me the time (and salary!) to pursue my studies on the science and religion interface, it was Oxford that provided the goad in the form of an invitation to deliver the 1978 Bampton Lectures there. The Bampton Lecturer is, unusually, appointed by the heads of Oxford colleges, an almost totally lay (and largely agnostic!) body and not by theologians. This is curious since the 18th-century testator, John Bampton, a canon of Salisbury Cathedral, had prescribed that the Lecturer should *inter alia* "confirm and establish the Christian faith" and "confute all heretics and schismatics" and that he should not be paid a penny until they had actually appeared in print--clearly John Bampton was as shrewd as he was philanthropic! They were published (and I was paid!) in 1979,³ and were well received, especially in the United States. But, as one German reviewer wistfully noted, I had waded into the problems thinking of ways to tackle them only ambulando and not on the basis of any pre-determined methodology or formula.

However those lectures did actually contain in a couple of pages an outline of my basic epistemological stance of a "critical realism," with respect to both science and theology. This stance is characterized by the conviction that in both science and theology we are aiming to depict reality through the use of revisable metaphors and models within the context of a continuous linguistic community. This view is widely held and well supported--and I am not suggesting I invented it--as an interpretation of what science is doing and affirming, but still needs to be established for theology against the tides of religious fideism, fundamentalism and conservatism that seek to overwhelm the establishing of a reasonable faith that would be plausible and believable in a cultural world dominated by the sciences. As regards the "critical" qualification of "critical realism," it is becoming transparently clear that one cannot ascertain truth in theology and religion simply by appeals to the authority of sacred books or traditions for it is simply circular for these to try to validate themselves. They cannot be self-authenticating. Their affirmations cannot avoid being judged by reason based on experience, that is, "critically."

During this time in Cambridge, I found something about my thinking life of which I had not previously been totally aware--namely that the scientific "me" could not be totally absorbed without remainder into the priest, even one working on the relation of science and faith.

Thus it was that--also again because I was free from Faculty pressure to publish conventional papers, this time scientific ones--I was able to explore widely, in a way I was never able to do while heading a research group, into some new developments, some still speculative, in physico-chemical theory that were beginning to look exceedingly promising and fruitful for the interpretation of the hitherto baffling complexity of living organisms and their intricate processes.

There is a time for everything under the sun, and my days in Cambridge came to an end somewhat earlier than they had to so that I could return to Oxford at the end of 1984 to set up there the Ian Ramsey Centre, at St Cross College, for the interdisciplinary study of ethical problems arising from scientific and medical research and practice and of the underlying philosophical and theological issues. This was a project that had been gestating for over twenty years, ever since Ian Ramsey, who was well known for his work on religious language and eventually became Bishop of Durham, had brought together, in a sermon before the University of Oxford, the threads of the concerns of many in the early 1960s about the need for Christian theology to cooperate with those of other disciplines in facing up to the intractable questions that lie at the roots of the ethical challenges coming from new applications of science, medicine and technology.

Before I come to my concluding reflections, I would like to recount another dimension of my concerns over the years. No one engaged in working on the interface between science and religion can be unaware of the social dimension of this interaction: the communities of those engaged in the scientific and theological enterprises are estranged and alienated and go on their ways each regardless of the other. Over the years I have been able to play some part in breaking this silence, of crossing this "no man's land" between two groups cast in the role of opposing armies by inherited, and false, mythologies of what happened in the 19th, and earlier, centuries. In the early 1970s I started in Britain the *Science and Religion Forum* and, in the early 1980s, *The European Society for the Study of Science and Theology*. All of which is immensely encouraging and of great significance for the future of religion, in general, and of Christianity, in particular, in Western society.

All of this has been very much at the level of the head, but the heart too has its reasons, and the hands their actions. God is in "the still small voice" and in the silences that follow louder more articulate exercises. Theology, words about God, cannot itself be the experience of God who is known through life in prayer, in worship, and in silence.

Furthermore, I saw that the Church needs not only intellectual inquiry, but it also needs a cadre of committed and informed members to constitute a new kind of Dominican order, held together by prayer

and sacrament, and committed to the life of science for and on behalf of the Church: to represent the Church in science and science in the Church. So it was that in 1987 there was founded, initially within the Anglican Communion, a new dispersed Order (The Society of Ordained Scientists--S.O.Sc.) held together by a Rule of prayer and sacrament, to which we are committed through appropriate vows made at a Eucharist. Our constitution has been so framed that we now include among our members women priest-scientists and ministers of the United Reformed, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches and of the United Church of Christ--and we are also international with several members in North America.

I conclude with some more general reflections prompted by this retrospect on my life, stimulated by this unusual and very tempting--if not downright self-indulgent--invitation to be loquacious about myself and my life, somehow always spent on borderlines, whether of physics/chemistry, physical chemistry/biochemistry, or science/theology.

First of all: Christian belief, or indeed any religious belief. It seems to me that religious belief, in general. And Christian belief, in particular, will confine itself to an intellectual and cultural ghetto unless it relates its affirmations to the best knowledge we have of the world around us (and that includes the human world). This constitutes a perennial challenge to Christian theology and to all religious belief--one that, at certain times in the past, Christian thinkers have responded to superbly and creatively. The problem today is that few theologians, and indeed few students of the humanities, have any inkling of the breadth, depth and height of the scientific worldview--partly because of the extraordinary narrowness of most education systems, notably the British, at least until recent changes in the new national curriculum) have their effect. There is an immense work of general education to be done everywhere.

Thirdly, the relation of science to theology is just one of the problems of the relations of many disciplines and forms of knowledge to each other. We need today a new map of knowledge. Science shows that the natural world is a hierarchy of levels of complexity, each operating at its own level, each requiring its own methods of study and developing its own conceptual framework and so its own particular science. What I would like to affirm, in a nutshell, is that atoms and molecules are not more real than cells, or populations of cells, or human communities, or human persons--there are social and personal facts just as there are physical and biochemical ones. The relation of these different levels should not be, in my view, one of what has been called "nothing buttery," that is, of "reductionism." Biology is not nothing but

physics and chemistry; neurophysiology is not nothing but biochemistry; psychology is not nothing but neurophysiology; sociology is not nothing but biology. All the way up the hierarchy we see these takeover bids by the level below with respect to the level above. Each level refers to one aspect of reality and we need explicitly to understand the non-exclusive relations they bear to each other.

Furthermore, the scientific and theological enterprises both involve exploration into the nature of reality. This comes as no surprise to those studying science. However very few people these days, (many of whom, especially politicians in Britain, use the word “theology” pejoratively) seem to regard the theological enterprise as also an exploration into the nature of reality. But that is indeed what it is, as splendidly expressed in the opening sentence of (of all things!) the 1976 report of the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England on Christian Believing:

Christian life [I would add life in all religions] is an adventure, a voyage of discovery, a journey, sustained by faith and hope, towards a final and complete communion with Love at the heart of all things.⁴

To conclude, let me not pretend that in such explorations as I have been able to make that I have arrived anywhere very significant, nor indeed have many of us. There is a mystery at the heart of things that requires not only all the data to be assembled together and none to be dismissed, but also the most intensive application of mind and heart and will to penetrate. The great Newton recognised as a scientist that, if he had seen further than others (he certainly had!), it was “by standing on the shoulders of giants.” This is as true for religion as it is for science and yet we also need to be reminded of that shrewd remark of Newton's equally great successor, Einstein, namely that “Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.” That has certainly been my experience that I have been trying to share with you in this embarrassingly personal talk.

Throughout my life, one of my joys, consolations and spiritual adventures has been in music. As scientists, we are, as it were, listening to the music of creation, the work of God the Creator-Innovator, again as Newton put it, we are “thinking God's thoughts after him.” For me this has been expressed in a uniquely evocative manner by the astronomer and mystic, Johannes Kepler, one of the giants on whose shoulders Newton stood:

The heavenly motions are nothing but a kind of perennial concert, rational rather than audible or vocal...Thus there is no marvel greater or more sublime than the rules of singing in harmony together in several parts...so that, through the skilful symphony of many voices, he [man] should actually conjure up in a short part of an hour the vision of the world's total perpetuity in time; and that, in the sweetest sense of bliss enjoyed through Music, the echo of God, he should almost reach the contentment which God the Maker had in His Own works.⁵

So it is that the modern scientist also hears "the echo of God" in the music of creation with a range of insights that must evoke not only an even greater wonder than that of a Kepler or a Newton, but also a profounder humility at the intricate, flexible and ever-new openness of all this marvelous world to which God the Creator gives existence and which is our earthly home.

Endnotes

¹*An Introduction to the Physical Chemistry of Biological Organization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983; paperback, 1989.

²*Il Paradiso*, Canto XXXIII, ll. 142-5. Trans. Barbara Reynolds. London: Penguin Books, 1962.

³*Creation and the World of Science*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

⁴*Christian Believing: The Nature of the Christian Faith and Its Expression in Holy Scripture and Creeds*. A report by the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England. London, SPCK, 1976.

⁵Quoted by Karl Popper in *Unended Quest*. London: Fontana/Collins, 1976. P. 59 (full reference in n. 59, p. 206).

Distinguished Alumni 2001-02

Martha Cortner Pixley (C-N '31)

Martha Cortner Pixley is the recipient of the 2001-02 *Distinguished Alumna Award* in recognition of her life of faithful service to Christ's church and for the manner in which she has honored her beloved *alma mater* through the daily Christian witness of her life. Mrs. Pixley is widely known and honored for her encouragement and support, her constant prayer for and regular correspondence with Baptists around the world through the American Baptist Convention and Baptist World Alliance, for her commitment to world missions, her biblical and hymnody knowledge, her leadership in World Peace and Prayer, and her wise counsel. A Michigan Baptist Woman of the Year, she was also awarded the prestigious American Baptist Convention's *Cora and John Sparrowk President's Award* in 2001.

Joe E. Barnhart (C-N '53)

Joe E. Barnhart was named a 2001-02 *Distinguished Alumnus* for his embodiment of Carson-Newman's mission of scholarship, teaching and academic freedom as evidenced through his courageous inquiry, university teaching, scholarly research and writing. After receiving his bachelor of arts in English literature in 1953, from Carson-Newman, he earned a master of divinity degree at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1956, and a doctor of philosophy degree from Boston University in 1964. Dr. Barnhart is professor of philosophy and religion studies at the University of North Texas where he has been on faculty since 1967. He is well known for his expertise in Dostoevsky's Ontology and Boston Personalism, as well as Church-State relations (First Amendment). He is author of numerous books and professional articles and respected leader in professional organizations.

Mack F. Bingham (C-N '55)

Mack F. Bingham is a 2001-02 *Distinguished Alumnus* for his life of faithful servant leadership in Christian ministry and witness, and for his unwavering loyalty to his *alma mater*. Mr. Bingham graduated in 1955 with a B.S. degree and earned a master of religious education degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1957. He served four Tennessee Baptist churches during his career of more than forty years, is a prominent leader in state, regional and local Baptist life, and is an involved alumnus and volunteer for numerous Carson-Newman causes. Among his many credits, he is responsible for the formation of *Samaritan Ministry*, sponsored by Central Baptist Bearden, in response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Currently, he is secretary of Mainstream Tennessee Baptists.

Carrie Owen McConkey (C-N '92)

For the stewardship of her God-given talents, her promise and early acclaim, her loyal support and service to her *alma mater*, Carrie McConkey is named the 2001-02 *Outstanding Young Alumna*. Having established her own business before age thirty, Mrs. McConkey creates unique wedding gowns using couture-sewing techniques with extensive attention to detail. Already, she has gained local and international notice, including a personal profile and sketch of one of her creations highlighted in *Wedding Trends and News*, a trade publication published in six languages and distributed throughout Europe. In addition, she is known for high ethical standards in her business operations. A frequent guest speaker in Carson-Newman classes, Mrs. McConkey also serves on the Carson-Newman Family and Consumer Sciences Advisory Board.

Responses

Martha Cortner Pixley

As an alumna of Carson-Newman College, I am deeply grateful for the recognition today. I praise God that He has led me forward all my ninety-four years.

As a child in a Tennessee home, family worship and Bible reading had a central place. Church was important. Sunday was a very special day. As a child, I gave my heart and life to Jesus.

On my very first Sunday evening at Carson-Newman College, September of 1926, I met with a small group of Christian students on campus. They were discussing what they wished their lives to become. Their words were the very same words God had been planting in my heart. We are called to live freely and fully in God's will, to radiate His love, and to share His salvation with all whose lives we touch. That expresses what Carson-Newman means to me. Here, I was able to learn and grow. A whole new world was opened to me, a new vision of service in all of life.

Every day, always, I use what I learned at Carson-Newman. I am grateful for the First Baptist Church and for Pastor Pope who nurtured me. I am grateful for fellow students and for faculty members who taught me well. I remember especially our Bible teacher, Dr. Campbell, who wrote in my annual, "Tell Jesus." I am grateful for the chapel services and the great singing. There, I learned to love Fanny Crosby's hymn, "I Am Thine, O Lord."

My years at Carson-Newman were a good basis for further growth and training. Then came the years of study at Louisville, Kentucky. There, God brought to me the finest friend of my life, William Pixley, my husband of fifty-eight years. Together we shared fifty years in American Baptist pastorates. We had three wonderful children and five grandchildren. On October 15, 1994, God called my husband home. Three years later my daughter Mary joined the heavenly choir. I say this because music was such a great part of our lives.

Today in God's grace I continue in leadership roles, especially in American Baptist Women's Ministries. We are delighted to have Dr. Michael Williams (C-N '78) as Executive Minister of Michigan. Like Dr. Williams I am proud to be counted among Carson-Newman alumni.

For the later years of our ministry God gave a verse to Bill and me. It is 2 Corinthians 2:14. "Thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumph, and through us spreads the fragrance of the knowledge of Him everywhere."

Joe E. Barnhart

Last year, when President James Netherton spoke at a meeting in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, he said something almost off the cuff that resonated with many of us. He wanted Carson-Newman College to be, among other things, a supportive environment where young

men and women could discover themselves and gain confidence in their ability to learn and grow. Learning comes by trial and error, and C-N in the 1950s was a friendly campus where errors and mistakes were used, not to demean us as student, but to stimulate us to try again and again. Because kindness prevailed over sarcasm and denigration, C-N classes offered us greater freedom to explore and establish our own identity, a task that took time, good will, tough love, and considerable humor.

My C-N speech professor, Harvey Hatcher, told me he could not look at me without laughing. It wasn't an insult but an honest confession that my mistakes in pronunciation and other mistakes in his radio course, for example, simply amused him. In his classes, he made us work hard, but they were supremely enjoyable courses, partly because we knew he sincerely wanted us to improve. He was obviously and warmly on our side.

I did not major in a philosophy at C-N because we had only one philosophy teacher in those days. Fortunately, Dean Cate chose superb textbooks. The philosophy department took a profound leap forward with the arrival of Dr. Paul Brewer, who saw clearly that philosophy at its best must interact with the other fields of inquiry. Dr. Brewer's openness helped later to bring in faculty members who could reach across departmental fences to learn from and appreciate each other's work.

A liberal arts college can literally liberate the mind and heart by encouraging students to venture into new intellectual and aesthetic territory, which is always risky business. Doug Harris perhaps doesn't remember telling his class that students had to choose between education and mere indoctrination. That made an impression on me when I was still a teenager. In one of Susan Estes' courses, I disagreed with her openly and politely. The next year in another class, she remembered not only my name but also my argument. That gave me the feeling of becoming a participant in the academic dialogue. She took my argument seriously. I recall replying that during subsequent months I had decided my view was less warranted than I had thought.

The thinking process learned from parents, relatives, and friends at home becomes intensified at college and is applied to new areas. At a liberal arts college like C-N, the free but rigorous interplay of ideas and dreams becomes a reality when students feel encouraged to articulate, correct, revise or even exchange their pet theories. By studying my notes in the margins of books I had read at C-N, anyone could detect a young mind struggling to improve his own ideas. At C-N, I learned the importance of steadily revising my views, some of which eventually died the death of a thousand qualifications. In fact, I filled a

large cemetery with deceased ideas. But that proved to be no problem because C-N teachers like Douglas Harris, William Bass, Carey Crantford, and Ailene Johnson taught us to create new ideas, some of which might turn out better than the discarded ones. For example, the Calvinistic conjecture of original sin became for me no longer viable, but it helped keep me alert to the serious problem and its related issues. By spending years on revising and, I believe, improving it, I have come upon a better theory, thanks to the labors of social and biological scientists as well as historians, literary critics, philosophers, and tenacious biblical scholars.

At C-N, I took all the Greek courses available. Although Greek was difficult, never once did our instructor Dan Taylor resort to ridicule. His secret was competence and endless patience. After giving considerable thought to becoming a teacher of Greek, I forsook that path for two reasons. Philosophy slowly became my passion, and I lacked Dan Taylor's caring patience and kind tenacity in handling students' grammatical errors day after day.

C-N gave us realistic opportunities to sail into new waters. While growing up with Roy Dobyns from the fifth grade, I never saw him play tennis until on the C-N tennis court. So where did he learn to play so well? Apparently at C-N. He earned a letter in tennis while learning to become also a remarkable math teacher. One of my C-N roommates was an actor and singer. He performed brilliantly in *Elizabeth the Queen and Essex* and later performed on stage in Boston. As Bob Goddard's roommate for a year, I learned that the secret of excellence lay primarily in relentless work. I will never forget the long hours he spent memorizing his lines and struggling to perfect his performance. Later, I had the good fortune of performing in a C-N play in various churches, not brilliantly, but with confidence.

A liberal arts college offers students opportunities to discover their talents. After serving as janitor of the J. L. Campbell Ministerial Association, I was reelected to the position. It might have been Kelter Mullins who suggested the second chance was given in the hope that I might eventually do the job properly. Later, I had the good fortune of serving as a president of the Columbian Literary Society, as senior class treasurer, and as business manager of the college annual. I also competed for the declaimer's medal and the orator's medal. My point is that President Netherton is right: C-N is an ideal campus where young men and women can experiment creatively and constructively, sometimes succeeding, sometimes failing, but always learning and gaining confidence.

A liberal arts college offers several distinct advantages. At C-N students in the 1950s could learn a good deal from one another be-

cause they lived in close association under a variety of daily circumstances. We could scarcely be around Carolyn Springer or Mattie Carroll, for example, without learning the importance of organization, of planning and attending to details in pursuit of worthy goals. While we lived in close association day by day, many challenging discussions sprung up. I saw this happen especially during my one year of teaching at C-N, when academic freedom had improved, thanks in part to Warren Weirman's recruiting, daring young minds who knew how to take advantage of academic opportunities on campus.

Finally, C-N today is a better college that it was in the 1950s. Greater academic freedom had contributed to conspicuous academic excellence. I doubt, however, that anyone since 1952 has surpassed Ruth Harris as an instructor in marriage and family. Highly practical for many of us preparing for marriage, her course seemed to me almost perfect. Where she is or what she is doing today, I don't know. But I remain deeply indebted to her and to Dr. Fite for offering her a contract. At C-N, I met Mary Ann Shropshire; and we became best friends, fellow pilgrims, coauthors, and eventually parents and grandparents.

So, are we glad we studied at this thriving liberal arts college, where we came better to know truly good people like Burl McMillan, Earlene Caylor, Richard Waggener, Billy Fox, Imogene Bake, Kenneth Young, Kenneth Dean, and others who have excelled as persons and as contributors to their communities? Yes, we are glad. A thousand times yes!

Mack F. Bingham

If the letter from Dr. Netherton had come on April 1, I would have been sure it was some kind of joke. When it came in November, I still thought there must be some kind of mistake. Until now, I always thought Carson-Newman used good judgment. Then, on hearing the names of the three other recipients I thought, well, three out of four is not a bad average.

My enrolment at Carson-Newman was not planned. In fact it was a sudden change in direction. I was already enrolled in another institution. But that summer in a citywide youth revival in Chattanooga I made a commitment to the Lord to a church related vocation. Soon after that I had an unexpected visit from Warren Weierman, Carson-Newman's Public Relations Director, accompanied by Hugh Peacock, a C-N student. The rest is history. That fall I enrolled and somehow managed to graduate in the class of '55.

Carson-Newman made a major contribution to that direction change. My sophomore year I was still struggling with the vocational choice. I was already convinced it wasn't preaching. That year the school sponsored a vocational choice. I was already convinced it wasn't preaching. That year the school sponsored a vocational emphasis week. For the first time I found out our seminaries had a school of religious education and there were people serving on church staffs called Directors of Education (now called Ministers of Education). We have come a long way since those days, and I hope I have helped to contribute favorably to that change in image.

When I think of Carson-Newman's influence on my life, it is more in terms of atmosphere, experiences, and relationships than a liberal arts college. It is difficult to put into words just how I feel. It is like I once heard someone say about another person, "If you knew her, words are unnecessary; if you did not know her, words are inadequate." That's sort-of the way I feel about Carson-Newman. If you had the privilege of being a student here, words are unnecessary. Otherwise, words are inadequate.

Carson-Newman to me is like---

Studying from professors who were unapologetically Christian with a calling to teach and a love and interest in students. (The lesson of the sense of call to serve.)

OR--attending morning worship at First Baptist with hundreds of students being prepared for worship with the organ and piano prelude by Agnes Hull and Alma Baskerville. (The lesson of corporate worship and preparation for worship.)

OR--learning from Coach Roy Harmon the value of teamwork, that managers can play an important role just as the starting quarterback, running back, and linemen play important roles. (The lesson of shared responsibility and cooperation.)

OR--watching Dr. Bass pace back and forth lecturing and recognizing and feeling his love and excitement for teaching and the personal interest he showed in his students. (The lesson of being informed and excited about your profession.)

OR--Dr. Brashear using the phrase "people are just people, people" reminding us we are all created in God's image with similar needs, desires and wants. (The lesson of the uniqueness and value of each human being.)

OR--hearing the entire student body singing, *Wonderful Grace of Jesus*, in chapel. (The lesson of expressing praise.)

OR--Buddy Catlett handing you a tennis racquet and saying, "You can learn to play." (The lesson of you can always learn something new.)

OR--Meeting my wife, Marie, and new friends like Kendall Morgan and Jim Hutson whose friendships have continued through the years. (The lesson of the most important thing in life is relationships.)

These lessons both taught and caught in my student years at Carson-Newman have continued to influence my life.

Real estate people use the term "location, location, location." Joining the staff of Central Baptist Church of Bearden in 1971, brought me back to East Tennessee. This move gave me the opportunity to share some of my time and energy with Carson-Newman. I have been privileged to serve on:

The DeArmond Missions Committee
 The Norton Institute of Congregational Health
 The Sesquicentennial Archives Committee
 Central's chairperson of the East Tennessee Baptist
 Scholarship Endowment Campaign
 The Knox County Alumni Association

All of this has caused me to think about my legacy at C-N. If you ask if I did anything spectacular, the answer is a resounding NO! But I was involved in some firsts:

First patient of Kathleen Manley when she became school nurse. (She often reminded me of this. The old house used then is a far cry from the new beautiful infirmary bearing her name.)

First male to wear a dress to Dr. Bass's World Literature class. (Not by choice.)

First person to introduce weight training to the athletic programs at C-N. (This was less than popular with the coaches. My how things have changed since the 50s.)

Enough of that!

I am a proud and thankful graduate of Carson-Newman. Though I feel undeserving of this recognition, I am very honored. My debt to this institution is far greater than I could ever repay.

Carrie Owen McConkey

When asked what Carson-Newman has meant to me, it's impossible for me to answer in only a few sentences. This school has been intertwined with my life since before I was born!

My Dad, Sterling Owen, played football here under Coach Roy Harmon and graduated in 1967. Shortly afterwards, he attended a Carson-Newman Homecoming where he met my Mom, Leslie. She didn't even attend here! I think she just had nothing to do that weekend, so she tagged along with some friends who were alums; and they made the introductions.

My first impressions of Carson-Newman College came after we moved to Knoxville in 1981. I had the chance to visit several times since we lived so much closer. Each visit, as a little kid, I was moved by the fact that everyone on campus said "Hello" to each other, and even to me, a shy eleven or twelve year-old. It made me feel important, and respected.

I decided to attend here during those years. Unfortunately, I forgot to mention that to my parents. My Dad was quite tense because even after I was well into high school, I hadn't mentioned a word about visiting colleges, or even if I even planned on going to one.

Finally, carefully and with sensitivity, he brought up the subject. I think he didn't know whether to cry or send me to my room when I casually replied, "Dad, I'm going to Carson-Newman, of course!" I applied, was accepted, and my poor father breathed a sigh of relief.

When I moved to campus in 1988, I discovered that people were still saying "Hello," and I experienced the true warmth and caring of the school over the next four years.

Fellow students said, "Hello"--building a large foundation of friends that to this day I speak to and rely on, on a weekly basis.

Faculty and staff on campus said, "Hello"--They always recognized me, and still do. Whenever I'm visiting the school, they stop dead in their tracks to greet me and ask how I've been.

My major department, Family and Consumer Sciences, said, "Hello" to me for the first time when I was an eighteen year-old freshman. Kitty Coffey, Linda McGoldrick, Judy Gooch, Diana Carroll, Cathy Bush, and Cathy Burchell, all cared about my welfare and my college experience and were both Moms and role models to me. Little did I know that they would keep caring, being my advisors and cheerleaders, as I became an entrepreneur a year after graduation. They have always taken time out for a visit or a phone call, in spite of their busy

lives. They have given me constant guidance, knowledge, and support far beyond the four years I attended Carson-Newman. That is above and beyond their job descriptions, I think.

So, in closing, I'd just like to say to the people of this school, thank you for saying "Hello" to me as a child and as an adult. Thank you for reaching out to me and never turning away. Thank you for being a part of my life since before I was born. And I'm sure that, in another ten years, if someone asks me what Carson-Newman means to me, I'll still have a hard time summing it up in just a few sentences.

Contributors

D. Brian Austin—Associate Professor of Philosophy, 1995; B.A., Samford University; M.Div., Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Joe E. Barnhart--Carson-Newman College graduate, 1953. Professor of Philosophy and Religion Studies, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, and recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award.

Mack F. Bingham--Carson-Newman College graduate, 1955. Retired Minister of Education, Central Baptist Church, Bearden, Knoxville, Tennessee, and recipient of Distinguished Alumnus Award.

James A. Coppock—Associate Professor of Management, 1961-64, 1969; B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.S., University of Tennessee, Knoxville; C.M.A., C.D.P. Further study: Georgia State University. Recipient of the 2001 Distinguished Faculty Award.

Wayne Flynt--Distinguished University Professor of History, Auburn University.

Marshall P. Forrester—Instructor of Music, Band Director, 1997; B.M., University of North Carolina, Greensboro; M.M., University of Rochester; Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Jennifer Wallace Hall—Instructor of English, 2000; B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Western Carolina University; Ph.D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

David S. King—Assistant Professor of French, 2001; B.A., M.B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Washington University.

- Carrie Owen McConkey--Carson-Newman College graduate, 1992. Owner and operator of a wedding gown business, Knoxville, Tennessee, and recipient of the Distinguished Young Alumna Award.
- Calvin S. Metcalf--Carson-Newman College graduate, 1956. Interim pastor of First Baptist Church, Jefferson City, Tennessee, and member of the Board of Trustees, Carson-Newman College.
- Martha Cortner Pixley--Carson-Newman College graduate, 1931. Giver of a lifetime of faithful service to the church and recipient of the Distinguished Alumna Award.
- Arthur Peacocke—Founder of The European Society for the Study of Science and Theology and retired Professor of Religion and Science, Oxford University, Oxford, England.
- Walter B. Shurden—Former Professor of Religion, Carson-Newman College. Executive Director of The Center for Baptist Studies and Callaway Professor of Christianity, Mercer University.