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PREFACE

Because this paper covers most of Sherwood Anderson's fiction, and because it uses both primary and secondary sources, some method had to be devised to keep the reader aware of the sources of the quoted matter. The secondary sources, including both Anderson's critics and his own comments on his work, are indicated by a footnote number and are documented at the back of the paper. The primary sources are documented by a parenthesis following the quoted material. Each parenthesis contains both an abbreviation for the book in which the quoted material appears and the page on which it appears. Many of Anderson's short stories have been reprinted in collections; the parentheses will indicate the source I have used. "Death in the Woods," for example, appears in most collections of Anderson's short stories, but because it first appeared as a chapter from Tar: A Midwest Childhood, the documentation will show its first source, e.g., (TMC, p. 17).

The following table shows the abbreviations used for the primary sources:

Dark Laughter (DL)
Horses and Men (HM)
Many Marriages (MM)
Poor White (FW)
The Portable Sherwood Anderson (PSA)
Sherwood Anderson: Short Stories (SASS)
In addition to documentation of secondary sources, the notes at the conclusion of the paper occasionally include cross referencing, additional information from other critics, and other details which do not seem necessary in the body of the paper.

Although this paper attempts a thorough study of Anderson's fiction, certain works (his social-problem novels: Marching Men, Kit Brandon, Beyond Desire, and Perhaps Women) have been ignored because the works included in this study prove this paper's major points better than these novels. The conclusion to this paper, however, suggests ways in which these social-problem works can be understood through archetypal criticism.
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INTRODUCTION
The fiction of Sherwood Anderson has been subjected to more varied critical opinions than has the fiction of any other writer of his era. That *Winesburg, Ohio* and a few of his short stories (e.g., "Death in the Woods," "The Egg," and "I Want to Know Why") have endured is undoubtedly a testimony to their literary quality. These works are generally considered solid literary achievements and are often anthologized. The bulk of his work, however, is usually regarded as a failure or as the work of a yet unsatisfying, but promising, new writer.

The critics are not uniform in evaluating Anderson's work. Horace Gregory considers *Poor White* and *Dark Laughter* as representative of Anderson's "writing at the height of his narrative style."\(^1\) Nearly all of the other critics regard these two novels as failures.\(^2\) F. Scott Fitzgerald considers *Many Marriages* Anderson's best novel,\(^3\) although usually this novel is regarded as his worst.

Three critical approaches are most commonly used by Anderson's critics: biographical, social, and Freudian. The first of these—biographical—is the least satisfactory because the critics employing this approach too often confuse Anderson with his protagonists. Irving Howe, for instance, states that
Anderson had "a fundamental psychic maladjustment in his private life" and that this maladjustment manifests itself in his works. Although many of Anderson's works contain a definite autobiographical element—as Anderson himself admits—his own life was merely a point of departure for focuses on more external concepts. The autobiographical elements are so altered and rearranged that they lose their strict, personal meaning. He had intended Tar to be an account of his own childhood, but

Like everyone else in the world I had so thoroughly recreated my childhood, in my own fancy, that Truth was utterly lost. . . . My fancy is a wall between myself and Truth. (TMC, p. xvi)

The second approach often used by Anderson's critics is social commentary. While this approach is more valid than the biographical, critics employing it too often ignore the artistry in Anderson's works. Although he was definitely influenced by the rise of industrialization, by the depression, and later by Communism, the critics who evaluate him in terms of social commentary alone ignore the techniques Anderson used to describe the changes he observed in America. In Waiting for the End, Leslie Fiedler's only comments are that the heroine in Beyond Desire is a Jewish Communist organizer, that Anderson is anti-Semitic, and that he had "begun to express overtly an envy of, and a longing for, the presumed superior
pleasures of dark-skinned heterosexual love."6 Fiedler does not even attempt to evaluate Anderson's fiction. Essentially, the social approach, though sometimes applicable, severely limits an understanding of Anderson's work. Although he writes of Americans experiencing the change from an agrarian to an industrial society, his topic is really man and man's environment. His observations of human responses to an unconquerable environment possess much broader implications than Fiedler and the other social critics acknowledge.

Perhaps the main approach used by critics to comment on Anderson's work is the Freudian one. This approach appears to be applicable since Anderson devoted much of his work to an analysis of contemporary sexual problems. Although he professed to have no knowledge of Freudian principles, many of his critics insist upon defining his work as psychological case studies. Regis Michaud's enthusiasm as a Freudian critic is evident in his evaluation of Poor White: "Its value resides in the Freudian sketches aside from the main plot, and in the analysis of pathological forms."7 These critics ignore the power of Anderson's insight: The psychological development of his characters is achieved because of his ability to make candid observations, not because of his understanding of Freudian principles. Anderson approached psychological problems on the
simplest level, seeking to understand through intuitive perception and through empathy. "The stories are not from the couch of a literary psychiatrist; they are vehicles by which Anderson as craftsman can explore the human soul."\(^8\)

The necessity for discounting the influence of Freud on Anderson becomes evident when an analysis of a protagonist's dream or vision is required. Freudian critics ascribe the occurrence of a dream or a vision to the manifestation of a neurosis.\(^9\) While such an interpretation is occasionally appropriate, more often it is not. Anderson's insight into frustration, into sexual problems, and into repression is evident throughout his work. *Winesburg, Ohio*, for example, describes the effects of stifling, small-town life on its characters and on the ways in which they attempt to deal with their problems. Although their behavior contains neurotic elements, there is no justification for citing Freud as Anderson's muse: The Oedipal conflict, Freud's inadvertent contribution to literature, is not evident; and wish-fulfillment through dreaming is effected by Anderson's understanding of and insight into human nature. In other works, the Freudian approach, though somewhat applicable, severely limits a full understanding.

Critics of Anderson usually consider *Many Marriages* and *Dark Laughter* as manifestoes for sexual freedom; and on the surface, they do present escapes from the frustrations caused
by Puritanical wives and by unfulfilling jobs. However, while *Many Marriages* deals with every man's desire to escape from these conditions, it cannot be regarded as a realistic portrayal of such an escape. Because the book is ritualistic and unrealistic, it is merely a documentation of this desire, rather than an advocacy for the desertion of one's family. *Dark Laughter* is usually considered a sequel to *Many Marriages*. Here the protagonist has escaped but is again trapped in a similar situation; in effect, Anderson is denying the possibility of modern man's achieving the freedom he desires. Thus, neither of these books can be considered manifestoes for sexual freedom.

Because of the limited applicability and value of a Freudian reading of Anderson's works, and because his better fiction goes beyond social realism, another approach is necessary. His work is primarily mythical. His diction often displays this quality; archetypal imagery permeates nearly every piece of his fiction. Even the titles of many of his short stories display an emblematic intent: "Mother," "Seeds," "Planting Corn," "Milk." Other works evidence mythic qualities because of the ritual involved. *Many Marriages*, for example, is so ritualistic that it becomes mythic--myth being the verbal imitation of ritual--and this novel's use of sex becomes archetypal, not Freudian. "Death in the Woods" is another of
Anderson's overtly mythic works because of its archetypal content and its ritual. Joseph Campbell in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* discusses archetypal imagery extensively and has evolved a pattern of an archetypal hero's adventure. "An Ohio Pagan" portrays this pattern, as does Windy McPherson's Son. In both of these works, Anderson deals with an unusual child who leaves home, goes into "the kingdom of the dark," endures "tests," is aided by "helpers," and is finally rewarded with a spiritual boon.

Since the role of the mythological hero is to establish communication between God and man and between man and man, the role is fundamentally a mystical one. Anderson's work contains definite mystical qualities. Though Anderson is a mystic, he is not a religious mystic since he is not bound by theology or doctrine. His secular mysticism does not always ignore religion, however; instead it reinterprets religion, often pantheistically. Mysticism—an intuitive source of knowledge—is manifested in Anderson's fiction through the protagonists' groping and through the ever-present epiphany. Groping, a common reaction of mystics who attempt to explain the quality of their vision, occurs most effectively in Anderson's stories of adolescents at the race tracks. The epiphany, present in virtually all of his fiction, occurs through two basic modes:
the visionary epiphany and the interpersonal epiphany. In *Poor White* and in "An Ohio Pagan," Anderson develops epiphanies through dreams or visions. In both of these works, the heroes gain insight into cosmic forces. The interpersonal epiphany is used more often, however. Anderson stresses the ephemeral quality of the interpersonal epiphany in "The Untold Lie" and in *Many Marriages*, but in "A Meeting South" and in "A Chicago Hamlet" he implies a more enduring quality of the epiphany. Usually Anderson employs dreams, visions, and epiphanies as structural vehicles for conveying a mystical view of life, thus supplying a means for the mythological hero's attempt to strike a balance between the gods and man. Similarly, sex becomes an archetypal symbol for fertility, growth, and the satisfying life. Conversely, frustration and repression—perpetuated by conventional, Puritanical concepts—become symbols for "life-denying." Sex, then, also becomes a mystic vehicle through which the hero expresses the way to a better life. Thus, mysticism becomes a facet of Anderson's use of myth.

It is, therefore, the intent in this paper to discuss Anderson's concept of myth and mysticism and to show how he uses them in his work. The intent in this paper is not to be exhaustive, but rather to suggest that the archetypal approach is more effective in analyzing Anderson's fiction than is the
commonly used Freudian approach. The few works of Anderson that are considered solid literary achievements remain just that, regardless of the approach applied in their evaluation. The bulk of his work, however, has been grossly misinterpreted. It is proposed, therefore, that an increased understanding of the archetypal qualities in his fiction will effect a re-evaluation of Anderson and of his contribution to American literature.
CHAPTER I

ANDERSON AND PSYCHOLOGY
In *Three Literary Men*, August Derleth recalls a humorous account of Anderson's sensitivity to criticism of the sexual content in his work. Anderson was speaking to a group of his friends about the memoirs he was preparing for Harcourt, Brace:

... thinking of his having lived in many places and that he would, quite possibly, have a long story to tell, Wandrei asked, "Is it to be sectional or complete in one volume?"

Both the Andersons misunderstood the question—or one word of it, "Oh, no, it won't be at all sexual," said Anderson hastily.

"Unless necessary," added Mrs. Anderson.¹

Of all the proposed literary influences on Anderson, critics most commonly point to Freud. Because the Freudian psychologists used dream analysis to diagnose their patients, and because so many of Anderson's protagonists lapse into dreams as a release for their frustrations, critics cite Freud as having had a major influence on Anderson's literature and begin evaluating it within the framework of Freudian psychology. Hailed as the "American Freudian,"² Anderson is also lambasted for his obsession with an overly-frank portrayal of the sordid side of life. John McCole attacks Anderson for using Freud as his "Bible"³ and for being interested only in the abnormal:

Anderson has focused his attention upon only the shady side of the street and upon the steady stream
of day-dreamers, perverts, neurotics, and morally atrophied people who slink along it.\footnote{4}

Maxwell Bodenheim, another critic who objects to the sexual material in American novels, complains that the psychoanalyst has "become the godfather of most contemporary American prose . . . ." In Anderson's novels, Bodenheim continues, young men only "lie upon their backs in cornfields and feel oppressed by their bodies," and "sensuality adopts a heavy, clumsy, and naively serious mien."\footnote{5} "Anderson's excessive preoccupation with the new psychology strikes deeply at the root of his talent,"\footnote{6} Rebecca West observes. To H. W. Boynton "... he seems . . . like a man who has too freely imbibed the doctrine of the psychoanalysts . . . ."\footnote{7} Regis Michaud claims that the value of Poor White "... resides in the Freudian sketches aside from the main plot, and in the analysis of pathological forms."\footnote{8} Alyse Gregory views Anderson as resembling "the anxious white rabbit in Alice in Wonderland clasping . . . the latest edition of Sigmund Freud."\footnote{9}

Anderson, himself, was partly responsible for the perpetuation of ideas concerning the Freudian influence. In Dark Laughter, Bruce Dudley, musing over the complicated sex drive, says, "A German scientist can explain \underline{it} perfectly. If there is anything you do not understand in human life consult the works of Dr. Freud" (\textit{DL}, p. 230). In other works
Anderson uses psychological terms to explain a character's neurosis: In *Many Marriages* Mary Webster thinks there has been a "rape of the unconscious self" (*MM*, p. 185). In *Poor White* Clara Butterworth's vision of walls closing in on her is so strong that it affects her "deeply buried unconscious self" (*PW*, p. 177). The sex drive in *Many Marriages* is a strong primordial force: "That life can perpetuate itself at all in such an atmosphere of repression is one of the wonders of the world and proves, as nothing else could, the cold determination of nature not to be defeated" (*MM*, p. 65).

Although Anderson's early critics found much of Freud in his fiction, he resisted such criticism, claiming he knew nothing of Freud or his work. How much of this naivety was a pose Anderson assumed and how much was warranted cannot be known. He had undoubtedly been exposed to certain psychoanalytic concepts through his association with Floyd Dell. In his *Memoirs* Anderson relates the enthusiasm that Dell and his associates had for Freud:

> Freud had been discovered at the time and all the young intellectuals were busy analyzing each other and everyone they met. Floyd Dell was hot at it. We had gathered in the evening in somebody's rooms. Well, I hadn't read Freud (in fact, I never did read him) and I was rather ashamed of my ignorance. . . .

Yet, in spite of this exposure, Anderson maintained his ignorance of Freudian principles. In a letter to William Sutton,
Henry P. Boynton (a New York psychologist) recalls both that Anderson scoffed at critics who associated his works with Freud and that "Anderson claimed he had never read a book on psychology and had no knowledge of its principles and that when people talked in terms of psychology, he scarcely knew what they were talking about."\(^{11}\)

That Anderson "had never read a book on psychology" is difficult to believe; but his assumed ignorance of its principles is almost incredible. (After critics connected his work with the Russians', he read Dostoevski, Chekov, and Tur- genev.) Irving Howe, in discussing this naivety, says: "But can one really believe that during the two decades he heard himself linked to the famous 'Doctor Freud' Anderson never tried to read his books? Is this not at variance with everything we know about human vanity and curiosity, qualities in which Anderson was happily not deficient?"\(^{12}\) Even if Anderson had not read the works of Freud, he must have possessed at least a casual knowledge of some of this psychoanalyst's basic principles. His close association with Floyd Dell and his conversations with Dr. Trigant Burrow could hardly have left him as ignorant as he professed.

But a casual knowledge of Freud and a dependence upon him are two different matters. Ultimately, Anderson's independence of Freud resides in his rejection of any systematized
approach to knowledge. Trigant Burrow, an eminent psychoanalytist, discusses Anderson's rejection of the scientific approach:

I remember many years ago having spent the long hours of a summer afternoon arguing with Sherwood Anderson as to the merits of the psychoanalytic aim. Anderson argued that human life was not to be delved into with the surgical probes—that it was not to be got that way. . . . [Anderson stated] "The illness you pretend to cure is the universal illness. The thing you want to do cannot be done." 13

Rather than dependence upon psychoanalysis, dependence upon his own insight into the human psyche was Anderson's primary source. In essence, the critics who designate Freud as Anderson's muse are saying that Anderson lacked the powers of observation necessary to determine the roots of American psychological and social problems. Even in his early writing he is concerned with the stifling midwestern towns he had lived in, with the characters he had known who inhabited these towns, and with the external and internal isolation imposed upon them. Anderson did not need a textbook on psychoanalysis to observe this. The autobiographical content evident in nearly all of his work and the natural insight he employed in the development of his characters were all Anderson needed to explore the human mind. The Freudian critics fail to distinguish between a psychological case study and a literary study of frustration. Instead of saying that both Anderson and Freud were interested in the causes and effects of neurotic behavior, these critics
assert that Anderson exploited Freud's psychoanalytic principles in developing his characters.\textsuperscript{14}

It is significant that the critics who measure Anderson by Freudian principles never elaborate on just how a particular work reflects these principles. Their common approach is to briefly discuss Freud's analysis of sexual problems and then catalogue sexual problems manifested in Anderson's characters. Regis Michaud, for example, devotes two of twelve chapters in \textit{The American Novel Today} to a discussion of Anderson's dependence upon Freud, but never meets the issue head-on. He says that \textit{Winesburg, Ohio} "is entirely in harmony with the most recent contributions of American literature to psychoanalysis" and that it "gives a literary rendering to Freudism."\textsuperscript{15} Notice, then, his discussion of an individual story, supposedly proving Anderson's Freudian intent:

\begin{quote}
Here is a man whose hands are incessantly shaken by a suspicious automatism. He is fond of caressing children. One day he is accused of having taken advantage of one of them and he is expelled from the village.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

This brief explanation of "a literary rendering of Freudism" in "Hands" can only be the result of a gross misreading.

"Hands," the first story in \textit{Winesburg, Ohio}, should discourage any attempt to interpret Anderson's work by Freudian principles. Wing Biddlebaum is a very gifted teacher who uses
his hands "to carry a dream into the young minds" of his students. Wing tousles his students' hair and "under the caress of his hands doubt and disbelief went out of the minds of the boys and they began also to dream" (WO, p. 32). The fathers of his students misunderstand Wing's intentions, however; labeling him a homosexual, they drive him out of town. Wing never understands what happened to him.

Wing has received his name because of his hands' "restless activity." When he seeks to explain a point, his hands become "the piston rods of his machinery of expression." Yet, when the point concerns his romantic dream (man can become god-like), his hands become "inspired" instruments through which he expresses himself; he becomes a Socrates:

\[ \overline{\text{Wing was}} \] speaking as one lost in a dream.

Out of the dream Wing Biddlebaum made a picture for George Willard. In the picture men lived again in a kind of pastoral golden age. Across a green open country came clean-limbed young men ... to gather about the feet of an old man who sat beneath a tree in a tiny garden and who talked to them. (WO, p. 30)

Indeed, Wing has a great love for his students, "not unlike the finer sort of women in their love for men," as Anderson admits. But then the narrator explains that this description "is but crudely stated" and it "needs the poet" (WO, p. 31). Essentially, Wing is more muse than teacher, a winged muse offering inspiration to his students.
Although Michaud intimates that Wing's behavior is that of a latent homosexual, it is not. Rather it is the love of a gifted teacher for his students. His hands are not the instruments of perversion, but the winged instruments of inspiration that poets throughout literary history have known. To diagnose Wing's problem as that of a homosexual is to admit to as little understanding as his persecutors possess.

Of "The Strength of God," Michaud claims the protagonist is a

hypocritical minister who had seen a naked woman through a crack in the window of his church. The wretched man had forgotten prayer and could no longer expel the temptation from his mind. He became half insane and was about to end up badly. But one day he again saw the naked woman praying in her room and he conceived a new happier idea of life.17

Here Michaud displays not only a superficial but also an erroneous interpretation of this story. First, there is no basis for calling Reverend Hartman hypocritical, for throughout the story he retains his faith and continually prays for inner strength. As for his becoming "half insane," note Anderson's description:

When thoughts of Kate Swift /the naked woman/ came into his head, he smiled and raised his eyes to the skies. "Intercede for me, Master," he muttered, "keep me in the narrow path intent on Thy work." (WO, p. 151)
Indeed, even when Reverend Hartman feels that he cannot control himself, he says,

"If my nature is such that I cannot resist sin, I shall give myself over to sin. At least I shall not be a hypocrite ..." (WO, p. 153)

This minister undergoes an experience very similar to that of the minister in *The Scarlet Letter*. Reverend Dimmesdale, after his walk in the woods with Hester, returns home, throws a prepared sermon into the fire, and

began another, which he wrote with such an impulsive flow of thought and emotion, that he fancied himself inspired . . . .

Both Anderson and Mistress Hibbins (the "witch" in *The Scarlet Letter*) would have agreed that the minister is inspired—for inspiration can come from preternatural forces as well as from spiritual forces. Reverend Hartman, because of the sin on his soul, also discards a prepared sermon for a spontaneous one:

"Out of my own experience I know that we, who are the ministers of God's word, are beset by the same temptations that assail you," he declared. "I have been tempted and have surrendered to temptation." (WO, p. 151)

In both works, the woman of doubtful morality provides a spiritual boon because of an inherent sensual nature. Thus, in "The Strength of God" Reverend Hartman asserts, "God has appeared to me in the person of Kate Swift, the school teacher, kneeling naked on a bed" (WO, p. 155). Michaud asserts that
Anderson denounces the human mind as "a mad and dangerous machine." Such an assertion, of course, is absurd. In this story, Reverend Hartman's mind receives a divine revelation. Although he projects the revelation into an accidental situation, this projection supplies no basis for describing his mind as "a mad and dangerous machine." Rather it is a somewhat natural phenomenon for a deeply religious man who is exposed to a seemingly improper temptation.

Although Regis Richaud has been the focus of the refutation of the Freudian approach, he is only one of many who approach Anderson's work in sketchy, Freudian terms. Only James Hepburn has attempted to do an in-depth analysis of Anderson in terms of Freud. His article, "Disarming and Uncanny Visions," deals with "Death in the Woods" and focuses upon the imagery of feeding.

Briefly, "Death in the Woods" concerns an old woman who is victimized by husband and son. Her whole life is wrapped up in keeping their tiny farm running. The animals are always hungry, and since the men are never home, it is the old woman's duty to keep them fed. One winter afternoon, she is returning from town with a heavy pack of food on her back. She is accompanied by a pack of hungry dogs and when she sits down to rest in a clearing, the dogs run off to find something
to eat. She freezes to death under the tree; the dogs return and eventually wrest the pack from her back, tearing her dress to the waist. She is later discovered by a hunter and then is brought to town by a group of men. The narrator of the story is an adolescent in this group who senses the universal mystery of death because in death the old woman looks like "a charming young girl."

Hepburn claims that the story, as it is usually interpreted, is unsatisfying because although the dogs are hungry, they assault her only for the food on her back; "they do not touch her body." He then proposes that "the breast" is the unmentioned, covert image which ties the story together:

. . . the reader has suspected that the dogs will attack the woman's body for food--as once the storyteller or reader took his mother's breast to his mouth for food; but the dogs leave the woman's body unharmed--so the storyteller or reader wanted only the food on her front. . . . Then consider that the old woman . . . is a young-old woman; and the woman who feeds her child is a young . . . woman, whose act the child consciously forgets and who is old, sexless when the child as an adolescent redisCOVERS THE FEMALE BREASTS AS SEXUAL OBJECTS. The storyteller tells a lie . . . ; he has once before seen a woman so exposed.21

Hepburn also interprets the dogs' "red tongues hanging out" as phallic and the narrator's similar experience as "castrative." Such an interpretation is both preposterous and (although intended otherwise) unsatisfying.
Hepburn's Freudian analysis of "Death in the Woods" completely distorts Anderson's intent. To establish such an interpretation necessitates ignoring other, more important elements in the story: the mysticism and the ritual which are discussed in the following chapter. The narrator asserts that through this experience he has a "strange mystical experience" and that he now understands the nature of death. The ritual performed before the old woman by the dogs and the ritual of birth, life, death, and rebirth find no significance in the Freudian interpretation. Anderson's purpose has been lost.

That Anderson's fiction can be understood and appreciated without depending upon psychoanalytic principles cannot be overstressed. However profitable a Freudian approach may at first appear to be in analyzing Anderson's work, any attempt will inevitably fail, as Hepburn failed, because Anderson's use of psychology is not systematic. His dependence upon insight and empathy to delve into character development (i.e., his psychology) does not permit another systematic psychology to be superimposed upon it. Attempts to do so often result in erroneous and ludicrous statements: Wing Biddlebaum is not a latent homosexual and breast-feeding is not submerged imagery in "Death in the Woods."

Although Freud and Anderson may parallel one another at times, Freud is ultimately of little use in comprehending
Anderson's psychology. Understandably, the preponderance of sexual problems in *Winesburg, Ohio* might lead the critics to interpret the work in Freudian terms; but a careful analysis of each frustration does not elicit a clear, Freudian interpretation. The Oedipal complex, for example, one of Freud's major contributions to psychology, is never overtly expressed in *Winesburg*. As Freud defines the Oedipal complex: "... boys concentrate their sexual wishes upon their mother and develop hostile impulses against their father as being a rival..." Elmer Cowley, the protagonist of "'Queer,'" hates his father, but his hatred is not opposed by desire for his mother. (Indeed she is not even mentioned.) Although George Willard, the main character throughout the book, feels closer to his mother than to his father, he neither competes with his father for her affections nor thinks of her sexually. In "The Thinker," there is very little understanding between Seth Richmond and his mother, Virginia; indeed, she even attempts to make her dead husband a hero in her son's eyes.

Anderson's use of wish-fulfillment is much more simple than Freud's. In *Winesburg*, Anderson does not use dreams to express hidden desires. In speaking of the function of dreams, Freud states that the dream is "a distorted, abbreviated, and misunderstood translation" of desires. When awake, the
dreamer would not acknowledge the interpreted version of the dream, because he represses these same desires that the dream exposes. Thus, dreams supply a fulfillment of repressed desires. Anderson, however, does not use these extremes in his depiction of wish-fulfillment. Rather, the wishes of the so-called "grotesques" in Winesburg are the inevitable result of their frustrations and are expressed overtly: Because Reverend Hartman is an ineffectual minister, he "dreamed of a day when a . . . new current of power would come . . . into his voice and his soul" (WO, p. 148). Because Enoch Robinson is lonely he consciously "began to invent his own people to whom he could really talk" (WO, p. 170). Because Elmer Cowley fears being considered strange, he says, "I guess I showed him I ain't so queer" (WO, p. 201) after performing a very queer act. Alice Hindman's impulsive, nude flight into the rain is an inevitable result of thwarted love, for "Deep within her there was something that would not be cheated by phantasies and that demanded some definite answer from life" (WO, p. 118). (Her act, had Anderson been following Freud's principles, would probably have been expressed in a dream.) These wish-fulfilling acts in Winesburg, Ohio are the inevitable results of thwarted hopes, results which Anderson could easily have observed with no knowledge of Freudian psychology.
Occasionally, however, Freudian principles are more applicable. In *Windy McPherson's Son*, for example, the development of the protagonist's sexual life closely parallels Freud. *Windy McPherson's Son* is the story of Sam McPherson, a poor, but enterprising youth from Ohio, who eventually becomes one of America's most prominent businessmen. Because financial success is unfulfilling, however, he leaves his empire to wander across the American landscape searching for truth. Sam's comments upon American culture ensure the worth of this novel, and his sexual experiences and observations contain definite Freudian elements.

Anderson could not ignore Sam's youthful, awakening impulses which "made him at times mean, at times full of beauty."

One night when the sex call kept him awake he got up and dressed, and went and stood in the rain by the creek in Miller's pasture. The wind swept the rain across the face of the water and a sentence flashed through his mind: "The little feet of the rain run on the water." (*WMS*, p. 33)

But while Sam was capable of sublimating the "sex call" to an aesthetic creativity, he also was capable of surrendering himself to sexual vice. As a youth he had checked the dictionary for sexual terms and had reveled in the intimacy of the tale of Ruth. As an adult he had extinguished his lust through prostitutes. Although Sam does not deny youth the opportunity of confronting vice, he denies the glamour of such a confron-
tation.

Through Sam, Anderson implies a Freudian development of sexuality. Latent homosexuality, for example, is evident, coinciding with Freud's theory that this "taboo topic" "can be traced back to the constitutional bisexuality of all human beings . . . ." The basic difference, however, between psychoanalytic theory and Sam's development is produced by the differences between Freud's and Anderson's attitudes toward sexuality: Freud states that "Psychoanalysis has no concern whatever with judgments of value"; such judgments are exactly what Anderson (and subsequently Sam) are concerned with. The awakening sexual impulses manifested by erotic dreams, narcissism, homosexuality, and patricide are expected—even charming—in the adolescent. These covert impulses are fanciful dreams in youth and cannot be condemned. However, susceptibility to vice in an adult is manifested on an overt level and must be condemned. Erotic dreams are acceptable; erotic actions are not.

Before Sam comprehends this gradation of sexuality, he has experienced all of its aspects: adolescent heterosexuality, autoeroticism, latent homosexuality, patricide.

Already he dreamed of having women in his arms. He looked shyly at the ankles of women crossing the street . . . . (WMS, p. 32)

Sam read Walt Whitman and had a season of admiring his own body with its straight white legs . . . . (WMS, p. 29)
Sam thought of Mike McCarthy, for whom he had at that moment a kind of passion akin to a young girl's blind devotion to her lover. (WMS, p. 34)

Sam was fighting with himself to control a desire to spring across the room and kill the man who he believed had brought his mother to her death . . . . (WMS, p. 84)

After arriving in Chicago, Sam is frightened by "the faces of women looking out at him through small square windows cut in the fronts of the houses." However, as the acquisitive, business urge begins to overpower his desire for knowledge and truth, his resistance dissipates and he succumbs to carnal passion. The covert sexuality of his youth develops into the overt sexuality of a young adult; ultimately, he develops a detached, Olympian view of sexuality. Sam has run the whole gamut.

Ultimately, however, a strictly Freudian reading of Windy McPherson's Son is limiting. Although it helps to define different stages of Sam's sexuality, it ignores value judgments both in and of the novel. Thus, Sam's social commentary—"Dissipation and vice get into the life of youth . . . and into all modern life" (WMS, p. 296)—is devaluated. Also, Freudian readings of this novel ignore its basic mythic structure, wherein sex is employed as a test in the mythological hero's adventure—a test which Sam fails: "You would think no man better armed against vice and dissipation than that painter's
son of Caxton" (WMS, p. 296). Eventually, through endurance and observation, Sam overcomes his propensity for vice; he succeeds in his test.

Thus, although psychoanalysis is occasionally helpful in interpreting particular facets of a work, sole dependence upon it severely limits an understanding of the work as a whole. Clearly, Anderson's study of the human psyche differs greatly from Freud's. Each deals with psychological problems, but each in his own manner.

Although a careful analysis of Anderson's works does not elicit a clear, Freudian psychology, neither does it elicit a clear, "Andersonian" psychology. Because Anderson did not subscribe to a systematic study of the psyche, his use of psychology becomes difficult to discuss. Yet, because of the importance of the psychic qualities of his characters, some synthesizing concept of psychology must be imposed upon his fiction which is general enough to allow for Anderson's inconsistencies, yet specific enough to apply to Anderson's work alone. The key to "Andersonian" psychology is his use of frustration for character development.

Clearly, frustration enters into all of Anderson's work. Although his study of frustration often focuses upon
sex, other factors also enter. Essentially, the frustration his characters experience is induced by both internal and external sources. Lack of will, timidity in dealing realistically with conflicts, inarticulateness, and insensitivity to others are internal sources of frustration and conflict. Puritan morality, industrialization, economic concerns, and conventionality are external sources of frustration. Each of Anderson's major characters experiences at least one of the above conflicts in his search for happiness, and most of them are frustrated by a combination of conflicts.

Hugh McVey in Poor White provides an example of both internal and external frustration. His inordinate desire to lie on the river bank and "to give way to dreams" is barely repressed by his slowly emerging will. At first, it is only with a tremendous effort that he can remain conscious enough to even move himself from one place to another. Although this assertion of his will keeps him on his feet and moving, his assertiveness does not develop to the point where he can exercise it to obtain those things which he desires most--love, understanding, and companionship. Hugh desperately wants to be loved by a woman, but his inarticulateness and fear thwart every opportunity. Even when he does attract a woman, his Puritanical inhibitions interfere:
With a conscious effort he took himself in hand. "She's a good woman. Remember, she's a good woman," he whispered . . . . (FW, p. 236)

He remains frustrated, and because of the subjectivity inherent in isolation, he never realizes that she may also have thwarted desires and feelings of inadequacy. An example of an external source of frustration is provided by the rising industrialization. Hugh himself has no interest in economic concerns; yet ironically he is responsible for the stifling industrialization that destroys the natural, pastoral lives of the people in Bidwell.

Hugh McVey is a grotesque; that he belongs among the twisted minds in Winesburg can hardly be refuted. However, the major difference between Hugh and the citizens of Winesburg is due to the difference in the scope of vision displayed in the two books: In Poor White Anderson attributes most of the twisted characters (except for Hugh, of course) to the rise of industry and to the compulsive mania for "getting on" in the world. No such social force is responsible for the formation of the grotesques in Winesburg; indeed, no such social force can or should be included. The psychic distortion of the citizens of Winesburg is the result of a deprivation of a variety of experiences and of the subsequent attachment to one experience—-one truth—-which becomes the
focal point for the remainder of their lives. In "The Book of the Grotesque," the introductory chapter of Winesburg, Ohio, Anderson explains his theme: "They were all grotesques" (WO, p. 23). "Grotesque" is Anderson's term for those people who fail to find fulfillment because they live by false values. "Truths" make them grotesque because each person's truth excludes all other truths:

It was the writer's notion that the moment one of the people took one of the truths to himself, called it his truth, and tried to live his life by it, he became a grotesque and the truth he embraced became a falsehood. (WO, p. 25)

Elizabeth Willard, a grotesque and the mother of the main character in Winesburg, Ohio, is one of the most pathetic characters in the book because she makes the most conscious, realistic appraisal of her dilemma. In a ceremony that was "half a prayer, half a demand, addressed to the skies," she cries,

If . . . I see him George, her son becoming a meaningless drab figure like myself, I will come back . . . for this my boy must be allowed to express something for us both. (WO, p. 40)

George was to be the incarnation of her thwarted girlhood dreams: the "giving something out of herself to all people," the chance for experience, the union of her personal spirit and that of society. Though the mother and son cannot talk, they communicate; Elizabeth has instilled within George those
qualities which were important to her. Thus, when George tells her he is leaving, he unconsciously voices her own youthful aspirations: "I don't know what I shall do. I just want to go away and look at people and think" (WO, p. 48). Elizabeth's prayer to protect her son from defeat has been answered; he will go out to express something for them both.

George Willard symbolizes a means of expression for his mother (hence, her grotesqueness) just as he does for the other grotesques in the village. Structurally George is a catalyst who binds the other characters together and who initiates an emotional response in them. Through him they hope to find both a release from their frustrations and a source for communication with humanity. Like Elmer Cowley in "'Queer,'" the grotesques feel George "belonged to the town, typified the town, represented in his person the spirit of the town" (WO, p. 194). Even Wing Biddlebaum, in "the presence of George Willard . . . came forth to look at the world" (WO, p. 28). Yet when confronting George, many of them--like Elmer and Kate Swift--can only strike out: "Like one struggling for release from hands that held him [Elmer] struck out, hitting George blow after blow . . . ." (WO, p. 201). Ironically, in their desperate need for communication, they turn to someone who lacks the ability to understand or help.
Thus, although Wing Biddlebaum finds an outlet through George, he also feels threatened and hurries away, "leaving George Willard perplexed and frightened . . ." (WO, p. 31). After Kate Swift beats George's face with her fists in frustrated confusion over her role with him--woman or teacher--he muses, "I have missed something Kate Swift was trying to tell me" (WO, p. 116).

To escape from their claustrophobic existence in Winesburg, the grotesques lapse into dreams, fantasies, and delusions. Elizabeth Willard, for example, is convinced that her husband intends to harm George, so she decides to kill her husband; she becomes like "a tigress whose cub had been threatened . . ." (WO, p. 47). Her one moment of decisive action would be dramatic; she would at last become what she had dreamed of in her girlhood: "No ghostly worn-out figure should confront Tom Willard, but something quite unexpected and startling. Tall and with dusky cheeks and hair that fell in a mass from her shoulders, a figure should come striding . . ." (WO, p. 47). Reverend Curtis Hartman, an ineffectual minister, "dreamed of a day when a strong sweet new current of power would come like a great wind into his voice and his soul and the people would tremble before the spirit of God made manifest in him" (WO, p. 149). Enoch Robinson, to
relieve the extreme loneliness of his life, invents a group of people "to whom he explains the things he had been unable to explain to living people" (WO, p. 170). Alice Hindman has been jilted by a man to whom she had been totally committed and after years of frustration she answers the sexual "call that was growing louder and louder within her" (WO, p. 119) by running nude into the night and the rain, looking for someone to embrace. Jesse Bentley so thoroughly confuses himself with the Jesse from the Bible that he drives himself and his family to exhaustion by extending his land; later he persuades his daughter to name his grandson "David." Like Reverend Hartman, Jesse longs for a sign from God and misinterprets a natural event as the awaited sign.

Others in Winesburg find a temporary release from frustration through alcohol. Drunkenness often provides Anderson's characters with penetrating insight. The stranger in "Tandy" echoes Mike McCarthy in Windy McPherson's Son when he says, "I am a lover and have not found my thing to love . . . . It makes my destruction inevitable, you see" (WO, p. 144). In "Drink" Tom Foster attempts to transcend his past through the use of alcohol: Because of an attempted seduction by a prostitute when he was very young, Tom was introduced first to the seamy side of sex; when he falls in love with
Helen White (a symbol of wholesome girlhood), the confusion of innocent love and carnal love leads Tom to frustration. He is "like an innocent young buck . . . that has eaten of some maddening weed" (WO, p. 216). Poetically, fervently in love, he attempts to express his emotion in the only way he knows; he gets drunk:

Helen White made me happy and the night did too. I wanted to suffer, to be hurt somehow. I thought that was what I should do . . . . It was like making love . . . . (WO, p. 219)

Thus Tom Foster becomes a grotesque through frustrated desires, and like the other grotesques, he tries to explain to George, who could not have understood.

In view of Anderson's psychological content, Clifton Fadiman seems to have missed the intent of Winesburg, Ohio by reading it in terms of Anderson's more socially oriented books. In appraising Winesburg he says, "The sex-starved, life-starved, unbalanced Americans are the non-useful by-products of an industrial process which sees human beings merely as tools."28 Although Anderson's grotesques are "starved" and "unbalanced," he does not deal with social forces or external powers. Instead, he gives examples of personal destruction by internal frustrations. He says, in effect, that the lack of will in Elmer Cowley is destroying him, that timidity in dealing with problems realistically is destroying Enoch Robinson and Alice
Hindman, that insensitivity to others is destroying Wash Williams, and that inarticulateness is destroying Elizabeth Willard. The grotesques are destroying themselves.

Although Freudian psychology offers only a limited view of Anderson's work, "Andersonian" psychology is also limiting. While Anderson was interested in studying the causes and effects of frustration, this was not his sole purpose for writing. Much larger issues were involved. In Many Marriages and Dark Laughter, for example, Anderson does study frustration in men caused by frigid wives, but this study is subordinated to a much larger point of view. Although critics of these two books have labeled them manifestoes for sexual freedom, the label is inappropriate in both cases: in Many Marriages, because the entire novel is based on ritual, rendering it a mere expression of the desire of every man to escape frustration, and in Dark Laughter because, although it reiterates this desire, it also negates the possibility of modern man's achieving such freedom. Both books are structured upon archetypal imagery, and although they deal with a repressive environment, this is of less importance than is the archetypal content.

Sex, repression, and frustration certainly present the primary conflicts in Anderson's work. Indeed, his fiction
is highly psychological. But ultimately, any dependence upon psychology—Freudian or otherwise—renders only a limited understanding of Anderson's work. The dreams, visions, and archetypal images suggest other frameworks within which his fiction can be interpreted. A study of his mythic qualities and of his mysticism will provide a more profitable approach.
CHAPTER II

ANDERSON:  THE ARCHETYPAL APPROACH
Essentially, Anderson's fiction is mythic. While this fact has been noted by a few of his critics—James Schevill and David Anderson, for instance—none of them has discussed his work in terms of mythic structure. Occasionally Anderson's critics mention that a particular work contains mythic overtones; more often they only hint at the mythic details without studying the use of archetypal images.

Undoubtedly, the preponderance of Freudian criticism is partly to blame. Because many of Anderson's critics are searching for phallic images, neurotic behavior, and sexual repression in his work, the imagery is viewed psychoanalytically, not archetypally; thus, the stories are considered more as case histories than as literature.

Among the critics sensing the mythic qualities in Anderson's fiction is Schevill who notes that Many Marriages fails miserably when read on the realistic level but when read as an image "of great depth," "it helps to revive in the reader the sense of the necessity of experiment." Schevill also insists that "The Egg" must be read on this "symbolic level . . . as a parable for the state of man." James Mellard, in his analysis of narrative forms in Winesburg, Ohio,
also senses mythic qualities and states that each of "the figures in these virtually allegorical tales finds his 'truth' in one rather ritualistic scene or event." In other stories, he asserts that "Anderson devotes much of the narration to descriptions and expositions of character that suggest the unchanging, even archetypal natures of the protagonists."\(^4\)

Mellard's comments on Winesburg, Ohio, apply to much of Anderson's other fiction as well: The second sentence of "Death in the Woods" indicates the archetypal nature of the protagonist: "All country and small town people have seen such old women"; indeed, Anderson emphasized this archetypal intent when he wrote later that "the theme of the story is the persistent animal hunger of man. There are these women who spend their whole lives, rather dumbly, feeding this hunger . . . ."\(^5\)

Even the garden imagery in Dark Laughter and the ritual in Many Marriages effects an archetypal quality, and the mythic details in "An Ohio Pagan" (e.g., Tom's noble ancestry) cast epic overtones on the story. David Anderson, one of Anderson's more recent critics, notes that Anderson is at his best when he reproduces "the Midwestern rhythms and idioms . . . incorporating them in the old oral storytelling tradition, thus elevating that same old subject matter to the realm of American mythology."\(^6\) Even a cursory glance, then, reveals
that myth, ritual, and archetypal imagery appear in some of his fiction. A more intense look sees it permeating virtually all of Anderson's fiction.

Not all of Anderson's critics view his use of myth favorably, however. The most vehement criticism comes from those who insist upon reading his work as realistic. Chase, for example, is repelled by *Many Marriages* and complains that "the book might be disgusting were it not so ridiculous." John Webster is the only character who "ever achieve[s] any semblance of life" though he is only a "pot-bellied, bespectacled little man who has become a mystic." Chase and other critics who complain that Anderson's work does not achieve a credible realism, consistently ignore that he was not attempting realism. What Anderson was attempting in *Many Marriages*—and to a lesser degree in nearly all of his fiction—was the depiction of very human problems by using myth as a structural base. The oppressive reality that Anderson saw—the repression, isolation, and confusion of man's existence—is in every piece of his fiction. But unlike Sinclair Lewis who transformed fiction into a higher journalism, Anderson transformed fiction into what Alfred Kazin regards as a substitute for poetry and religion, "as if a whole subterranean world of the spirit were speaking in and through Anderson, a spirit implor-
ing men to live frankly and fully by their own need of liberation, and pointing the way to a tender and surpassing comradeship." Though Kazin is sidetracked into interpreting Anderson as a prophet, his comment accurately senses "the subterranean world" from which myth springs.

The exact phenomena designated by the term "myth" is ambiguous at best. In both scholarly and popular usage, "myth" has acquired a variety of connotations, including: legends, supernatural-religious beliefs, theology in general, false beliefs, superstitions, formulae for ritual, literary symbols and images, and social ideals. Clearly, "false beliefs" is not a useful definition in a study of myth; nor is "anti-intellectualism or any other such pejorative." Some critics restrict the definition of "myth" to "prose narratives which, in the society in which they are told, are considered to be truthful accounts of what happened in the remote past." Such a definition, of course, not only verges on sheer history, but also negates any possibility of contemporary mythmaking. Jung rebuts such interpretations of myth with his theory of the collective unconscious:

The most we can do is to dream the myth onwards and give it a modern dress. And whatever explanation or interpretation does to /the myth/, we do to our own soul as well, with corresponding results for our own well-being. The archetype--let us never forget this--is a psychic organ present in all of us.
Whether the rejection of myth will lead to neurotic behavior is a moot question; however, Jung and his followers are convinced that the myth is still an integral part of modern man.

A fundamental argument in the study of myth is the unreliability of reason. Jung notes that "Reasonable explanations do not help at all" in the formation of myth; rational belief is secondary. "Belief organizes experience not because it is rational but because all belief depends on a controlling imagery, and rational belief is the intellectual formalization of that imagery." A more useful definition of "myth," then, so far as literature is concerned, is stated by Mark Schorer in "The Necessity of Myth":

Myths are the instruments by which we continually struggle to make our existence intelligible to ourselves. A myth is a large, controlling image that gives philosophical meaning to the facts of ordinary life; that is, which has organizing value for experience. ... Even when, as in modern civilization, myths multiply and separate and tend to become abstract so that the images themselves recede and fade, even then they are still the essential substructure of all human activity.

"Myth," then, according to Schorer, can be defined as a controlling image which unifies experience so that on the cultural level it attempts to satisfy social organization and on the personal level it attempts to satisfy "the whole personality." Richard Chase also notes the controlling imagery
and defines "myth" as "an esthetic device for bringing the imaginary but powerful world of preternatural forces into a manageable collaboration with the objective facts of life in such a way as to excite a sense of reality amenable to both the unconscious passions and the conscious mind."\footnote{15}

The controlling image, then, enables the "spirit" which speaks through Anderson to be manifest in the protagonists of his novels. John Webster, for instance, possesses "a sense of reality amenable to both his unconscious passions and to his conscious mind." Because he can embrace a philosophy which accepts both reason and primordial urges, he survives. Conversely, because his wife embraces a philosophy which accepts only the conscious mind, she never is really alive. Jerome Bruner refers to this phenomena as present in American fiction when he states: "There still lingers the innocent Christian conception that happiness is the natural state of man—or at least of the child and of man as innocent--and that it is something we have done or failed to do as individuals that creates a rather Protestantized and private unhappiness."\footnote{16} Joseph Campbell notes the same situation when he states: "The lines of communication between the conscious and the unconscious zones of the \underline{modern} human psyche have all been cut."\footnote{17} It is the contemporary hero's problem, then, to weld these parts together.
Essentially, this is a prophetic role, one required of a new spiritual leader.

It is doubtful that Anderson actually considered himself a prophet; his concept of himself as the naive storyteller, the groping spinner of yarns, is not consistent with the Olympian vision necessary for a prophet. In the poem, "Testament," Anderson confesses that he is "one who would be a priest" but who can only "stumble into the pathway of truth . . . . I smell the footsteps of truth but I do not walk in the footsteps."18

Anderson is not a prophet; rather, he emphasizes the need for a prophet. Mike McCarthy's prayer in Windy McPherson's Son echoes this need:

Oh Father! Send down to men a new Christ, one to get hold of us, a modern Christ with a pipe in his mouth who will swear and knock us about . . . . I have seen men and women here living year after year without children. I have seen them hoarding pennies and denying Thee new life on which to work Thy will. To these women I have gone secretly talking of carnal love . . . .

Oh Father! help us men of Caxton to understand that we have only this, our lives, this life so warm and hopeful and laughing in the sun . . . .

(WMS, pp. 43-44)

Essentially, the role of his "new Christ" is to weld the conscious segment of life with the unconscious segment that acknowledges the importance of sex. Since Tom Edwards in "An Ohio Pagan" also needs a prophet, he personifies Christ as a
Bacchus figure who "lies on his belly in the grass" and who "with a wave of his hand summoned the smiling days." His Christ is not the Puritanical deity, but a personified force of nature to whom one can pray, "Jesus, bring me a woman" (HM, p. 340). This urgency for a "new Christ" is expressed in much of Anderson's work; but he would never claim to be a prophet, for on innumerable occasions he points to his hesitant vision and to his uncertain grasp of truth. Anderson might well have become a grotesque, but like the old writer in "The Book of the Grotesque," he didn't:

You can see for yourself how the old man, who had spent all of his life writing and was filled with words, would write hundreds of pages concerning the matter. The subject would become so big in his mind that he himself would be in danger of becoming a grotesque. He didn't . . . . It was the young thing inside him that saved the old man. (WO, p. 27)

The "young thing" inside Anderson that saved him was his own fusion of the natural (i.e., preternatural) forces with the more conscious aspects of his life. Repeatedly, he attempted to insert the necessity for this fusion into his literature.

The achievement of this affirmative approach to life is possible for his characters only if they will be like Natalie in Many Marriages:

... there was something in her, very kindly, that gave sympathy when it could not understand. (MM, p. 125)
Since acceptance of the sex drive in Anderson's fiction symbolizes the affirmative life, it is one step toward a personal-cultural salvation. Sex, then, represents "those less well understood communions of the spirit which are so hard to describe,"\(^1\) and those creative, life-giving, living forces which permeate every facet of a healthy existence. To convey this concept Anderson turns to myth as a vehicle for his thoughts.

Maud Bodkin, Northrop Frye, and Joseph Campbell provide three different approaches for analyzing myth. In *Arche-typal Patterns in Poetry*, Miss Bodkin uses a very subjective approach to analyze the imagery in various literary works. Following Jung, she states that "archetypal patterns, or images, are present within the experience communicated through poetry, and may be discovered there by reflective analysis."\(^2\) While the subjectivity of her approach is sometimes wearing, the results showing the universal appeal of certain images are impressive. Frye expands Miss Bodkin's imagistic approach and states that "when so many poets use so many of the same images, surely there are much bigger critical problems involved .. . ."\(^3\) He then discusses ritual as both a natural phenomena and a literary phenomena. "Ritual," as he defines it, is "a temporal sequence of acts in which the conscious meaning or
significance is latent." Frye's theory of myth is essentially a study of ritualistic scenes since a complete work does not necessarily involve one ritual. Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* develops a plot synopsis which describes a mythical hero's adventure. Carrying the hero from the "call to adventure," through the trials of the adventure, to the "return threshold," this outline of the mythological adventure is the most complete and concise description available.

Certainly, to anyone familiar with the works of these three critics, placing Miss Bodkin, Frye, and Campbell into restrictive categories will appear somewhat arbitrary, for each of the studies overlaps the others. However, the designated categories define their respective focuses; and by the application of the three approaches, a full, workable description of the myth can be effected. Using Miss Bodkin's study of archetypal imagery to study Anderson's word choices, Frye's study of ritualistic scenes (which are expansions of the archetypal imagery) and Campbell's study of the mythic plot (which is the synthesis of archetypal imagery and individual rituals), many facets of Anderson's fiction can be meaningfully discussed.

Without relying upon Miss Bodkin's subjective technique for discovering the significance of archetypal imagery,
her conclusions are helpful in analyzing Anderson's imagery. In her chapter, "The Image of Woman," Miss Bodkin studies various archetypal functions of women in literature noting especially: the goddess, the muse, the matrona dolorosa, the virginal youth, and the temptress.

In Anderson's work, the use of "mother," for example, provides an archetype which permeates much of his fiction. Winesburg, Ohio's "Mother" presents a portrait or an emblem of the universal figure: George Willard's mother is "motherhood" itself. Elizabeth Willard has directed every facet of her existence toward this role: Her dowry will help George escape from Winesburg; she protects him from all harm, intended or unintended. Elizabeth Willard is representative of the other mothers in Anderson's work—silent, hard-working, self-sacrificing women (i.e., matrona dolorosa) who devote themselves to their children. All of them achieve an emblematic quality.

Sometimes, however, Anderson becomes more abstract and "mother" becomes a symbol for the life-force and for creativity. Miss Bodkin refers to this phenomena: "Woman on earth . . . is represented as an expression of the Matrona—the feminine principle of the deity." This earth-mother principle is most evident in "An Ohio Pagan" where Anderson
describes the landscape as a "giant woman who smiled at the boy on the hill," bestowing on him an intuitive knowledge of the forces which create and determine life. Other concepts of femininity are evident in the form of the anima. Following Jung, Miss Bodkin defines the anima as "the effort to bring to life, or make accessible, ... the undeveloped feminine aspect of the personality." The anima, then, a projection of ideal womanhood, is also present in Anderson's work: Winesburg's Helen White is a symbol of ideal girlhood (i.e., Bodkin's "virginal youth"). Thus, when Tom Foster's remarks about Helen are considered derogatory, George replies, "Now you quit that... I won't let Helen White's name be dragged into this" (WO, p. 218). In Miss Bodkin's terms, George will not allow the image of the "virginal youth" to be confused with the image of the "temptress." In "The Man Who Became a Woman," the protagonist has "invented a kind of princess" (i.e., the anima). Natalie of Many Marriages is also an ideal woman because she accepts the instinctual life, and Sponge Martin's wife in Dark Laughter is an ideal woman for this same reason. Each of these latter women became ideal by combining the roles of "goddess" and "temptress."

Since many of Anderson's stories concern adolescents
at the race tracks, horses become a dominant symbol in his work. Although Miss Bodkin does not discuss this archetypal symbol, Jung notes that the horse is

an archetype that is widely current in mythology . . . As an animal lower than man it represents the lower part of the body and the animal drives that take their drives from there.25

Although Jung also notes that the horse is usually a symbol for "mother," Anderson employs it merely as "woman." Thus, when Herman Dudley in his confusion of sex roles wishes the horse "was a girl sometimes or that I was a girl and he was a man" (HM, p. 200), the image is archetypal. The narrator in "I Want to Know Why" views horses as a projection of femininity: "Jerry looked at the woman in there, the one that was lean and hard-mouthed and looked a little like the gelding Middlestride . . ." (TE, p. 18). In Poor White, Tom Butterworth's disintegrating character is shown through his attitude toward horses; at first he pampers them, then he beats them, and finally he rejects them in favor of an automobile, an attitude which parallels his disintegrating regard for his daughter.

Throughout Archetypal Patterns in Poetry, Miss Bodkin studies images of rebirth. She notes that "corn buried in the ground and rising to fruitfulness used as a symbol of eternal life attained through death."26 Such planting
imagery occurs in much of Anderson's work. Indeed, "The Corn Planting" bases its whole structure on this image. Mr. and Mrs. Hutchenson have their only child, Will, late in life. He is unusually artistic and is sent to Chicago to study art. The parents, however, "both stuck close to the land" so they have not seen their son since he left; the father "didn't want anyone else plowing one of his fields, tending his corn, looking after things about the barn" (SASS, p. 201). They have lived so close to the earth for so long that leaving it, even for a short time, is inconceivable. When they receive the news of their son's death in an automobile accident, it was an incredible thing: The old man had got a hand corn-planter out of the barn and his wife had got a bag of seed corn, and there, in the moonlight, that night, after they got that news, they were planting corn . . . . It was as though they were putting death down into the ground that life might grow again. (SASS, pp. 202-203)

Corn imagery is also present in his other works, though not as symbols of rebirth. In Winesburg, George's first sexual encounter occurs just after walking where "The corn was shoulder high and had been planted right down to the sidewalk" (WO, p. 60). In Windy McPherson's Son, John Telfer attempts to fertilize Sam's receptive mind in a meadow next to a cornfield.

In her study of the archetypes of heaven and hell, Miss Bodkin focuses upon Milton's Paradise Lost. The last
half of *Dark Laughter* is strikingly similar to Milton's depiction of Eden. Bruce Dudley, after deserting his frigid wife and wandering about, returns to his boyhood home where he takes a job as a gardener. The garden he and his employer's wife care for is at the top of a very high hill and can be reached only with difficulty. In the peaceful seclusion of the garden, Bruce and his employer's wife fall in love, but are eventually turned out. When last seen, the woman is weeping as they descend the heavily wooded hill. The planting imagery in this novel is not used as an image of rebirth, but as the archetypal garden. Similarly, the world outside the garden is surrounded by

... a steep wilderness, whose hairy sides,
With thicket overgrown, grotesque and wild.

This is the world of man into which both Adam and Eve and Bruce and Ailene are driven—a world where love and loneliness cannot last.

Miss Bodkin also notes that rivers are usually present in descriptions of both heaven and hell. *Dark Laughter* develops extensive river imagery; Miss Bodkin's comments apply aptly: "Seeing in the image of the river the vision of man's life and death... we experience a death-craving akin to that of infant or neurotic for the mother, but in synthesis with the sentiment of man's endurance." When Bruce returns
to his boyhood town, he goes down to the Mississippi which flows through it. There

certain things, impressions, pictures, memories had got fixed in the boy's mind. They stayed there after his mother was dead and he had himself become a man. (DL, p. 95)

The man Bruce had somehow got his notion of his mother mixed up with his feeling about the river. (DL, p. 100)

The river as a symbol of the passage of time and of "man's endurance" is depicted by a log floating in the Mississippi:

It became a test. The need was terrible. What need? To keep the eyes glued on a drifting, floating black spot on a moving surface of yellow-gray, to hold the eyes there fixed as long as possible. (DL, p. 101)

Sea imagery, usually as a representation of the unconscious, is also present. Miss Bodkin notes that stagnant, foul water is used in situations where "stagnation and corruption, where even radiance is foul." In Many Marriages, John describes his married life as "a beach covered with rubbish and lying in darkness . . . . Before it lay the heavy sluggish inert sea of life" (MM, pp. 100-101). And conversely, Many Marriages compares the good life to swimming in clean water.

In other places, Anderson uses water imagery as a rebirth archetype for purification. Thus, in "Seeds," he writes,

I /the narrator/ began to sense the depths of his weariness. "We will go swim in the lake," I urged. (TE, p. 22)
Similarly, in "A Chicago Hamlet" Tom washes to purify himself from the sin of desiring to kill his father, "feeling that his own body was a temple" that now needed cleansing. Herman Dudley in "The Man Who Became a Woman" says that if you "scrub the floor so clean you could eat bread off it ... you feel sweetened up and better inside yourself too" (HM, p. 190).

In her chapter, "The Devil, the Hero, and God," Miss Bodkin discusses the role of the shaman:

In the earliest times prophetic exaltation appears to have been through some symbolic inner enactment of the sexual mystery that the seer or medicine-man achieved a vision which both he and his fellows felt as authoritative--of a value to life beyond that of everyday perception.31

The shaman appears as an archetype throughout Anderson's fiction. After listening to his prophetic friend shout from a jail cell (where he had been placed after killing his lover's husband), Sam McPherson notes that "where the church had failed the bold sensualist succeeded" (WMS, p. 46). The unnamed protagonist in "Tandy" echoes this thought when he states, "I am a lover and have not found my thing to love" (WO, p. 144); yet, because he realizes the importance of love, a young girl responds to his prophecy. The role of shaman is most clearly portrayed, however, in Dark Laughter. From Sponge Martin, a white primitive, Bruce Dudley learns both
the proper relationship between men and women and the proper relationship between man and his work. The Negro race also serves in this capacity, and from them Bruce learns the value of a slower pace of life.

Bruce Dudley, the protagonist in *Dark Laughter*, has left his frigid wife and his unfulfilling newspaper job to search for a more meaningful way of life. He has grown a beard, assumed a new name, and has returned to his boyhood town to work in an automobile factory where he meets Sponge Martin. Later, when Bruce and Ailene, his employer's wife, fall in love, they vainly hope to live as Sponge and his wife have lived.

In walking out of his apartment, Bruce denies modern life and embraces primitivism. He is disgusted with his contempt for life, with his jargon of newspaper cliche, and with his wife's pseudo-intellectualism. He goes on an "intellectual jag," and first studies the Negro:

The niggers were something for Bruce to look at, think about. (DL, p. 73)

Sleep again, white man. No hurry. Then along a street for coffee and a roll of bread, five cents... Maybe a song will start in you too. (DL, p. 81)

The tones from the throats of the black workers touched each other, caressed each other. (DL, p. 106)

From these Negroes he learns to value the simple aspects of life--food, sleep, sex. Their songs are not jargon-laden;
instead, they are intuitive expressions of their joy in life. Through Sponge Martin, the white shaman, Anderson presents the epitome of the good life. Sponge allows instinct to guide his actions; even though he is an older man, his work, as well as his sexual life, is fulfilling. His wife goes on periodic drunks with him in the woods where she "acts like a kid and makes [Sponge] feel like a kid too" (DL, p. 32). Sponge's daughter, however, is a prostitute; and this, not even Sponge can condone. For Sponge, the teacher, sexual prowess is a valuable asset and it is not to be misused.

Bruce and Sponge also discuss craftsmanship and through Sponge's influence, Bruce hopes that "the beginning of education might lie in a man's relations with his own hands . . . (DL, p. 62). His total immersion in the instinctual life leads Bruce to claim, "I guess I'm a primitive man, a voyager, eh?" (DL, p. 62).

Although Bruce eventually asserts that he is a primitive man, the last portion of the book negates this assertion. He falls in love with his employer's wife, becomes her gardener, and after a long interval of mutual attraction is able to consummate his love. During their courtship, an ironic tone is inserted by the Negro servants' uninhibited laughter, reminding the reader that the primitives handle such matters much more easily. Bruce and Ailene's relationship, although
fostered by sexual attraction, is not based upon the intuitive approach that Sponge and the Negroes display. "Having experimented with life and love they had been caught ... Was what they had done worth the price?" (DL, p. 309). Bruce Dudley, after having escaped the weighty responsibility that negates an intuitive life, is caught again: "... [the lovers] had taken a step from which they could not draw back" (DL, p. 309). As the couple leaves the garden, the book concludes with the ironic, "high shrill laughter of the negress" (DL, p. 319).

Many other archetypal images are evident throughout Anderson's work. Tree imagery (symbolizing life, death, resurrection, and crucifixion) is present, especially in Tar, Many Marriages, and Dark Laughter. Milk becomes an emblematic image in "Milk Bottles" where whole milk represents health; sour milk, wretchedness; and condensed milk, modernity. Christ images symbolize, as Miss Bodkin notes, the divinity in man. "The Philosopher" states that "everyone in the world is Christ and they are all crucified" (WO, p. 57). In "A Chicago Hamlet," Tom washes himself, remembering that Christ had had His feet washed by a sinner. In "An Ohio Pagan," Tom Edwards is confused about the character of Christ and, therefore, interprets religion pantheistically. In "The
Contract," the male protagonist's character is entirely developed through Christ imagery.

As noted earlier, this use of Miss Bodkin's study is more restrictive than her study itself. She describes "patterns" (i.e., rituals), but these patterns are only a framework for her major focus, the study of individual archetypal images. Thus, for a more exhaustive study of ritual, Frye and other critics who focus upon ritual must be consulted to effect a more centralized study of the image in its setting.

Frye notes that "the verbal imitation of ritual is myth."

Wellek and Warren comment upon the same phenomenon:

Historically, myth follows and is correlative to ritual; it is the spoken part of ritual; the story which the ritual enacts.

In "Myth and Ritual," Lord Raglan notes the very close relationship between the performance of ritual and the occurrence of myth. He asserts that "every rite has or once had its associated myth and every myth its associated rite," although much of the information necessary for proof is now lost. He even proposes, with Saintyves, that "such stories as Bluebeard, Cinderella, Sleeping Beauty, and Little Red Ridinghood are associated with rites . . . ." Frye is more cautious, however, and distinguishes between the myth and the folk tale:
Myths, as compared with folk tales are usually in a special category of seriousness: they are believed to have "really happened," or to have some exceptional significance in explaining certain features of life, such as ritual.  

Whether Cinderella is to be considered a myth or a folk tale is an eternal problem to the mythologists. For the purposes of this study, however, it is important to note that by either definition, ritual is involved in myth. Frye asserts that myth develops from the fundamental design of nature, that man's rituals are adapted from the natural cycles of the earth. Therefore, the progression of the seasons corresponds to the "human cycle of life, death, and rebirth." At other times, myths are used "as allegories of science or religion or morality" by achieving a parabolic content to explain the ways of the gods and of man. However, no myth can be fully explained, for "what they 'mean' is inside them, in the implications of their incidents." So far as literature is concerned, myth supplies a form; and to Frye, as well as to Jung, it is natural that authors adapt this form to their own purposes.

Essentially, the purpose of ritual is to effect order between God and man and nature. As Weisinger notes, the myth and ritual pattern "has devised a mighty weapon by which \( \overline{\text{man}} \) keeps at bay, and sometimes even seems to con-
quer, the hostile forces which endlessly threaten to over-
power him." The ritual, of primary importance in any dis-
cussion of myth, is the basis for two of Anderson's works, 
Many Marriages and "Death in the Woods." Many Marriages is 
Anderson's most overtly mythical novel, primarily because 
the focus in this work is on ritual. Here, Anderson devotes 
one hundred twenty pages to the performance and explanation 
of John Webster's ritualistic ceremony.

In Many Marriages, Anderson's protagonist is a wash-
ing machine manufacturer in a small Midwestern town. John 
Webster is a sensitive man, a dreamer; but because he is sad-
dled with a frigid wife, a dull adolescent daughter, and an 
unwanted business, he is unfulfilled. Eventually he and his 
secretary fall in love and go away together. Before he 
leaves, however, he explains the reasons for his desertion to 
his wife and daughter. Ultimately, he convinces his daughter 
that his escape from repression and frustration to freedom is 
valid. Mrs. Webster, however, cannot withstand this blow to 
her security and commits suicide just after John leaves. The 
daughter, left in the care of an understanding servant, 
retains the possibility of a life of freedom as her father 
leaves with his secretary to begin his new life.

James Schevill, in his biography of Sherwood Anderson,
notes that as recently as 1947, Maxwell Geismar could still assert that Many Marriages "contains deeds that are semi-erotic and wholly embarrassing . . . ." "The view of the book as 'embarrassing,'" Schevill continues, "can only be attributed to a false reading." Many Marriages was not intended to be an actual portrayal of a middle-aged businessman running away with his secretary; such an interpretation is due to a superficial reading, for none of the protagonist's actions are to be interpreted realistically. Anderson fuses archetypal imagery and a modern setting to effect a caustic statement on contemporary life. Visions, pagan ceremonies, and archetypal images are intentionally incongruous and intentionally unrealistic.

John and his wife had married because of an accident; they inadvertently came naked into each other's presence, had a brief epiphanic experience, and were later married because of shame and guilt caused by this experience. Mary Webster, a frigid woman who feels that sex is for procreation only, has long since ceased to satisfy John; therefore, he often goes on "business trips" to other cities, searching for a release from his sexual frustrations. After suddenly falling in love with his secretary, Natalie, John decides to abandon both his family and his business so he
can live with her. To explain his decision to his daughter and wife, he performs a strange ritual in his bedroom. When his family, overcome with curiosity, comes in, John explains both his ceremony and his plan to abandon his family and then leaves.

The focus of the novel is on the ritual and on John's explanation of the ritual. During the ceremony John removes his clothes and parades in front of a picture of the Virgin Mary, which is placed on his dresser between two yellow candles. This ceremony represents a primitive ritual of purification: "Now I have taken my clothes off and perhaps I can in some way purify the room a bit" (MM, p. 85). The Virgin is a symbol of fertility and acceptance of life's natural forces. At one point John speaks to the picture: "... I dare say I shall not offend you," and the Virgin looks "steadily at him as Natalie might have looked" (MM, p. 86). Natalie, Katherine (the servant), and the Virgin are all symbolic of mother earth. These women accept life's natural forces and deserve the adoration of a poet-priest: "Natalie should have a poet for a lover" (MM, p. 87). These three women are synonomous with the mother earth who smiled "an invitation" to Tom Edwards in "An Ohio Pagan." Thus, John Webster, in explaining his ritual to his daughter, says of
the picture, "She is the unspeakably beautiful Virgin, but there is something very earthy about her too" (MM, p. 126). She is this earthy Virgin who gives the gift of life, symbolized by a jewel or a cup (MM, pp. 213 and 222).

Natalie (as her name, a derivative of "natal," suggests) has given new life to John. He has experienced a rebirth, accomplished only through a slow, painful process of purification: "One could not love until one had cleansed and a little beautified one's own body and mind . . . ." (MM, p. 223). John has undergone this process of rebirth: "There was something diabolically strange about the way youth had come into his figure" (MM, p. 136). Now he attempts to teach his daughter the proper way of life. He is the priest, and Jane is the initiate. This priestly role is properly played by a woman, as Natalie's mother had done with Natalie, but Mary Webster's repressed attitude toward sex will not allow her to perform this function. When John "half makes love" to his daughter, then, it is not because of incestuous perversion, but because of his priestly function: "A subtle feeling of confidence and sureness went out of him into her." He is effecting a rebirth within the initiate. This is quite within the realm of myth for as Campbell notes, "The hero of action is the agent of the cycle, continuing into the living
moment the impulse that first moved the world."

As John performs the primitive ceremony of initiating Jane into the mysteries of life, Mary Webster, a symbol of life-denial, is sacrificed. Mary's becoming the image of the sacrificial animal has been prepared for: "For a moment her rather huge figure was crouched on the bed and she looked like some great animal on all fours . . ." (MM, p. 107). Although the sacrifice is actually a suicide, the poison she drinks resembles blood: "There was a reddish brown stain running down from one corner of the mouth . . ." (MM, p. 233). Her suicide would have been horrible except for the fact that she had been emotionally dead most of her life. Her death is an appropriate culmination of a life-denying existence; she had repressed every natural instinct and placed them in the "deep well" of her unconscious.

In this cursory explication of Many Marriages, only a few of the most prominent symbols have been discussed. The novel abounds in archetypal imagery; there is nothing that cannot be explained on an allegorical or a mythical level. Anderson uses typical garden imagery (the tree as cross and as giver of the fruit of knowledge) and water imagery (as the unconscious, as purification, and as life and death forces). The jewel and the cup symbolize the giving of new life.
There are allusions to classical mythology: Prometheus ("They cannot carry the fire of life . . .") and Icarus (John "had plunged far down into . . . the heavy salt dead sea of his wife's life") (MM, pp. 114 and 202). The theme of the novel is epitomized in one pervasive image, the well which is the archetypal image for the unconscious:

If one kept the lid off the well of thinking within oneself, let the well empty itself, let the mind consciously think any thoughts that came into it, accepted all thinking, all imaginings, as one accepted the flesh of people, animals, birds, trees, plants, one might live a hundred or a thousand lives in one life. (MM, p. 191)

It is with this acceptance that John leaves his home and goes off with Natalie. "Life was life. One might still find a way to live a life" (MM, p. 258). He has the knowledge, but he must yet learn to apply that knowledge.

In spite of the extensive use of sex in Many Marriages, this book cannot be interpreted profitably in Freudian terms. Sex is a symbol for either the acceptance of life's forces or their denial. Jung notes that "the more archaic and 'deeper'—that is, the more psychological—the symbol is, the more collective and universal, the more 'material,' it is." By resorting to primitive ritual, Anderson has effected—not a case study for abnormal psychology, as Cleveland Chase would have us believe—but a symbolic explanation of primordial
urges which, if accepted, lead to a fulfilling life: "It is only possible to live the fullest life when we are in harmony with these symbols; wisdom is a return to them." Many Marriages is not usually considered one of Anderson's better works. Such an evaluation is undoubtedly due to the critics' attempts to read it as an example of realism. However, even an archetypal approach, although it salvages much of the novel by explaining Anderson's purpose, does not place this novel among his best. The archetypal and ritualistic content display a heavy-handedness which suggests a lack of artistry. For an example of Anderson's use of ritual in a well-handled work, we can turn to his universally appreciated short story, "Death in the Woods." Anderson said that this short story's aim "is to retain the sense of mystery of life while showing at the same time, at what cost our ordinary animal hungers are sometimes fed." Irving Howe notes that "Death in the Woods" employs "an elemental experience to convey the sense of the ultimate unity of nature, an harmonic one-ness of all its parts and creatures bunched in the hand of death." The old woman's body arouses in the narrator "some strange mystical feeling;" and, although it is greatly submerged, a dreamy quality is evident in this story.

Mrs. Jake Grimes is one of those old, worn-out women
whom "nobody knows much about." Her husband and son have
gone off, leaving her to care for the run-down farm. "The
stock in the barn cried to her hungrily; the dogs followed
her about." Her only function in life is to keep everything
fed.

Men had to be fed, and the horses that weren't any
good but maybe could be traded off, and the poor
thin cow that hadn't given any milk for three
months. Horses, cows, pigs, dogs, men. (TMC, p.
208)

One afternoon, while returning from town with a
large pack of food tied on her back, she sits down to rest
under a tree in the snow. "It was a foolish thing to do . . . ." (TMC, p. 210). While she sleeps and dreams before she dies,
the dogs perform "a kind of death ceremony."

In the clearing, under the snow-laden trees and
under the wintry moon they made a strange picture,
running thus silently, in a circle their running
had beaten in the soft snow. (TMC, p. 213)

After she dies the dogs sink their teeth into the pack, break-
ing it open to get the food. The old woman's dress is torn
off her shoulders and this is the way she is found the next
day, "... the body so slight that in death it looked like
the body of some charming young girl" (TMC, p. 215).

The eerie scene produces the "strange mystical feel-
ing" about which "something had to be understood" (TMC, p.
221). Mrs. Grimes, although particularized at the beginning
of the story, becomes more and more archetypal as the story continues. While at first she seems to represent the victimized female, she later comes to symbolize all humanity: "Her story becomes the story of all the unnoticed and uninteresting deaths that litter man's time." The archetypal image of rebirth through death occurs in this story: The old woman was worn and uninteresting in life but in death her frozen body becomes that of "a charming young girl." As Frye notes, winter is a symbol of defeat and death. For the old woman, though, death provides a release; her becoming "a charming young girl" is also indicative of rebirth, i.e., spring images. Nature, cruel to her in life, is kind in death. The death ceremony performed by the dogs is appropriate since her existence had been closer to that of animals than to that of man.

In "Death in the Woods," the sparseness and gauntness of the archetypal imagery is functional, for Anderson has one focal point--the ritual of death--and every detail in the story directs the reader's attention to that point. The initiation of the young narrator into this ritual is a solemn experience that is built upon for the rest of his life.

The whole thing, the story of the old woman's death, was to me as I grew older like music heard from far off. The notes had to be picked up slowly one at a time. Something had to be understood. (TMC, p. 221)
The sparseness of the archetypal imagery in "Death in the Woods," unlike that of Many Marriages, employs a perfect economy and allows this story to be placed among the greatest in the world.\(^{52}\)

The initiatory experience is, of course, primarily ritualistic. Although modern man no longer undergoes the rugged rites exercised by primitive man, this is not to say that he has no initiatory, ritualistic experiences. The introduction of Huck Finn to the atrocities of civilization, for example, is both initiatory and ritualistic. Anderson's young protagonists undergo similar introductions. Tar, for example, is initiated into the loneliness of each individual's existence at a very tender age. Later he learns of the mystery of sex and reproduction and finally of the mystery of death through the old woman who dies in the woods. Will Appleton, the protagonist in "The Sad Horn Blowers," also learns of the solitude that every man must endure. Anderson's race track stories all deal with initiation. Although these stories do not usually include a formal ritual as in Many Marriages, for instance, and although the initiatory experience is often accidental, these stories--taken in their entirety--are to be considered as rituals of initiation. That their seasonal settings sometimes pass from summer to fall (per-
haps indicative of Frye's passage from the "triumph phase" of childhood into the "dying" phase of adulthood\(^5\) is of less importance than is the entirety of the experience itself.

In "I Want to Know Why," the protagonist is thrust out of childhood into the adult world by an accidental glimpse of sordid love. No longer can he live the instinctual, race track life. Although at the conclusion of the story he is confused (he still "wants to know why"), he is no longer a child. Similarly, Herman Dudley, because of his sudden insight into human nature, is severed from the easy, intuitive life at the race track: "I was so sick of the thought of human beings that night I could have vomited to think of them at all" (\textit{HM}, p. 214).

Usually in Anderson's treatment of the initiatory experience, no concept of order is effected; chaos is not held at bay. Rather, the young protagonist sees the terrible disorder of modern life; and because he is still part child, he feels that chaos is unnecessary. Still, he is pushed out of the instinctive life of Negroes, children, and animals into the chaotic, adult life of repression, Puritanism, and frustration. Only a few adults like Bruce Dudley and Sam McPher-son reject the usual patterns of adulthood and search for a better life. These searches may not be successful, however;
Bruce Dudley, for example, fails and is recaptured. This is Anderson's implicit view of the irony of the initiatory experience. He does create two "success stories," however; "An Ohio Pagan" and Windy McPherson's Son each present a protagonist who eventually grasps a fulfilling concept of life.

In Chapter IV of The Hero with a Thousand Faces, Joseph Campbell summarizes the archetypal adventure a mythological hero encounters. He emphasizes that this process is not static, that many tales may enlarge upon one or two of the events of the total adventure, and that differing characters or events may be fused.

The mythological hero, setting forth from his common-day hut or castle, is lured, carried away, or else voluntarily proceeds, to the threshold of adventure. There he encounters a shadow presence that guards the passage. The hero may defeat or conciliate this power and go alive into the kingdom of the dark (brother-battle, dragon-battle; offering, charm), or be slain by the opponent and descend in death (dismemberment, crucifixion). Beyond the threshold, then, the hero journeys through a world of unfamiliar yet strangely intimate forces, some of which severely threaten him (tests), some of which give magical aid (helpers). When he arrives at the nadir of the mythological round he undergoes a supreme ordeal and gains his reward. The triumph may be represented as the hero's sexual union with the goddess-mother of the world (sacred marriage), his recognition by the father-creator (father atonement), his own divinization (apotheosis), or again—if the powers have remained unfriendly to him—his theft of the boon he came to gain (bride-theft, fire-theft); intrinsically it is an expansion of consciousness and therewith of
being (illumination, transfiguration, freedom). The final work is that of the return. If the powers have blessed the hero, he now sets forth under their protection (emissary); if not, he flees and is pursued (transformation flight, obstacle flight). At the return threshold the transcendental powers must remain behind; the hero re-emerges from the kingdom of dread (return, resurrection). The boon that he brings restores the world (elixir).54

It has been argued that this plot is not mythical, that the events described are such common occurrences that it is no more mythic than is the work of any writer. However, if dreaminess is present, if the hero reveals his superiority in childhood, and if the actions of the hero implicate society, then—according to Campbell—the work must be recognized as having mythic overtones.55

"An Ohio Pagan" portrays Campbell's development of the mythological adventure. Tom Edwards, as noted earlier, is a descendant of Twn O'r Nant, "a gigantic figure in the history of the spiritual life of the Welsh" (HM, p. 315). Tom was orphaned and is cared for by Harry Whitehead, a farmer who is more interested in racing horses than in farming. Harry's most promising horse, Bucephalus, is "a great ugly-tempered beast," but Tom conquers him with love.

A sight it was to see the boy with the blood of Twn O'r Nant in his veins leading by the nose Bucephalus of the royal blood of the Patchens. (HM, p. 317)

At sixteen, he drives Bucephalus in a race, winning "a royal
battle" against very stiff competition. This makes Tom a
celebrity in Bidwell, but it also brings him to the attention
of the truant officer. The threshold of adventure occurs
when Tom decides to sneak away from Bidwell in the night to
escape attending school. His love for Bucephalus represents
the guardian of the passage; but his desire to avoid school
overpowers his love for the horse and he goes "alive into the
kingdom of the dark:" "To Tom it [the city] was in a way
fetid and foul" (HM, p. 323). This is the nadir of his exist­
ence and soon he escapes from the city and returns to the
country.

From this point until the final vision, Tom encoun­
ters "tests" and "helpers." One "test" is of his ability to
endure the devaluation of his status:

The slender boy, who had urged Bucephalus to his
greatest victory, . . . now drove a team of plodding
grey farm horses. (HM, p. 324)

The other "tests" are philosophical and involve his thinking
"about life and its meaning;" proper approaches to religion
and sex occupy the major portion of these thoughts. One force
which threatens him--his employer's son's insistence upon the
carnal nature of love--is offset by Tom's inherent knowledge
of good. The employer himself becomes a "helper" and leads
Tom to a religious conception of the universe. The final
vision presents Tom's mystical union with ultimate reality as the landscape personifies "the goddess-mother of the world." This vision, an epiphany, "is an expansion of consciousness and therewith of being."

Campbell notes that the "final work is that of the return." This Tom displays when he decides to return to school. "If the powers have blessed the hero, he now sets forth under their protection," Campbell states. The earthmother "smiled at Tom and her smile was now an invitation." At this point, Anderson concludes his story without discussing the "return threshold" or the "boon," although both of these are implied: the "return threshold" in his decision to return to school and the "boon" in his being a descendant of Twn O'r Nant. Although he is the descendant of a savior, Tom must still undergo all of the tests before he too proves his right to bring a spiritual boon to society.

Campbell's description of the archetypal adventure correlates closely with "An Ohio Pagan" because of Anderson's insertion of mythic details into the story. This story is overtly mythic; Windy McPherson's Son also displays these mythic details, as well as those of the American-success myth, though on a more subtle level.

Windy McPherson's Son relies upon the Horatio-Algier
myth which was still popular at the time. Unlike the "rags-to-riches" heroes of the American success myth, however, Sam McPherson, "one who had realized the American dream . . . and had . . . sickened at the feast," wanders out of a fashionable club to seek the truth. Anderson parodies this success theme by creating a character who casts off the imagined economic boon he brings to society to find a spiritual boon which will restore order to the world.

Sam, in the first chapters of the book, is an unusual child. His friends are adults who teach him and who instill values in him. John Telfer (a father figure) and Mary Underwood (a mother figure) provide intellectual and emotional guidance for the boy; and, although they have opposing methods, they have the same confidence in his future. Telfer, a "practical" man, wants to educate Sam for life by teaching him to observe life. Mary intends to educate Sam through books. When Telfer asks, "Does Mary, while loving books, love also the very smell of human life?", Sam blindly consents that she does not, though

... if later in life he learned that there are men who could write love letters on a . . . housetop in a flood, he did not know it then . . . . (WMS, p. 52)

From the first page of the book, he displays a compulsive drive for success. Sam, aroused with wonder and admiration at
John Telfer's discussion of art, is aroused even more by the arrival of the "seven forty-five" from Des Moines; and scurries off to compete with Fatty in selling newspapers. His dual personality—truth-seeker and businessman—provides the conflict in the novel. This drive, evident even in his youth, contributes to Sam's superiority in the business world.

Telfer, Mary Underwood, and the security of Caxton provide the "commonday hut" from which Sam sets forth toward the "threshold of adventure." He has been ready to leave for some time, but he is kept in Caxton by his mother's lingering illness. On the night she dies, Sam and his father fight because Windy has come home drunk and is disturbing the dying woman. Sam grasps his father's throat, Windy falls unconscious, and Sam thinks he has killed him. As he throws his father's body into a ditch, he intuitively knows that his mother is also dead: "'We need a woman in our house,' he kept saying . . ." (WMS, p. 85). With the death of his mother, his last tie with Caxton is broken; with the "murder" of his father, he crosses the "threshold." Campbell notes that patricide is a common method of crossing the "threshold," and is a "free field for the projection of the unconscious content. Incestuous libido and patricidal destrudo are thence reflected back against the individual . . . ."56
Symbolically, throughout the book Sam is trying to kill the Windy McPherson in himself. Windy represents everything that Sam hates. In Book One, Sam is taken in by his father for the last time: Windy has told the town that he will play the bugle in Caxton's first Fourth-of-July celebration. He finally even convinces Sam that he can play the bugle and Sam buys his father a trumpet with money from his savings. During the ceremony Windy raises the bugle to his lips and produces "only a thin piercing shriek followed by a squawk." Windy's family "crept home along side streets;" and afterwards Sam resolves,

I've got my lesson. I've got my lesson .... You may laugh at that fool Windy, but you shall never laugh at Sam McPherson. (WMS, p. 25)

Windy McPherson, by depriving his family of security through drunkenness and unrealistic pretentions, and by making his wife support the family by taking in laundry, unwittingly instills in his son two traits that later hinder Sam's chances for intellectual and emotional happiness. Because of the financial insecurity of his home, Sam places a compulsive emphasis upon money. Although he eventually realizes that wealth is not security, most of his life is spent in overcompensating for his unstable background. The second trait is instilled in Sam through Windy's pretentions. Windy becomes
so involved in his lies and wishes that for him they become truths. He convinces himself that he had been an army bugler, that he is descended from a good family, and that his failures are caused by others. Because of Windy's delusions, Sam sees delusions everywhere—in books and in other people. When something is not an undeniable fact, it is a pretense. Because of this second trait, it takes Sam a long time to accept vague, undefinable truths. He finds it hard to understand that dreams and hopes are as real as dollars. It is appropriate, then, that Windy is the "shadowy presence that guards the passage"; momentarily his "shadowy presence" is defeated, and Sam goes "alive into the kingdom of the dark"—the business world of Chicago.

From Sam's entrance into the business world to the last few chapters of the book, he is confronted with "tests." Every business venture presents a challenge which Sam meets successfully; but still he is not fulfilled. Success becomes competition, the pitting of himself against others. The conflict between truth-seeker and businessman is temporarily resolved when his acquisitive nature becomes dominant:

"'What I'm doing has to be done and if I do not do it another man will ... the individual who stands in the way should be crushed'" (WMS, p. 230). Sam's business partners
become his "helpers" in these "tests," but eventually he exploits them and becomes one of the most influential businessmen in the world. Even marriage propells him into his important position. However, financial success is not enough and Sam, "sickened at the feast," decides to try a more humane, fulfilling approach to life.

This reversal in values is prepared for by Anderson's inclusion of two other "helpers" who sustain the truth-seeking aspect of Sam's nature. After Sam leaves Caxton, two women enter his life to replace Mary Underwood's influence. First Janet Eberly, a cripple whom Sam loves, tries to break through the wall of "reality" Sam has built:

Books are not full of pretense and lies; you businessmen are .... Men sit writing them and forget to lie, but businessmen never forget. (WMS, p. 148)

After Janet's death, Sam realizes that "she awoke something in him that made it possible for him later to see life with a broadness and scope of vision" (WMS, p. 150) that was no part of his grasping, business world. However, this awakening dies with Janet and is not renewed until Sue Rainey comes into his life.

This second replacement for Mary Underwood is the daughter of Sam's employer at the Rainey Arms Company. Although Sue is wealthy and has the choice of any man she
might want, she has not married because of an ideal. She first becomes a special woman through her identification with Janet Eberly: "I wish you had known me better that I also might have known your Janet. They are rare--such women" (WMS, p. 165). Yet Sue, because of her idealism, is even more rare. After Sam's proposal she says,

> You are able and you have a kind of undying energy in you. I want to give both my wealth and your ability to children--our children. That will not be easy for you. It means giving up your dreams of power . . . . You will have to be a new kind of father with something maternal in you . . . . You will have to live wholly for me because I am to be their mother, giving me your strength and courage and your good sane outlook on things. And then when they come you will have to give all these things to them day after day in a thousand little ways. (WMS, pp. 178-179)

Because of Sam's love for her and because of the positive side of his dual nature, Sam accepts this life. His business dreams have become "so much nonsense and vanity" and he says, "I will live for this" (WMS, p. 179).

His marriage presents Sam with another kind of "test"--the acceptance of idealism. However, Sue's planned, bookish approach to life fails when she is unable to bear children; and eventually they drift apart, Sue forcing an interest in social movements and Sam returning to the business world. The idealistic life cannot be sustained. Finally Sam completely severs their relationship by forcing Sue's
father out of Rainey Arms Company. Sue's dream has been too inflexible; the two idealists find that they have nothing in common except this dream. Again, Sam is unfulfilled.

After Sue's departure, Sam runs the business for a time, before deciding to try a third method--John Telfer's approach: to "love . . . the very smell of human life," and to search for truth. Organized religion offers unsatisfactory answers, as Sam discovers during a Caxton revival meeting; from the Lutheran minister in Ohio, he discovers that sometimes even ministers achieve no real spiritual satisfaction. Fulfillment must be sought independently.

As a boy in Caxton, Sam has idolized Mike McCarthy, an educated, fun-loving man-about-town. One evening, after escaping from the amused stares of a hypocritical congregation at an evangelist's meeting, Sam discovers that Mike has murdered the husband of a young woman Mike has been making love to. The enormity of his crime snapped Mike's mind and he--a professed atheist--prays from his jail cell:

Oh Father! Send down to man a new Christ, one to get hold of us, a modern Christ with a pipe in his mouth . . . .

Oh Father! help us men of Caxton to understand this, our lives, this life so warm and hopeful and laughing in the sun . . . . (WMS, p. 44)

Although Telfer thinks Mike "a kind of Christ with a pipe in his mouth," Sam eventually comes even closer to emulating
this Christ. For both Mike and Sam, Christ went about the world, "not as a teacher, but as one seeking eagerly to be taught."

Although the Caxton boy's prayer—"... make me stick to the thought that the right living of this, my life, is my duty to you" (WMS, p. 46)—is temporarily submerged, the renewal of his quest after truth and God brings this "duty" to the surface once again.

Essentially, the truths Sam discovers on his quest are recognitions of himself and understandings of former events. Through Ed's grasping, financial efforts, Sam sees himself as the former Chicago businessman. The incidents at the shirtwaist-factory strike point to the repercussions of some of his own business transactions. From a prostitute he learns of real mother love and begins to understand the depth of his own mother's love; from her he also learns that Sue's idealism was a bookish approach to a natural phenomena. From Joe, who runs an unprofitable threshing crew, Sam learns that independence is a universal need. From the socialists he discovers that man is basically self-centered and that even those who profess a desire to better man's lot are so selfish that any threat to their position causes them to lose sight of their social goals. Although Sam discovers many truths, he comes to no conclusions; he remains unfulfilled and aban-
dons his search, lapsing into an even more dissipated life than the one he had previously rejected:

He lost his native energy, grew fat and coarse of body, was pleased for hours by little things, read no books, lay for hours in bed drunk and talking nonsense to himself, ran about the streets swearing vilely, grew habitually coarse in thought and speech, sought constantly a lower and more vulgar set of companions, was brutal and ugly with attendants about hotels and clubs where he lived, hated life, but ran like a coward to sanitariums and health resorts at the wagging of a doctor's head. (WMS, p. 310)

This is the nadir of Sam's existence. He has denied every "good" that exists for him. Finally he "undergoes a supreme ordeal and gains his reward" by adopting three children.

Campbell says of the reward: "... intrinsically it is an expansion of consciousness and therewith of being (illumination, transfiguration, freedom)." The expansion of consciousness in Sam's case encompasses all three manifestations: His "illumination" is an epiphany through which he understands the proper use of nature's life force. His "transfiguration" is accomplished through a life lived in accordance with this life force; at last he is "freed" from the gnawing unfulfillment he has known.

In Windy McPherson's Son, the reward and the boon Sam brings to the world are the same. With his "expansion of consciousness and therewith all being," he is "practicing
the most difficult of all arts—the art of living" and the art of instilling right living in children. The success motif resolves itself only in the transmission of knowledge and truth to children.

This child motif is one of the most pervasive motifs in the novel. Telfer, Mary Underwood, and Jane McPherson all strive to transmit their knowledge to Sam. Mike McCarthy—"the Christ with a pipe in his mouth"—shouts from his jail cell:

I have seen men and women here living year after year without children. I have seen them hoarding pennies and denying Thee new life on which to work Thy will. (WMS, p. 42)

Sam and Sue idealistically plan their lives so that everything will revolve around their future children and Sam says:

It is not the love of woman that grips me . . . but the love of life. I have had a peep into the great mystery. This--this is why we are here--this justifies us. (WMS, p. 183)

Sam's adoption of three children reaffirms this assertion:

Perhaps now the test of his life had come. There was a way to approach life and love . . . . The buried inner thing thrust itself up. (WMS, p. 328)

Through the adoption of the children, Sam is given the opportunity to return to Sue, thus crossing the "return threshold." "There was the mother hunger still alive in her" but in neither of them is there the idealistic enthusiasm
they felt in the first year of their marriage. Sam is less assured that he can "surrender to others, live for others," (WMS, p. 329) although he is resolved to try. Through this resolution to live for his new family, the old conflict of idealism versus business is resolved.

I cannot run away from life. I must face it. I must try to understand these other lives, to love . . . (WMS, p. 330)

On his quest, Sam has observed the decaying morality of America and, in effect, acknowledges his mythological role:

... we [Americans] sprang from the big clean new land through which I have been walking all these months. Will mankind always go on with that old aching, queerly expressed hunger in its blood, and with that look in its eyes? Will it never shrive itself and understand itself, and turn fiercely and energetically toward the building of a bigger and cleaner race of men?

"It won't unless you help," came the answer from some hidden part of him. (WMS, p. 295)

This is the "elixir" he returns with; it constitutes the social implications that myth must possess. The truths he has learned can now be communicated, starting with his adopted children. To a degree, this restores order to his chaotic world. Sam has effected a balance between the forces of the unconscious and the forces of conscious being.

Anderson, though emulating the archetype of the mythic adventure, is rather vague about the content of the "elixir." Whether or not Sam returns with a "boon" for society is ques-
tionable. Presumably, the reader will remember Sam's experi-
ences—sexual, occupational, idealistic—and his subsequent
conclusions about the proper way to live.

Anderson believed that the search for truth provides
the proper way to live life. He himself had abandoned secu-
rity and success to search. Before he became a writer, he
was living proof of the Horatio-Alger myth. He had risen
from a childhood of extreme poverty to a position as presi-
dent of the Anderson Manufacturing Company. One morning,
while dictating a letter to his secretary, he experienced an
epiphanic moment similar to those he later wrote about. He
stopped his dictation and stated, "My feet are cold, wet,
and heavy from long walking in a river. Now I shall go walk
on dry land."57 With that, he walked out the door to learn
and to write. This is the "Anderson myth" he would have his
readers believe.

Bruner refers to this phenomena among other contem-
porary novelists:

It is not easy to create a myth and to emulate it at
the same time. James Dean and Kerouac, Kingsley
Amis and John Osborne, the Teddy Boys and the hip-
sters: they do not make a mythological community.
They represent mythmaking in process as surely as
Hemingway's characters did in their time, Scott
Fitzgerald's in theirs. What is ultimately clear is
that even the attempted myth must be a model for
imitating, a programmatic drama to be tried on for
fit.58
This is the direction of Anderson's myth. He had lived the type of life he consistently proposes in his works. It is up to his readers to "try it on for fit."\(^5^9\)

The function of myth in society, as Mircea Eliade notes, is to "reveal the structure of reality";\(^6^0\) as the product of a particular society, myth supplies a means of explaining "the way things are" by focusing upon a particular hero who displays "exemplary mannerisms."\(^6^1\) Thus, by adopting these mannerisms, the individual members of the society try to achieve the same goals the hero has achieved. When a hero has established a particular method of communicating with his gods, for example, other, less heroic individuals carefully copy each prescribed motion, establishing the ritualistic pattern of communicating with these gods. These motions, when passed down to succeeding generations, become archetypes, the significant symbols upon which the new myths and the new rituals are constructed. Thus, the study of myth becomes circular; the mythic images, rituals, and plots become so interdependent that any categorization in the study of myth is clearly an imposed, arbitrary system. Fundamentally, then, Miss Bodkin, Frye, and Campbell's approaches are interdependent. Each is attempting to study
the methods by which "the structure of reality" is revealed.

The study of "the structure of reality" must not be confused with realism, however. Mark Schorer draws the distinction between the two when he speaks of "the prevailing and tiresome realism of modern fiction. When we feel that we are no longer in a position to say what life means, we must content ourselves with telling how it looks." Myth, then, necessarily possesses a philosophic function through which it can "say what life means." This is what Miss Eliade refers to when she states, "There is no myth which is not the unveiling of a 'mystery.'"

When a hero sets off on a quest, often his ultimate goal involves some kind of spiritual or moral revelation—the "unveiling of a 'mystery.'" Such an "unveiling" has been noted in "An Ohio Pagan" where, through a semiconscious state, Tom Edwards experiences a mystical union with ultimate reality; his experience is essentially epiphanic— that is, the "what-ness" of his particular quest is manifested—and this epiphany is symbolized by the earth-mother smiling upon him. For Tom Edwards, the earth-mother's smile is "an invitation" to enjoy the freedom of a full life without the restraints of repressive, Puritanical influences. The conclusion of Sam McPherson's quest is essentially the same as Tom Edward's,
but with qualifications; both conclude that sexual freedom is a "good," but *Windy McPherson's Son* draws a distinction between sexual freedom and sexual vice. Although Tom's epiphany is essentially more mystical than Sam's, for the purposes of myth, each of the heroes unveils a moral revelation.

That Anderson's heroes are usually dreamers is significant. Through their dreams and visions, these heroes grasp some meaning which is significant either to society or to themselves. Tom Edward's vision bestows a somewhat private sense of truth, which he may or may not bestow upon society. Hugh McVey, of *Poor White*, has a vision which overtly implicates society and foretells its doom. While the dreamers become the recipients of these sometimes terrible truths, they are still in a better position than are the non-dreamers, who stumble through life blindly following conventionality. Thus, from Anderson's point-of-view, the dreamers are mythical heroes bearing mystical truths which will free us if we will only heed them.
CHAPTER III

ANDERSON AND MYSTICISM
The world, as Anderson develops it, is a highly complex, but organized system. The earth passes through its seasonal changes with infinite regularity; animals are born, give birth, and die. Every facet of his natural world is totally integrated and totally interdependent. Into this complex system comes man, the only isolated facet of nature. When man perceives the unity of nature—but at the same time perceives his independence from this unity—he responds in one of two ways: Either he withdraws, thus becoming a "grotesque," or he sets forth to integrate himself (and sometimes others) into this ordered world, thus fulfilling the role of the mythological hero.

This process of integration is primarily mystical. The ordered world is a manifestation of ultimate reality, and projection into this ultimate reality is achieved through dreams, visions, and intuitions. Essentially, then, the study of Anderson's use of mysticism is the study of how the mythological hero perceives and/or reaches ultimate reality, how he responds to this "illumination," and how his mystic experience affects both his life and the lives of those around him.
Anderson's critics often acknowledge the mystic aspects of his work, although they seldom attempt to explain them. Irving Howe, in speaking of Windy McPherson's Son, suggests that this mystic quality is caused by his "lazy" use of "a gaseous filler to occupy the vacuum left by failures of his imagination." Alexander Klein is equally critical in his evaluation of Anderson's mysticism: "The Andersonian world is narrow and substanceless; life is denuded of practically all sensory elements, meaning, value, intellect, complexity—everything becomes undirected feeling of a low-energy potential." John McCole expresses the same rejection of Anderson's mysticism: "... his characters babble about symbols that only the devil could understand; and that, perhaps, only the devil is meant to understand."

Fundamentally, these critics' rejection of Anderson's use of mysticism stems from their reading him as a realistic writer. Because of some peculiar quirk of time, Anderson and Sinclair Lewis were at first invariably placed together in the history of literary ideas. Winesburg and Main Street were published at the same time and contained superficial similarities; consequently, the critics placed them in the same category—realism. Currently, however, the differences have become more significant than the similari-
ties; Lewis' and Anderson's approaches to small-town social problems appear incompatible. Alfred Kazin, for example, describes Anderson as the "drowsing village mystic" and Lewis as the "garrulous village atheist." For Lewis, objective reality was a primary goal in his scathing depictions of small-town narrowness. For Anderson, however, objective reality was only a base for a larger, subjective vision of life. The realistic detail in Anderson's work "... is only a starting point on the road into the psyche where its meaning must be sought. It is to be sifted, analyzed and arranged until it yields this truth ... ." In his Memoirs, Anderson advises writers to recognize that "... the unreal is more real than the real and that there is no real other than the unreal." Therefore, the responsibility for the expression of truth necessarily falls upon the intangible realm of dreams, visions, and intuitions; Anderson intends that these psychic experiences be viewed as an expression of mysticism.

Other critics, then, like Kazin, are more perceptive and note that mysticism is an integral part of Anderson's style and vision. Robert Lovett correlates Anderson with the Russian writers whose use of action "diffuses attention and carries it beyond the immediate action to more remote implications of a life that is unrevealed but none the less sig-
nificant.⁷ Clifton Fadiman expresses a similar thought: When Anderson escapes into "fantasy," "he writes with conviction and unmatchable delicacy."⁸ Julius Friend directly contradicts Klein and says Anderson's mysticism is "an earth mysticism, which accepts life, the life of the teeming earth, the life of the senses, as well as the life of the spirit, with something approaching the same kind of ecstasy as that of the Christian mystics."⁹ Friend finds none of the "low-energy potential" that Klein notes, but all of the energy of "ecstasy."

Mysticism, as commonly understood, involves a third kind of knowledge. Usually, knowledge is described as the result of either sense perception or reason. The knowledge of the mystics, however, is the result of "feelings" and intuition.¹⁰ Knight Dunlap notes that "the mystics claim the experience is transcendent, above intellect and above sense; in other words: purely emotional."¹¹ The goal of the mystic is to seek the immediate experience of one-ness with ultimate reality through transcendence of "the ordinary distinctions between subject and object."¹² Those who have known mystical experience agree on the difficulty in communicating the quality of their vision. Any precise method of explanation fails. Dunlap detects a definite sexual quality in many of
the mystic's explanations:

I do not mean to say that the mystic recognizes the experience as explicitly sexual, and it usually is not sexual in the sense of being licentious or lewd . . . . What I mean is, that in the experience there are certain factors which are conspicuously present in sexual emotion . . . 13

The mystics, then, resort to unconscious sexual imagery in their groping to explain the three basic qualities of a mystical experience: union, love, and ecstasy. These three qualities "... have been employed in various languages to designate this act," 14 for the mystics "... look upon love as the solution to the mystery of life." 15 However, as Miss Spurgeon notes, it is important to remember that mysticism is not necessarily bound by doctrine and theology. Mysticism is "... a temper rather than a doctrine, an atmosphere rather than a system of philosophy." 16

There are two central issues around which the criticism of Anderson's use of mysticism revolves: his groping for intangible truths and his theory of moments. Critics who can accept the validity of these two issues accept his entire mystical view of life. Those who cannot reject him.

Anderson saw himself as a clumsy, uneducated man groping for words with which to express himself. He viewed himself as a poet who saw, felt, and understood but who found it difficult to express his vision of life:
There I sat, in the room with the apple before me, and hours passed. I had pushed myself off into a world where nothing has any existence. Had I done that, or had I merely stepped, for the moment, out of the world of darkness into the light? . . . .
My hands are nervous and tremble . . . .
With these nervous and uncertain hands may I really feel for the form of things concealed in the darkness? (HM, pp. ix-x)

Anderson would never have asserted that his vision of life was so complete that he need not grope; indeed, no mystic has been fully satisfied with his own explanation of his vision. However, this humble pose infuriates some of his critics: The author of a superb work like "Death in the Woods," a man who fraternized with intellectuals as Anderson had, must have been assuming a dishonest pose. Therefore, they regard his "fumbling manner" of telling a story and his "false humility" in dealing with his material as essentially dishonest.

Groping, however, is the first step from ignorance to knowledge. Indeed, groping implies a premonition of some larger, more relevant truth. This is seen especially in his stories about adolescents. In these stories, the narrators—usually race track swipes—wonder at the confusion in the adult world. In "I Want to Know Why," the narrator cannot understand why "Jerry Tillford, who knows what he does, could see a horse like Sunstreak run, and kiss a prostitute the same day" (TE, p. 19). The adolescents are mature enough to
have definite value systems, but immature enough to be confused by any distortion of values. This allows Anderson to present caustic comments on contemporary society; and since these comments are mouthed by unsophisticated narrators, he does not risk a moralizing tone. The adult world, as these adolescents perceive it, is so unnecessarily chaotic and immoral that, like the narrator of "The Man Who Became a Woman," they become "so sick at the thought of human beings . . . that they could have vomited to think of them at all" (HM, p. 214).

In "The Man Who Became a Woman," the theme of a narrator groping for a comprehensive understanding of man's dual nature enables Anderson to achieve one of his most effective short stories. Through the archetype of the anima and through the Yang-Yin principle, Anderson presents a story which shows both a character who apprehends a mystical (and mythological) truth and a society which rejects and/or reinterprets such truths. The narrator, Herman Dudley, explains that he is not a writer but that he has to tell "... this story has been on my chest..." Like the narrator of "I Want to Know Why," Herman is a swipe who prefers the love of horses to the love of man—with the exception of his close friend, Tom. The story, motivated by a "kind of like
confession," concerns a mystical confusion of sex roles; Herman has developed a desire for a woman; yet he claims
to love Tom Means . . . although I wouldn't have dared to say so, then. Americans are shy and timid about saying things like that . . . . I guess they're afraid it may be taken to mean something it don't need to at all. (HM, p. 188)

Also, this confusion of sex roles is projected into his love for a horse: "I wished he was a girl sometimes or that I was a girl and he was a man" (HM, p. 200).

One rainy night, Herman is in a bar where he watches a fight between a father and some village taunters. After a few drinks he looks into the mirror and sees "not my own face but the face of a scared young girl" (HM, p. 209). Following these strange experiences, he runs back to the stables where, in the dark, he is later mistaken for a woman by the Negroes, "my body being pretty white and slender then." The drunk Negroes attempt to seduce the young "girl" and Herman is so frightened that he runs out into the night. He runs in the dark until he falls into the skeleton of a horse—a grotesque climax symbolizing the conclusion "of the race-horse and the tramp life for the rest of my days" (HM, p. 228).

Herman does not blame the Negroes and explains that he "had invented a kind of princess" and that "now I was that woman" (HM, p. 221). Maxwell Geismar, in discussing this
story, notes:

No doubt the orthodox Freudians, noticing the dream-like symbolism set off against both the animal world and the slaughterhouse of civilization, will construe this as a narrative of repressed or unconscious homosexuality.\textsuperscript{18}

Herman Dudley provides the defense against such interpretations: "I'm not any fairy. Anyone who has ever known me knows better than that" (HM, p. 209). Rather than a story of latent homosexuality, this is a story which depicts the duality of man's nature. Herman's mention of his "dream princess" provides the key to another interpretation; she is his anima, the projection of his own femininity into an ideal woman. This phenomena is described by Miss Bodkin as "representing the dreamer's effort to bring to life, or make accessible the . . . undeveloped feminine aspect of the personality."\textsuperscript{19} In Herman Dudley's case, the anima is evoked because of loneliness, alcohol, and timidity in the presence of girls.

But Anderson is working with more than a psychological occurrence. Rather, it is Jungian, archetypal, and mystical. Inevitably, then, the narrator must grope for a way to express the actual quality of his experience:

I'm puzzled you see, just how to make you feel as I felt that night. I suppose, having undertaken to write this story, that's what I'm up against, trying to do that. (HM, p. 208)
Essentially, the truth Herman Dudley is groping for concerns his own perception of the duality of man's nature: Man is not all male. This has been somewhat prepared for by Herman's experience in the bar. The large man who responds pugnaciously to taunts also has a maternal side. He seeks first the welfare of his child (the maternal role) and then assaults his enemies (the male role). The truth Herman perceives is the Yang-Yin principle as Campbell defines it:

Yang, the light, active, masculine principle, and Yin, the dark, passive, and feminine, in their interaction underlie and constitute the whole world of forms. They proceed from and together make manifest Tao: the source and law of being.20

It is of little wonder that Herman professes to be puzzled by this apprehension of "the source and law of being," for it is ultimately the apprehension of his own divinity. Even if through his groping he finally organizes the essence of this experience, he probably will not perform the role of the mythological hero, for to admit the duality of man's nature is to admit homosexuality—at least in society's eyes—and "Americans are shy and timid about saying things like that" (HM, p. 188).

Anderson's adolescent swipes are one group of characters who grope, but most of his characters display this quality. Windy McPherson's Son, for example, devotes most of
its content to Sam McPherson's groping after intangible truths, which, when found, will provide a "social boon."

Hugh McVey, from Poor White, gropes for an escape from his loneliness and inadvertently experiences a revelation which has direct social implications. At the conclusion of Poor White, Hugh acknowledges that he possesses the insight to bring "light and color" to American towns, which is, of course, the role of the mythological hero. Groping, then, is Anderson's method of preparing his characters for an illumination.

The second central issue on which criticism of Anderson's use of mysticism revolves is his theory of moments. Life, for Anderson, is not a horizontal passage of time; rather, it is a well-spaced series of ecstatic illuminations ("epiphanies," James Joyce calls them) with the intervals between these moments spent in contemplation of the illumination; "... they are moments at which a character, a landscape, or a personal relation stands forth in its essential nature or 'what-ness,' with its past revealed as if by a flash of lightning."²¹ They are those rare flashes of intuition which reveal some primordial truth and which give continuity and meaning to life. These epiphanies are usually the property of the mythological hero, for he is the one with
the strength and integrity to withstand, interpret, and reveal the truth he discovers. As Campbell notes:

The adventure of the hero represents the moment in his life when he achieved illumination—the nuclear moment when, while still alive, he found and opened the road to the light beyond the dark walls of our living death.22

This progression from "living death" to "illumination" has been noted in Windy McPherson's Son and in "An Ohio Pagan"; though on a smaller scale, the epiphany is present in most of Anderson's fiction.

Either because of rejection of this theory of moments or because of a misunderstanding of it, much adverse criticism has been directed toward Anderson's work. The authors of such criticism object to the limited scope that the epiphanic moment necessitates. Hence, Cleveland Chase says,

... if he were able to grasp all of the important causes of these "moments" and to deduce all the significant results from them, his theory would work quite well. ... But he does not possess that gift. In a book like Winesburg, Ohio ... he showed that he knew pretty well what was happening at a given moment ... [though] ... there was little comprehension of what went on before and what followed.23

Here Chase misunderstands and consequently rejects the epiphanic moments in Winesburg; a more careful reading of individual episodes would have elicited background information and would have foretold the future of the character.
In "Drink," for instance, Tom Foster (who is caught in an ancient conflict, love versus lust) discovers innocent love, but he understands it only in terms of his previous experience. Tom, although he has "never asserted himself" and has always remained "unmoved and strangely unaffected," has been influenced by the squalor and sordidness of carnal love. "He thought, after what he had seen of the women standing before squalid houses" and after "one of the women of the neighborhood tempted him and he went into a room with her" (WO, p. 215) that he would put sex entirely out of his mind. But later, when he innocently falls in love, he can only express it in a sordid, painful way. Getting drunk was like making love. . . . It hurt me to do what I did and made everything strange. That's why I did it. I'm glad, too. (WO, p. 219)

Because he is in love and is happy, he wants "to suffer . . . because everyone suffers and does wrong." Thus, by presenting Tom Foster's view of life and his attitudes toward sex, Anderson subtly forecasts Tom's future; he will remain a grotesque. In this way, Anderson expands the epiphanic moment so the illuminating visions his characters portray can have broad implications. Mellard notes that for Tom Foster--as for Anderson--"the illumination of life is mystical and intuitive, stimulating and painful, so what better symbol for it
than the dream or vision enhanced by drink?"25

Similarly, the future is forecasted for the other characters as well. What will Wing Biddlebaum ever be but a frightened ex-teacher who occasionally reveals his talents through his "nervous expressive" hands. What will Enoch Robinson (from "Loneliness") ever be but a lonely old man who has been deprived of even his invented friends. What Chase misunderstands is that the revealing epiphany, because of its very nature, discloses the "what-ness" of each character; and this "what-ness" is indicative of the remainder of each life.

James Joyce, who coined the literary usage of the term, "epiphany," proposed that the trivialities of everyday life often effect "a sudden spiritual manifestation."26 Common gestures, actions, and situations are capable of triggering a response in the observer through which he can observe a radiant, infinite quality. Like Eliot's "objective correlative," Joyce's "integritas" ("wholeness") and "consonantia" (the harmony of the parts which constitute this whole) elicit a particular radiant response in the observer—"claritas."
The total response, epiphany, results from an individual's perception of the essence of a thing and often occurs as an intuitive flash or revelation. In *Stephen Hero*, Joyce explains the theory:
This is the moment which I call epiphany. First we recognize that the object is one integral thing, then we recognize that it is an organized composit structure, a thing in fact: finally, when the relation of the parts is exquisit, when the parts are adjusted to the special point, we recognize that it is that thing which it is. Its soul, its what-ness, leaps to us from the vestment of its appearance. The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant. The object achieves its epiphany.27

Revelation, as a technical device, is used by many authors, although Joyce was the first to employ it as a technique of characterization; 28 this is the way Anderson uses epiphany. In nearly all the stories of Winesburg, an epiphany allows either the protagonist and/or the reader to understand the essential "what-ness" of a character or situation. "Drink," for example, provides a two-fold epiphany: Tom Foster, by becoming drunk, understands the pain involved in love; and the reader, perceiving these tragic implications, realizes that Tom, because of his concept of the nature of love, will never find health or happiness in love.

Two basic modes of epiphany are evident in Anderson's work: epiphany produced through an interpersonal relationship and epiphany produced during dreams, visions, inebriation, or some other semi-unconscious state. These two modes may work independently (e.g., Tom Edward's vision in "An Ohio Pagan" and Ray Pearson's relationship with Hal Win-
ters in "The Untold Lie") or interdependently (as when the alcohol brings the speaker and David together in "A Meeting South" and when the feverish illness allows Tom to better understand his father in "A Chicago Hamlet"). Both basic modes of the epiphany perform mythological (and, therefore, in Anderson's case, mystical) functions. The epiphanies perceived through the semi-unconscious state are fundamentally concerned with apprehension of ultimate reality. The epiphanies perceived interpersonally both dispel individual loneliness and apprehend the divinity present in man.

All of the main characters from Anderson's novels lapse into dreams and visions which express their frustrations and desires or which mystically connect them with the "never-changing" aspects of life. Poor White provides an example of both. Here Anderson creates his most inveterate dreamer. Hugh, the protagonist in Poor White, is the son of a drunken ne'er-do-well. He eventually is cared for by a station master and his wife, who give him the only affection he knows in his youth. When they leave Mudcat Landing, Hugh runs the station for a short time, and then he too leaves for the East where he hopes to find friendship, love, and opportunity. However, because of his timidity, his repression, and his inordinate desire to dream, he does not find
the fulfillment he desires. When he reaches Bidwell, Ohio, he takes another job as station master. To combat loneliness and his desire to dream, he makes small inventions which are taken over by some businessmen of Bidwell and which make the town a growing, industrial city. Hugh achieves no personal fulfillment from his inventions, however; he is still a lonely, dreaming man. Two women enter his life: First Rose is attracted to him, but because of his repressions, nothing develops between them. Clara is later attracted to him; she assumes the dominant role and initiates their marriage. At the conclusion of the book, Bidwell has become a dirty, grasping city because of Hugh's inventions, but Hugh himself has finally achieved the love and the fulfillment he has spent his entire life searching for.

On the surface, Hugh McVey does not appear to possess the qualities of the mythological hero. Although he is creative and intelligent, his social retardation inhibits him to the extent that he cannot be a hero like Sam McPherson. If, however, Hugh's asocial tendencies are read as a test which he is to overcome (as he eventually does) and if his concepts concerning the betterment of society are considered, he can be regarded as a mythological hero. But even more observable than the mythic elements in Poor White is the continuous
presence of mystic moments, which are most apparent in Hugh's recurrent dreaminess.

Throughout the novel, Hugh McVey's "dreamy, detached outlook," bred on the banks of the Mississippi, conflicts with what he wants from life. He is not an idealist who sets a determined course against rising industrialization; indeed, at first he is scarcely responsible for any of his actions. When not lying "half asleep in the shade of a bush on the river bank," he is combating this inclination toward "laziness" by immersing himself in seemingly meaningless tasks: counting pickets in a fence, weaving baskets. He must not allow himself to return to that "fluttering, dreamy state" of his youth. Hugh, the repressed young man who dreams in moments of "weakness," often desires to exchange his awkward being with anyone who is more gregarious, more assertive than he.

To be a young man dressed in a stiff white collar, wearing neatly-made clothes, and in the evening to walk about with young girls seemed like getting on the road to happiness. (PW, p. 67)

Sometimes Hugh watches young couples, wishing he were an assertive male; but he can only find solitary outlets to relieve his frustrations and to deter his dreaming. After dreaming of what love must be like

... the spark of the fires of spring that had touched him became a flame. He felt new-made and
tried to leap lightly and gracefully across the stream, but stumbled and fell into the water. Later he went soberly back to the station and tried again to lose himself in the study of the problems he had found in his books. (PW, p. 75)

Ironically, Hugh's inventions are an escape from dreams and a result of dreams. His life-long compulsion to do something concrete when beset with the desire to dream develops his creative abilities. While watching Ezra French's family set cabbage plants,

The machine-like swing of the bodies . . . suggested vaguely to his mind the possibility of building a machine that would do the work they were doing. His mind took eager hold of that thought and he was relieved. There had been something in the crawling figures and in the moonlight . . . that had begun to awaken . . . the fluttering, dreamy state . . . . To think of the possibility of building a plant-setting machine was safer. (PW, p. 78)

Although Hugh's directed thoughts are more concrete than the threatening dreaminess, they are still a product of his dreams; they develop because of his compulsive need to escape dreams and because of his idealistic desire to ease man's labor. Later, when he identifies with the Iowan inventor, Hugh recognizes this two-fold cause of his inventions and "for a moment he became not an inventor but a poet. The revolution within had really begun" (PW, p. 358).

This two-fold explanation is not complete, however. Instinct--or intuition--is an even more basic force in Hugh's
life. Although dreams are pleasurable for him and although thinking provides him with awareness, they are not as essential to his happiness as is the fulfillment of his instincts.

Anderson establishes varying levels of consciousness and at each level a corresponding social ability appears. The "fluttering" dreamy state is an asocial state. There is no need for human relationships and loneliness is not painful. Thinking, however, introduces elements of social awareness and personal helplessness. As Hugh contemplates his situation, he becomes more confused and withdrawn. Instinct bridges the gap between dreaming and thinking. Whenever social barriers are broken down it is because of an instinctual process. Sara Shepherd's maternal "impulses" cause her to care for Hugh: "With all her mother's soul she wanted to protect Hugh . . ." (PW, p. 7). Similarly, when Hugh neglects "giving himself time to think," he attempts to reach across the barrier between him and Rose McCoy; it is thinking which impedes this intuitive attempt. As a boarder in the McCoy home, Hugh's room adjoins Rose's.

At the window next to his sat Rose McCoy . . . . Without giving himself time to think, Hugh knelt on the floor and with his long arm reached across the space between the two windows . . . . But with a conscious effort he took himself in hand. "She's a good woman. Remember, she's a good woman." (PW, p. 236)
The wall between Hugh and his wife, Clara, is also finally destroyed by instinct. When Hugh is attacked by Joe Wainsworth, Clara's instincts are aroused and "the woman who had become a thinker stopped thinking" (PW, p. 360).

In effect, Anderson is saying that three degrees of consciousness are necessary: Thinking (a highly conscious state) produces awareness and productivity; dreaming (an unconscious state) produces escape and pleasure; and instinct (a semiconscious state) supplies the interpersonal epiphany and destroys social barriers. The most positive development in the protagonists in Poor White, however, is through the epiphanic mode of the semiconscious state. An effective relationship is only achieved by means of a vision or a primordial intuition. Had it not been for an instinctive communication exerted by him and toward him, Hugh would have remained totally asocial, an undesirable state since it is not freely chosen. At the conclusion of the book, Hugh is still only semi-social, a desirable state since it is achieved through free choice.

In Anderson's work, intuition expresses mysticism, often through the archetypes of dreams and visions. Shortly after Hugh McVey leaves Mudcat Landing, he drifts into the dream world where a vision forecasts the remainder of the
book:

Half formed thoughts passed like visions through his mind. He dreamed, but his dreams were unformed and vaporous. For hours the half dead, half alive state into which he had got, persisted. He did not sleep but lay in a land between sleeping and waking. Pictures formed in his mind. The clouds that floated in the sky above the river took on strange, grotesque shapes. They began to move. One of the clouds separated itself from the others. It moved swiftly away into the dim distance and then returned. It became a half human thing and seemed to be marshaling the other clouds. Under its influence they became agitated and moved restlessly about. Out of the body of the most active of the clouds long vaporous arms were extended. They pulled and hauled at the other clouds making them also restless and agitated. (PW, pp. 27-28)

On an allegorical level, the dream foreshadows the influence of Hugh and his inventions upon the town of Bidwell. However, the dream is more significant as an account of a mystical experience. Hugh first perceives ultimate reality and then merges with the cosmic forces, finally becoming one with the primal force:

Hugh thought his mind had gone out of his body and up into the sky to join the clouds and the stars, to play with them. From the sky he thought he looked down on earth and saw rolling fields, hills, and forests. He had no part in the lives of men and women of the earth, but was torn away from them, left to stand by himself. (PW, p. 28)

The primal force with which Hugh is united is described through pastoral imagery. Indeed, through his use of mysticism, Anderson attempts to turn to nature and to natural forces. Ultimate
reality, then, is interpreted through pantheism. St. Teresa, in an account of one of her visions, describes an experience very similar to Hugh's:

I remained there in my room for a few moments thus, when I was rapt in spirit with such violence that I could make no resistance whatever. It seemed to me I was taken up to heaven.  

Lack of control and an upward movement are evident in both descriptions. Violence is often present in mysticism; St. Teresa and Hugh each experience it during their trances: In Hugh's vision, a river, which symbolizes the force of industrialization,

swept over the land, uprooting trees and forests and towns. The faces of drowned men and children borne along by the flood, looked up into the mind's eye of the man Hugh, who . . . had let himself slip back into the vaporous dreams . . . . (PW, p. 29)

The "mind's eye" is a common metaphor for that part of man which is capable of perceiving ultimate reality. Anderson's diction in the description of Hugh's dream is appropriate. Dunlap notes that after the mystic experience, the subject is somewhat vague concerning what actually occurred because of the intangible quality of mysticism. Anderson, like the mystics, resorts to simile and metaphor to convey the essence of the experience.  

Thus, in Poor White the semiconscious state instills mystical insight into Anderson's protagonist: Hugh's vision
supplies him with a knowledge which forecasts society's doom. This is the kind of knowledge proper to the mythological hero. Also, Hugh is an isolated individual who, through apprehension of the forces of nature, becomes integrated into society, as well as into the fundamental order of organized nature. He has perceived the necessary one-ness of all things:

Now his eyes looked at the towns . . . scattered up and down midwestern America as . . . he had looked at the colored stones held in his hand. He looked at the towns and wanted light and color to play over them as they played over the stones . . . . (PW, p. 361)

Thus, the book concludes with another apprehension of ultimate reality as well as with the vague promise that Hugh will become the mythological hero who will bring "light and color" to America.

In the conclusion to "An Ohio Pagan," Anderson presents another mystic vision. The protagonist's background is appropriate for a mythological hero who has a vision: He is a descendant of another Tom Edwards, "a gigantic figure" who was a poet, a prophet, and a savior. Tom himself is an extraordinary boy. As a child he cares for the horse, Bucephalus, "a great ugly-tempered beast" which he conquers with love. At sixteen Tom becomes a celebrity when he drives Bucephalus in a trotting race and wins "a royal battle"
against two other excellent horses. But to escape his impending return to school, Tom leaves Bidwell during the night, "going east on a freight train, and no one there ever saw him again" (HM, p. 322). Like Tom Foster in "Drink," Tom Edwards remains detached from the world and merely observes. In his wandering he is introduced to the mysteries of religion, sex, and knowledge.

Religion, for Tom, as for all of Anderson's protagonists, is a personal thing. He misunderstands a sermon and sees Jesus as a Bacchus figure: "Tom took what was said concerning the temptation on the mountain to mean that Mary Magdalene, the adulteress, had followed Jesus and had offered her body to him . . ." (HM, p. 329). Tom identifies with his employer who "must be very close to Jesus, who controlled the affairs of the heavens" (HM, p. 331); when his employer prays for clear weather, it does not rain. As in Poor White, Anderson uses pantheism to explain Tom's religion. Organized religion confuses Tom but when he interprets Christianity as a nature worship, he becomes a religious person.

The mysteries of sex also confuse Tom. He is developing sexual desires and he wants to be like the Jesus-Bacchus figure who approaches sex as "healthy and animal-like" fulfillment; but he is confused by acquaintances who approach sex
with furtive, carnal attitudes.

Tom's vision portrays the path to his future. As in Poor White, natural landscapes are personified: "... everything in nature became woman."

For a long time he remained in a hushed, half-sleeping, dreamless state and then he opened his eyes again . . . .

The bay was a woman with her head lying where lay the city of Sandusky . . . . Her form was distorted by pain but at the same time the giant woman smiled at the boy on the hill. There was something in the smile that was like the smile that had come unconsciously to the lips of the woman who had nursed her child . . . . (HM, p. 345)

Couched in pantheistic terms is another interpretation of ultimate reality. Although the dream contains sexual implications, the author's intent goes beyond them. In Mysticism in English Literature, Miss Spurgeon discusses the mystics' use of women in explaining their visions. Though her discussion focuses upon Rossetti, it applies equally well to Tom Foster. When Tom sees the landscape as a woman,

it is not the desire of possession that so stirs him, but rather an absolute thirst for the knowledge of the mystery which he feels is hiding beneath and beyond it. Here lies his mysticism.

The archetypal image of the benevolent mother earth conveys Tom's mystic sensations and concludes his childhood. He is now ready to accept nature and to enter into the mainstream of life, presumably as the reincarnation of his great ancestor.
Thus, both Hugh McVey's and Tom Edwards' visions provide a mystical insight into the cosmic forces of life. In Tom's vision, however, mysticism focuses on the earth-mother. Much of Anderson's symbolism is sexual. Sex, for him, is "... the symbol of whatever lives, grows or creates; it is the very spirit of affirmation which bursts the bonds of the fixed and static." Therefore, Jesus becomes a Bacchus figure for the Ohio pagan, and Tom's epiphany is produced during a vision in which he finds a place for himself within the scheme of nature, within the "never-changing" aspects of life.

While Anderson does not use visions in the same manner as Joyce does, there are distinct similarities. Every writer who "... senses a portion of his ordinary world across a psychic distance" experiences a sense of revelation which, according to Miss Hendry, is dissociated from his subjective and practical concerns, fraught with meaning beyond itself, with every detail of its physical appearance relevant. It is a revelation quite as valid as the religious; in fact, from our present secular viewpoint, it perhaps would be more accurate to say that the revelation of the religious mystic is actually an aesthetic revelation into which the mystic projects himself—as a participant, not merely as an observer and recorder...Miss Hendry's description of the secular mystic is more applicable in describing Hugh McVey's mystical experience than in
describing Tom Edwards', since Hugh projects himself "as a participant" while Tom remains as merely "an observer."

The second basic mode of the epiphany presented in Anderson's fiction is the "moment" which is produced during an interpersonal relationship. Such moments are just as dramatic, though less mystical, than are the visionary epiphanies. Because of interpersonal barriers, humans rarely come into each other's "spiritual presences." Interpersonal epiphanies occur during those rare moments when two individuals break through the walls that separate one from the other. In "The Man's Story," Anderson deals with a poet named Wilson who is disturbed by these barriers and who devotes his life to destroying them.

Men had themselves built the walls and now stood behind them, knowing dimly that beyond the walls there was warmth, light, air, beauty, life in fact . . . . (HM, p. 294)

This metaphor of the wall is found throughout Anderson's work: Hugh McVey and Rose McCoy are separated by a wall--physically and emotionally; indeed, the entire novel deals with Hugh's attempts to destroy the wall between himself and mankind. In "'Unused,'" May Edgley cannot penetrate the wall that separates her from the citizens of Bidwell; consequently, she erects an imaginary "tower of romance" into which she escapes from the loneliness of life. In Tar: A Midwest Childhood,
Tar notes that even within families there are barriers created by an abundance of children and by a lack of time and strength. Walls raised by Puritanism cause John Webster (of Many Marriages) and Bruce Dudley (of Dark Laughter) to abandon their conventional lives. It is natural, then, that any break in such a wall—any interpersonal epiphany—is a significant event.

Essentially, the interpersonal epiphany differs from the visionary epiphany because of their respective goals. While the visionary epiphany is a means of approaching ultimate reality, the interpersonal epiphany is concerned with apprehending the divinity in man. Sir Francis Younghusband describes this latter mystic approach in Modern Mystics:

And the modern mystic will not seclude himself from life: he will live in its very midst. The modern mystic will live the full life of the world. Convinced of the divinity in men and women he will love to be among them to be stimulated by that divinity.39

Presumably, this "stimulation" will result in some kind of revelation, that is, in some kind of interpersonal epiphany. However, while this approach may be called "modern," it is not strictly contemporary; Younghusband's comments apply aptly to Walt Whitman, a mystic poet of the last century. Compare, for example, Whitman's "Song of Myself" with Younghusband's comment:
And I know that the hand of God is the promise of my own,
And I know that the spirit of God is the brother of my own,
And that all the men ever born are also my brothers, and the women my sisters and lovers,
And that a kelson of the creation is love.

Repeatedly throughout *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman emphasizes both the divinity in man and the mystical insight he derives from perceiving this divinity.

Anderson, heavily influenced by Whitman, also perceives the divinity in man. He too is the sensuous mystic-poet who celebrates the presence of God in man. But Anderson differs from Whitman in one, important detail: While Whitman usually raises common humanity to the level of the gods, Anderson allows many of his common characters to remain common, but allows them, at the same time, to achieve an illumination. The interpersonal epiphany, then, as Anderson uses it, is a means to dispel individual loneliness (if only momentarily) and to indicate the divinity in man by the character's becoming one with his environment. The ephemeral quality of these experiences is stressed. Usually the character apprehends the "what-ness" of another character or of a situation only for a moment. Then he returns to what the mystics call a "dry period" where life is again a painful, lonely experience. The mystic life consists only of brief, fleeting
moments when the walls are broken and man perceives the total reality of his existence. Anderson's "The Untold Lie" focuses upon this kind of experience.

Mellard regards "The Untold Lie" as a "story of incident." Such a description is somewhat misleading, for the dramatic emphasis of the story is on neither the incident itself—the epiphany—nor the conflict caused by the incident. The emphasis is on the regrettable fact that a total understanding between two people, once attained, can neither be retained nor recaptured. Ray Pearson, a sensitive man, once had a dream: He would go to sea or go out west to "get a job on a ranch and ride a horse into Western towns, shouting and laughing and waking the people in the houses with his wild cries" (WO, p. 207). But he had gotten a girl pregnant, married her, and has become a "quiet, rather nervous man of perhaps fifty" whose shoulders are "rounded by too much and too hard labor." Hal Winters, his young companion, represents everything Ray had wanted to become. Hal, the son of a Windpeter Winters (who had "died gloriously" by driving his horses headlong into an oncoming train), "was a bad one." At twenty-two, Hal has had several affairs, and now he has Nell Gunther "in trouble." The actual interpersonal epiphany between Hal and Ray occurs when Ray reflects
on the aspirations of his youth and compares them with his present life.

RAY had forgotten about Hal and muttered words.
"Tricked by Gad, that's what I was, tricked by life and made a fool of," . . . .

As though understanding his thoughts, Hal Winters spoke up. "Well, has it been worthwhile? . . . . Has a fellow got to do it?" he asked. "Has he got to be harnessed up and driven through life like a horse?" (WO, pp. 204-205)

Hal then tells Ray that Nell is pregnant and asks him for advice,

. . . and from being just two indifferent workmen they had become all alive to each other . . . . (WO, p. 205)

The two workmen experience the "what-ness" of each other. As in Poor White, arms symbolize the capacity for real communication between two individuals: "the younger man came and put his two hands on the older man's shoulders" (WO, p. 205). Partly because of the effect of the epiphany on Ray's sensitive nature and partly because of his indecision as to the proper response, Ray shakes Hal's hands loose and walks away. However, after an unpleasant encounter with his wife which re-awakens him to an awareness of the squalor in his life, Ray instinctively and clumsily runs to find Hal before he commits himself to Nell. But when he encounters Hal a fence symbolically separates them in their relationship and whatever had made them "become all alive to each other" is gone:
Ray Pearson lost his nerve and this is really the end of the story of what happened to him . . . /and Hal/ seemed to have lost his own sense of what had happened in the corn field . . . . (WO, p. 208)

Their epiphany is gone; Ray can only mutter, "It's just as well /that Hal marry/. Whatever I told him would have been a lie" (WO, p. 209).

Anderson's "The Untold Lie" and Joyce's "A Little Cloud" are strikingly similar. Ray Pearson and Chandler are both sensitive, timid men who desire more exciting, flamboyant lives. Both are embarrassed when confronted by their loud-voiced, gusty companions. Hal is the son of Windpeter, and Gallaher personifies both Aeolus and "the 'windiness' of the modern press." After these confrontations, each returns home where he experiences domestic strife followed by a personal epiphany. Chandler realizes he will never write and that he is trapped:

It was useless. He couldn't read. He couldn't do anything . . . . He was a prisoner for life. His arms trembled with anger and suddenly bending to the /crying/ child's face he shouted: "Stop!"

Ray Pearson's experience is very similar:

As he ran he shouted a protest against his life, against all life, against everything that makes life ugly . . . . Then as he ran he remembered his children and in fancy felt their hands clutching at him. (WO, pp. 207-208)

In "The Untold Lie" as in "A Little Cloud," the protagonist
is ". . . subjected to a process of compression and distilla-
tion that rejects all irrelevancies, all particularities and
ambiguities," leaving only the "showing forth" of the pro-
tagonist's dilemma.

"A Meeting South" is a much less dramatic portrayal
of the epiphanic moment than is "The Untold Lie"; this is
structurally appropriate, for the setting is a night in
drowsy New Orleans. The epiphany does not come to the most
dramatic character of the story, but to the narrator, a minor
character. Also, in contrast to "The Untold Lie," the "what-
ness" of this epiphany is enduring.

The narrator is not originally from the South but he
has adopted New Orleans as his home and considers himself a
native: The "Northern tourists" are spoken of in a conde-
scending manner, and like all "good New Orleanians" he goes
"to look at the Mississippi at least once a day." Although
he and his friend, Aunt Sally, are midwesterners, "perhaps we
both in some queer way belong to this city" (PSA, p. 521).

The more dramatic character is David, a young, Southern poet
who has been permanently injured while flying for the British
in the war and has, therefore, developed a great "gift for
drinking" to deaden the lingering pain in his leg. Soon both
David and the narrator become a little drunk: "You are to
remember that my own head was a bit unsteady." When the nar-
urator takes the young Southerner to see Aunt Sally (a retired
madam), instantaneous, non-verbal communication is estab-
lished between the two:

She, it seemed, had understood him at once, had
understood without unnecessary words that the little
Southern man lived always in the dark house of pain,
that whiskey was good to him, that it quieted his
throbbing nerves, temporarily at least. (PSA, pp.
524-525)

While his two friends talk, the narrator "draws within" and
listens. The two seem to understand each other so well that
after David falls asleep, the narrator leaves, thinking,
"Well, I was, after all, a Northern man. It was possible Aunt
Sally had become completely Southern, being down here so long"
(PSA, p. 531). In considering himself a Southerner, he has
been deluding himself.

This quiet epiphany, appropriate in such a quiet
story, is established through the arrangement of seemingly
irrelevant details of local color. It is this careful arrange-
ment that Joyce is referring to when he says,

... when the relation of the parts is exquisit,
when the parts are adjusted to the special point,
we recognize that it is that thing which it is.46

Yet strangely, the narrator's epiphany in "A Meeting South"
does not break down the barrier between him and society. What
it does is reveal the wall that exists between the narrator
and Southern society, a wall which has always been there, but which has not been acknowledged. Thus, although this epiphany does not effect even a transitory fusion of man and society, it does effect an illumination through which the narrator perceives the reality of his situation.

In "A Chicago Hamlet," as in "A Meeting South," the epiphanic moment does not arise naturally from the protagonist's character; instead it is induced. While alcohol induces the "moment" in New Orleans, a fever produces the epiphanic moment in "A Chicago Hamlet." Tom is a young man who, although he continues to work on the family farm, constantly resents his father's lack of organization and ineffectuality. The father has wanted to become a Methodist minister, but has not succeeded; now—in Tom's judgment, at least—he attempts to compensate for his ineffectuality through prayer. This is a constant irritation to Tom. His father's prayers are not the only reason Tom has become soured on religion:

One day when he was walking alone through a strip of wood, coming back barefooted from town to the farm, he had seen—he never told anyone what he had seen. The minister was in the wood, sitting alone on a log. There was something. Some rather nice sense of life in Tom was deeply offended. (HM, p. 148)

Thereafter, Tom identifies his father with this minister. He becomes even more impatient with his father's persistent
prayer: "Give me the gift, O God, give me the great gift" (HM, p. 149).

One evening when Tom is ill, disgusted, and "in a bitter mood," he goes to bed without supper. He and his father have been digging potatoes and they are both dirty, but Tom falls into bed, unwashed, with a fever. His mind slips "a little out of his grasp" and when he hears his father praying in the other bedroom, Tom crawls out of bed. With a club in his hand, he creeps up behind his father:
"... he wanted to crush out impotence and sloth" (HM, p. 151). But as he raises the club he notices his father's bare feet.

The heels and the little balls of flesh below the toes were black with the dirt of the fields but in the centre of each foot there was a place ... not black but yellowish white ... .

His father had not thought it necessary to wash his feet before kneeling to pray to his God ... . (HM, pp. 151-152)

Tom returns to his room and performs a purification ceremony by washing himself: "It was a strange notion, this business of making oneself the keeper of the clean integrity of oneself" (HM, p. 152).

This protagonist, because of his epiphany, performs the ritual of purification, a function of the mythological hero. Although Tom does not share his father's devotion for
God, he intuitively realizes the necessity for some kind of religion to keep "the clean integrity of oneself." His ritual of purification, then, is both an acknowledgement of some kind of ultimate reality and an attempt to reach this ultimate reality. Such acknowledgements and attempts are roles of both the mythological hero and the mystic. Also through this epiphany, Tom achieves a temporary union with his father, thus briefly dispelling loneliness and apprehending the divinity in man.

When Anderson is writing at his best, his use of the epiphanic moment rivals Joyce's. As noted earlier, the structures of "The Untold Lie" and "A Little Cloud" are strikingly similar; they are also equally effective. When Anderson lapses into unintentionally vague diction, however, his fiction falls far short of the fiction of Joyce. Many Marriages, for example, abounds with epiphanic moments; but because of Anderson's haste and carelessness, the novel is not as effective as it might have been.

The most effective epiphany in Many Marriages is related by John Webster when he tries to explain to his daughter why he married her mother. They were both young, he tells, when they met for the first time at the home of a mutual friend. Mary had arrived earlier than expected, un-
dressed, and fallen asleep in one of the bedrooms. John, not knowing anyone was in the house but his host, showered and ran naked to an upstairs bedroom to dress. They meet, then, for the first time in the nude:

At that time I had never before been in the presence of a woman undressed . . .

Even at the moment when I walked, thus nude, into her presence she was a living thing in my mind. And when she came up to me, out of sleep, you see, before she had time to think, I was a living thing to her then. What living things we were to each other we dared understand but for a moment. (MM, p. 110)

This epiphany between Mary and John Webster fuses both the visionary and the interpersonal modes. She is barely roused from the unconscious state of sleep in which she has been dreaming of a god-like man, and he is fully awake; but a total epiphany is effected. Here again Anderson indicates the temporal, ephemeral quality of the "showing forth": "What I [John] mean to say is that I have spent all these years trying to recapture that moment" (MM, p. 107). Freedom of instinct produces a spiritual union; repression of instinct destroys it. For this reason, John Webster leaves his wife to establish a more meaningful and natural relationship with another woman.

Anderson's use of the epiphanic moment, then, is based upon intuitive knowledge (i.e., mystical knowledge), not
on reason and sense perception. This experience is one which the intellect cannot understand, and consequently no depiction of an epiphany can satisfactorily describe the exact quality of the experience. The attempt to depict the epiphany is the role of the mythological hero, since he is usually (though not always) the one who experiences the epiphany. Through the hero's dreams, visions, and interpersonal revelations, he achieves some kind of knowledge of both ultimate reality and his position in the world. Unfortunately, however, not all those who achieve illumination are of heroic stature. For them, the epiphany is only a small crack in the wall of isolation; thus, the illuminating experience—when one can become "all alive" to another—only emphasizes the usual loneliness of existence. For those of heroic stature, though, the epiphany provides a direction so that, like Sam McPherson, they can destroy the walls of isolation and thereby establish a meaningful relationship between both man and man, and man and ultimate reality.
There seems to be no point in Anderson's career where he decided to rely heavily on myth and archetypal images. Unlike Hemingway, whose fiction became more and more archetypal as his career progressed, Anderson's use of archetypal imagery, ritual, and mythic structure remains at a steady level throughout his career. As was demonstrated, his first novel, *Windy McPherson's Son* (1916) is structured on a mythic base. His second novel, *Marching Men* (1917), though classified as a social-problem novel, concerns a social savior who is martyred—a highly mythical structure. In *Winesburg, Ohio* (1919), the mythic structure is abandoned for archetypal images. As many of the stories' titles indicate, these character sketches reveal emblematic qualities: "Mother," "The Thinker," "The Philosopher." And even when the titles do not reveal an emblematic type, the stories do: Wing Biddlebaum is a kind of Socrates, the archetypal "teacher"; and both Reverend Hartman and Tom Foster are confused by the oldest of conflicts, eros versus agape.

In *Poor White* (1921), Anderson incorporates the mythic plot with archetypal imagery, a practice continued throughout his career. *Horses and Men* (1923) deals primarily
with the ritual of the initiatory experience, one of Anderson's recurring themes. Many Marriages (1923) and Dark Laughter (1925) present his use of ritual and archetypal imagery at their most overt level. Tar: A Midwest Childhood (1926) displays less mythic content, but more archetypal imagery, as was noted in the discussion of "Death in the Woods."

Except for two social-problem novels, Beyond Desire (1932) and Kit Brandon (1936), the remainder of Anderson's career consisted of memoirs, advice to writers, and newspaper work. Essentially, then, myth, ritual, and archetypal images are apparent in every facet of Anderson's fiction.

The inevitable question that follows an archetypal study is: How intentional was Anderson's dependence upon myth? Anderson's comments about his works do not provide clear, quotable statements which can be used as proof of his mythological intentions. Neither does he offer ironic challenges as Twain and Melville did, tempting their readers to search for hidden meanings. In asserting that "... persons attempting to find a moral ... will be banished ... ,"¹ Twain ironically implies that there is a "moral" in Huckleberry Finn. Similarly, Melville, by expressing a fear that Moby Dick might be read "as a monstrous fable, or still worse and more detestable, a hideous and intolerable allegory,"²
ironically gives a clue to a possible reading. No such sug-
gestive evidence appears in Anderson's work, however.
Indeed, even his comments on his works give little indication
of a mythological intent. The only information he provides
concerns two works. He vaguely suggests myth when he calls
*Many Marriages* a "fantasy of the flesh";\(^3\) and his allusion to
"Death in the Woods" is only slightly more indicative of a
mythic intent: "It's aim is to retain the sense of mystery
of life, while showing at the same time at what cost our ordi-
nary animal hungers are sometimes fed."\(^4\) Clearly, the critic
must find other ways of proving Anderson's mythic intent.

His work, itself, does possess certain mythic fea-
tures. His images are often archetypal, as was indicated when
applying Miss Bodkin's study to his word choices. He often
resorts to ritual, as this paper's use of Frye and others
indicates. His plot structures are what Campbell would call
a "mythological adventure." Even his mysticism is an integral
part of myth in that it deals with the spiritual aspects of
the hero's adventure. One can assert, like Jung, that the
collective unconscious is responsible for the mythic content
in Anderson's work. Indeed, there are echoes of Jung in
Anderson's fiction,\(^5\) but actual proof cannot, of course, be
obtained. Ultimately, one must turn to Anderson's works
themselves, for as even Jung notes, "... the work of art is something in its own right, and may not be conjured away."^6

Much of the mythic content in Anderson's work appears to be intentional. Many Marriages provides the reader with so many archetypal images and with such an elaborate ritual that it could not have been unintentional. Anderson's occasional heavy-handedness (e.g., portions of Tar and virtually all of "The Contract") reveal his archetypal intent where a more careful art might have concealed it. (Tar, for example, portrays a toddler who conceptualizes man's inherent loneliness and "The Contract" too obviously employs Christ imagery.) His allusions to the "cup of life," his dependence upon rituals of purification, and his development of heroes with epic ancestry cannot be unintentional. In fact, he is sometimes too "literary" in straining for symbolic overtones.

Such "literary" attempts, although damaging to his work as a whole, do not appear in most of his fiction and should not, therefore, be a basis for condemning Anderson. Much of his work has been disposed of in this manner. His critics too often judge him by his worst works, not by his best. Consequently, much of his later work has been ignored. Dark Laughter, for example, rivals Winesburg, Ohio and "Death in the Woods" as evidence of Anderson's best writing, although
it has usually been discarded because of its similarity to Many Marriages. Such tenuous arguments as his alleged Freudianism or his "vague mysticism" should no longer offer his critics a basis for dismissing him. His influence upon other writers (e.g., Hemingway, Faulkner, and Salinger) and his own contributions to American literature are too significant to be ignored.

As was noted in the introduction, the intent in this paper is not to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a framework for a new approach to Anderson's fiction. Several other areas which are relevant to an archetypal approach could also be explored. His use of what Philip Young calls the "Huck Finn Myth" would corroborate an archetypal reading of many of Anderson's works. As Young notes, Dark Laughter provides an example of this corroboration:

... the protagonist goes down the Mississippi river, and Anderson writes: "Since Bruce Dudley was a kid and had read Huckleberry Finn, he had kept some such notion in his mind. Nearly every man who had lived long in the Mississippi Valley had that notion tucked away in him somewhere."

Huck Finn's initiation to the atrocities of civilization parallels the initiatory experience of several of Anderson's characters. Both Huck and Herman Dudley (of "The Man Who Became a Woman") are sickened by the seemingly unnecessary brutality of the adult world. Also, a comparison could be
made of the varying attitudes toward Negroes; strangely, even though Anderson wrote at a much later date than Twain, *Huckleberry Finn* displays a healthier acceptance of the Negro than does Anderson's *Dark Laughter* where the Negro race is regarded as a symbol for primitivism. Young asserts that Huck Finn portrays "blind gropings of the mind"; these have already been noted in Anderson's work.

Another problem one might consider is the relationship of Anderson's use of the oral tradition and his use of myth. Since myth originally belonged to the oral tradition, reciprocal patterns could be found and these patterns could be discussed through Anderson's work. As a possible starting point, one could turn to David Anderson's statement that Anderson's use of the oral tradition raises his "same old subject matter to the realm of American mythology." One could also study this statement by comparing Anderson's style with Frank O'Connor's account of the development of the oral tradition in *A Short History of Irish Literature*. Archetypal imagery and mythological heroes will, of course, be found in both. Anderson's "An Ohio Pagan" might well be discussed in this way since it deals with a descendant of Twn O'r Nant, a "gigantic figure in the history of the spiritual life of the Welsh" (*HM*, p. 315). This story has been discussed earlier
in terms of Campbell's mythic plot, but its diction echoes the oral tradition:

A sight it was to see the boy with the blood of Twn O'r Nant in his veins leading by the nose Bucephalus of the royal blood of the Patchens. (HM, p. 317)

The lilt in these lines in no way contradicts the mythic content. Thus, the oral tradition fuses with myth.

Another area for further study should concern the novels ignored in this paper, Anderson's social-problem novels. Several critics read Anderson for social commentary (e.g., David Anderson and N. Bryllion Fagin). Though such an approach severely limits a full understanding of Anderson's technique, it could corroborate the myth's social boon. Each of these socially oriented novels concerns a protagonist who, because he is adversely affected by a threatening environment, conceives of some way to make life more endurable. In Poor White, for example, the inventor turns poet and thereby provides a direction for social reform. Marching Men, as David Anderson indicates, is Anderson's attempt "to reform society in one easy swoop" by providing a hero who is martyred for his participation in social reform. These social movements, then, can be understood through the social boon the mythological hero offers society.

Perhaps another area which could be considered con-
cerns Anderson's mysticism. Because sex is one of its major vehicles, this mysticism could be studied by referring to Whitman's influence upon Anderson, an influence which can be seen, not only in their respective mystical approaches, but also in their protagonists' desires to wander across the American landscape, observing the common people, loafing and inviting their souls. *Windy McPherson's Son* is, of course, the most obvious example: As Sam wanders through various sections of America in his search for truth, he is in constant contact with laborers, farmers, country women, and other vagabonds. He sings their praises in Whitmanesque language:

"These are the Americans," [*Sam*] began telling himself, "these people with children beside them and with hard daily work to be done, . . . who toil without hope of luxury and wealth, who make up the armies in times of war and raise up boys and girls to do the work of the world in their turn." (*WMS*, pp. 244-245)

It is evident that there is nothing in Anderson's fiction which cannot be discussed through an archetypal framework. The other approaches used in evaluating Anderson's work are sometimes effective, but only up to a point. The Freudian approach is helpful in studying a particular problem, but when the critic wishes to examine a particular work as a whole, he must go beyond the psychoanalytical method to a more compre-
hensive approach. Thus, the Freudian approach becomes a small facet of the archetypal approach. Similarly, the social approach can be more profitably understood within the framework of the archetypal approach; i.e., as a study of the society from which the hero emerges and to which he returns with a plan for a better way of life. The archetypal approach, then, provides the breadth necessary for a more complete understanding of Anderson's fiction.
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