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EACH FALL, Washington College welcomes to the family the incoming class of first-year students (we don’t call them “freshman” anymore…) and every fall, I am confronted by the odd juxtaposition of their youthful appearance and seasoned maturity. This year, there were 445 of them. There are probably some of you reading this who remember when the whole college was that size.

They come to Chestertown full of enthusiasm—and full of fear. They are outspoken—and they will not speak up in class. They have hundreds of opinions—and no tangible way of expressing them. They struggle with homesickness and yearn for friends and family and loved ones who are far away. They try and figure out who they are and who they want to be. Over the course of their four years here, they overcome all sorts of things: the fear, the homesickness, the inability to speak their mind. We the faculty watch them grow and evolve into remarkable citizens and then we cry when they leave us. But we know that
they will thrive, and come back to visit us because as everyone
knows, Washington College puts a boomerang into your hat at
graduation and somehow, you wind up back here at the most
unexpected of times.

I was thinking about these students when looking at the
projects of the artists Mike Komar, Karen Hye, Sarah Sheppard
and Karly Kolaja. What is extraordinary about the work that
they submitted for this issue is how they capture the essence of
a liberal arts education, a quality the first years find for them-
selves during their time in Chestertown. From those intimate
moments of friendship to the discovery of the intersection be-
tween art and psychology to the power of a dress in expressing
the environmental challenges our planet faces to the ultimate
revelation in Kolaja’s “I Am,” the art in this issue reflects the
growth of a student from their first year to their last. And the
amazing thing is that this issue contains not only the visual
representation of that, but also the textual. From delicate poetry
to personal narrative, from philosophical musings on humor to
explications of a statue and short stories to an investigation of
one’s own education, our students, from all classes, have found
ways of expressing who they are at this moment in time.

I want to thank my fellow editors—Professors Jehanne
Dubrow, Andy Helms, Matt McCabe, Mindy Reynolds and
Ricky Sears—and the outstanding staff in the College Rela-
tions office for their guidance, assistance and supervision of our
student editor. Erica Walburg, this year’s editor, has an incred-
ible eye for design and text as a result of her double majors
of Art and English. She brought to life the incredible images
of the artists and deserves all kinds of future success; she is
outstanding in a hundred different ways. As always, I thank
the Wednesday night support group (especially our youngest
members) and the Drama department for patience and per-
pective.
The arrival of a new president—Mitchell Reiss also arrived with those 445 students—marks yet another opportunity for all of us part of the Washington College family to grow, adapt and evolve. Just like our students. It’s exciting.

I hope you enjoy what they have come up with.

Michele Volansky
Chestertown, MD
November 2010
AS WE go through life, people often label us in one way or another. Some labels we accept and embrace, some we hate and spend years living down. But how would we describe ourselves, if given the chance? I asked a number of people from all walks of life to complete the sentence “I am _____,” using one or two words that they felt described them best. They displayed their own “labels” on a sign and posed for me. When the photographs were displayed, I introduced the series starting with a picture of myself holding a sign that read “I am.” The series of portraits followed. The photos were shot with a Canon digital rebel, and were printed on black and white pearlescent paper for the exhibition.
PEOPLE TEND to recognize humor when they hear it or see it. We respond with mirthful laughter to jokes and humorous situations, and often as a group. While it can and has been argued that this shared humor is the result of some evolved social or biological function, it does not seem unfair to assert that most people, with the exception of those who not just proverbially “have no sense of humor,” have at least a provisional working understanding of what humor is. As many philosophers have demonstrated, however, such knowledge is not easily translated into theory. We may experience humor, as sometimes demonstrated by laughter, but when asked most of us will not be able to explain why the cause was funny. Similarly, the three classical philosophical theories of humor—superiority, incongruity, and relief—attempted to define the phenomenon that is humor, but there theories have been rebuked almost as much as they have been utilized. Regardless, the fact that some comics are critically acclaimed while others fail, some comedies become classics and others are forgotten, and some jokes are repeated countless times as others fall flat, seems
to suggest that we have at least some common understanding of and appreciation for humor, and that implicit in that is a shared understanding of how we define it.

Just as perplexing and abstract as discussion of humor, yet more widely discussed by philosophers, is the concept of religious faith, specifically the belief in the Christian God. Consider the following thought experiment. God is, if the Bible can be granted as accurate, as it is for Christians, the all-powerful creator of the world who is not only omniscient, but also the image in which mankind was created, that sent His own son to us in order to be crucified, to forgive the sins of mankind, that we might all go to heaven. This brief summary is enough to send both atheists and theists spinning, but is not the focus of this paper. Rather, the focus is on a trait the Bible does not mention explicitly that has curiously made its way into the mainstream media and humor discourse. This element of interest is the question of whether or not God has a sense of humor. While it is admissible that even if God does have a sense of humor, His astounding nature would necessitate that it be radically different from our own, the fact is that this question is being taken up by humans, who have no choice but to see humor through the lens that we ourselves use to determine if a joke is funny. We do not have access to God’s mind-set. Thus, if we can temporarily allow for the existence of God as Christian canon dictates, and consider the debate of what the state of God’s sense of humor is, what can we then learn about the way that we ourselves see humor? If we say that God must have a sense of humor, yet none of the standing theories of humor allow for this, then how must these theories be amended? Further, what does the very fact that we popularly hold that God has humor, with or without concrete evidence, say about the way that we think about humor in general and what it means to us?

In 1999, a Christian-aimed comedy called *Dogma* was released. The film opens with a disclaimer warning audiences not to take that parody of the church too seriously, noting “even God has a sense of humor. Just look at the Platypus.”¹ This example of the little animal that seems to combine mammal, bird, and reptile
is often referenced as a sign of God’s good nature and humor, but *Dogma* is far from the only cultural icon that has referenced God’s sense of humor. The television program South Park has made similar suggestions, as in the following:

> It is sometimes hard, in times like these, to understand God’s way. Why would he allow nine innocent people to be run down in the prime of their lives by a senior citizen who, perhaps, shouldn’t be driving? It is then that we must understand, God’s sense of humor is very different from our own. He does not laugh at the simple “man walks into a bar” joke. No, God needs complex irony and subtle farcical twists that seem macabre to you and me. All that we can hope for is that God got his good laugh and a tragedy such as this will never happen again.²

Both of these references are jokes, but they are not necessarily insignificant. In his discussion of jokes, Ted Cohen writes that there are two kinds of jokes, pure and conditional. Pure jokes are those that can be appreciated by anyone, while conditional jokes require the audience to have some kind of background, either hermetic or affective.³ Hermetic jokes cannot be appreciated unless the listener has some kind of “special information,”⁴ while affective jokes are slightly different in that they demand an “attitude or prejudice.”⁵ Further, Cohen argues that jokes reinforce communal bonds through the intimacy that comes from laughter, as it is highlighted by the need in regard to conditional jokes to be a part of the group to even understand the joke, which serves to further emphasize the confines of that faction.⁶

This theory is relevant in reference to God’s sense of humor in two important ways. First, the jokes above that reference God having a sense of humor cannot be pure jokes, because they would not be appreciated by an individual completely divorced or unfamiliar with Christianity and the concept of God. Whether this requirement is hermetic, meaning the listener has to know some-
thing about God, or affective, in which case they have to believe something about God, is inconsequential. In either case, especially since in terms of religion it is difficult to differentiate between fact and belief, there is a shared understanding underlying these jokes. Second, drawing in the communal element of joking, if jokes are told to bring people together, and these very successful comedies see fit to do so by referencing God’s sense of humor, then that signifies that they expect to have an audience that generally shares their perspective. What we joke about says something about what we think about. In summary, clearly each of these examples is intended toward humorous purposes, but that does not preclude the fact that discussion of God’s sense of humor is on the table, and that dialogue seems to be leaning in one direction.

Similar suggestions about God’s potential sense of humor have come from within the religious community itself. GotQuestions.org, a web site dedicated to finding Biblical answers to contemporary questions, notes that, while Christian life is typically characterized by sober attitudes, God likely does have a sense of humor. It explains, “…the best indication that God does have a sense of humor is that He created man in His image… and certainly people are able to perceive and express humor.” Holy Spirit Interactive, an online self-proclaimed Catholic apostolate, builds on these sentiments saying “It makes sense, then, that God himself would also have laughter, and mirth, and fun as a part of His personality.” To summarize, a God without a sense of humor who made man in his own image would not create a sense of humor in us and, as many philosophers have tried to account for, mankind clearly does have a sense of humor. Therefore, God must as well.

Despite these suggestions, which come from a variety of sources, the debate of God’s sense of humor has yet to be taken up in a significant way by the philosophical community. John Morreall, however, in his book Taking Laughter Seriously, levels an argument according to incongruity theory that God cannot have a sense of humor. The most lauded of the traditional theories of humor, incongruity holds that we have generalized expectations of life, and “When we experience something that doesn’t fit these patterns,
that violates our expectations, we laugh.” For instance, when we see a man walking down the street, our everyday expectation is that he will continue to do so, meaning when he slips on a banana peel that we did not foresee and falls, the situation is humorous. Morreall develops this belief into a theory that describes humor as a pleasant psychological shift. It might be amusing for us to mistake our friend for an intruder when they enter our apartment, but not to expect our friend and find someone else instead; the latter “psychological shift” is not pleasant. Additionally, this shift must be quick, as in a surprise. He further argues that humor is a reflection that nothing in life is absolute, which would necessitate that it be treated with seriousness, while Christians believe absolutely in God and Heaven as serious things and so ought to behave seriously if they are remaining true to their faith. In addition, God is simply incapable of being amused, according to Morreall. Because God is omniscient, no situation can come as a surprise, thus a key qualification of Morreall’s incongruity theory is not met.

While Morreall may be confident that it is not possible for God to have a sense of humor, much of our culture, including serious members of the religious community, remains unconvinced. In an attempt to locate a justification for this, let us turn to the other two traditional theories of humor for a better fit to explain what God’s sense of humor might be like. Superiority, notably advanced by many including Plato and Hobbes, holds that humor “is caused either by some sudden act of our own, that pleases them; or by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another…” Put more simply, we laugh when other people do stupid things that make us feel better about ourselves. Recall that God, in contrast to humans, is all-powerful and perfect. Therefore, there is no reason that he should not always feel superior to the follies and shortsightedness of man. He would then have grounds to be laughing constantly. Aristotle characterizes the individual who laughs too easily as a buffoon, and La Fave suggests that such a person would be considered insane, rather than as someone with a sense of humor. Christians who believe in the God described above certainly would not allow such labels. Further, many philosophers
including Plato believe that to laugh at the misfortunes of another, as in superiority theory, is a kind of malice. It is cruel to take pleasure from another person’s pain or embarrassment. Christians contend that “Much of what the world calls humor is not funny but is crass and crude and should have no part in a Christian’s life… Other humor is expressed at the expense of others… again something contrary to God’s word.”

Christian morality makes superiority theory un-attributable to God, who is meant to be a picture of justice and omni-benevolence, and so it must be cast out along with Morreall’s incongruity.

It seems almost farcical to address relief theory in this context, but in the interest of covering the scope of traditional perspectives it will be covered briefly. According to Freud and others, humor, or specifically laughter, is the result of a biological discharge of stored energy. When we laugh at a joke about sex, that energy is expelled by a part of us that was working to keep such taboo subjects contained. We may also laugh, for instance, when something unexpected interrupts a situation of heightened emotion, such as when a play that is just about to meet its dramatic peak is stopped by an animal wandering on stage, thus ruining its ordinary process of resolution. The energy that would have otherwise gone toward heartbreak or ecstasy is released through laughter. While humans are presumably made in God’s image, this does not include the kind of biology that Spencer and Freud used as the basis of their theories. Accordingly, a theory of humor tailored to those physiological specifications is not transferable to God.

If none of these three classical humor theories offers a way for God to have a sense of humor, then where does that leave us? It seems unfair to suggest that these theories, which have been criticized in many ways beyond the scope of this topic, carry more weight in the understanding of humor than our aggregate everyday experience. In other words, if society suggests that God has a sense of humor and these theories counter that He cannot, that is a problem with them, not us. Recall that our discussion of whether or not God has a sense of humor is a means toward evaluating our own concept of what human humor is and is wholly reliant on
our understanding of human nature because we do not have the
capacity to understand God in non-human terms. Therefore, if our
three “comprehensive” theories of humor cannot explain why God
laughs, as we believe that He does, then there is a problem in the
way that those theories represent what we believe humor to be as
it applies to ourselves as well. We need a new theory.

Roberts challenges Morreall’s argument with the end of sup-
porting the possibility that God can have a sense of humor ac-
cording to a revised incongruity theory. Rather than the surprise
that Morreall talked about as playing such an important role in
appreciation of humor, countered by God’s omniscience, he offers
an understanding of psychological shift that is repeatable. In fact,
Roberts argues, psychological shifts can be conscious, as in the
example of the pictures used by gestalt psychology.16 For instance,
the example included here can be seen as either a young woman
with her head turned or an old hag17, but probably not as both
at the same time. Rather,

the viewer sees one first
and may gradually become
aware of or have their at-
tention drawn to the other.
Having realized both, how-
ever, they may move back
and forth between the two
perspectives seamlessly. This
analogy offers an alternative
to surprise and also lends
viability to the theory, as
people are able to laugh at
the same situations or jokes
on multiple occasions. In
fact, some jokes become funnier as they are repeated, in which
case there is no surprise at all. Roberts accounts for the power of
novelty in humor through what he refers to as “freshness of con-
strual,” a change in presentation or detail that could make a joke
or story more amusing.18 This perspective of incongruity, rather
than requiring surprise, calls for the following elements: perspective of congruity, interest in the subject, and ability to maintain freshness. As was discussed in regards to Cohen, jokes are most appreciated by those who have an interest, or some relationship, with their subject. Presumably God, as the creator of the world, would have an interest in all aspects of it. Also, as a constant and all-knowing observer, He may not be able to be surprised, but that does not preclude the observation of some trends or norms (congruities). Further, Roberts argues, there is no biblical or religious reason that God cannot keep his perspective fresh, fulfilling the third requirement. Thus, this theory of incongruity is able to allow for God’s sense of humor in a way that the traditional perspectives failed to.

Before going on to draw conclusions on this subject, consider why the question of whether or not God has a sense of humor is discussed at all. More importantly, the trajectory of Roberts’ argument, as well as the design of the jokes mentioned previously, seems to suggest not only that it is an important question, but that the answer we are looking to support is a positive one. In this regard Morreall was up against not only Roberts, but also the popular discourse discussed earlier. We want God to have a sense of humor. An evaluation of why this may be the case may help us to understand more about how we think about humor and the role that it plays in our lives, making it worthwhile to consider.

The idea of God’s having a sense of humor is related to a greater tension in faith which humor to some extent helps alleviate. According to Christian doctrine, the faithful must attempt the fight against evil and temptation while aware that God and good have already triumphed. Similarly, the religious are expected to try and model themselves after Jesus, but their efforts pale in comparison to the task and all sins have already been absolved by Jesus’ death. Perhaps this is the reason that Kierkegaard referred to Christianity as “the most humorous view of life in world-history.” These incongruities are absurd and yet serious and seem irresolvable without laughter. Kierkegaard goes on to explain that humor necessitates the existence of a kind of release-valve. In other words,
we can laugh at situations of immorality because at the end of the
day we are not the ones responsible for single-handedly vanquish-
ing evil. Thus our individual burdens are lightened. We can take
matters of the faith seriously, but humor means that we do not
have to do so all the time; such a task would be exhausting. In this
regard, humor for us is cast similarly to Freud’s theory of relief,
which shows it as a way of releasing energies, in this case tensions,
that otherwise would be overwhelming.

Take, for instance, Puritans like those in Salem, Massachu-
setts, who carried their faith with themselves into every part of
their lives and watched over their own shoulders as well as those
of others for piety. It may be melodramatic to suggest that the
introduction of laughter and humor into that society would have
eliminated the demand for other means of release, such as the
hanging of countless accused “witches,” but it does not seem un-
fair to suggest that the burden of unadulterated faith is too heavy
for mortals to bear. Taking God as a model, however, did not allow
the Puritans that pleasure through humor. “Sinners in the Hands
of an Angry God,” a famous sermon delivered by Edwards, states
of the people “They are now the objects of that very same anger
and wrath of God, that is expressed in the torments of hell.” This
fire and brimstone mentality hardly encourages reciprocal light-
heartedness, but instead condemns individuals to the tensions that
were discussed above. If, however, this understanding of God were
lightened to the extent that He has humor, then man’s state would
seem to improve accordingly.

The nature of this relationship is drawn out more in play the-
ory, a fourth, more biological, or evolutionary approach to humor.
Play theory holds that humor serves an important social function;
laughter and other physical reactions associated with humor sim-
plify communications between people by acting as social cues.

The utility of humor is contingent on the presence of shared ex-
期待ations and mutual enjoyment, but when unanticipated possi-
ibilities (distinct from incongruities) do catch us off guard and we
shift in the same direction then social bonds are strengthened.
The result is a reinforced group similar to the type that Cohen
referred to explaining his conditional jokes. To draw this theory into the discussion at hand, Christians, and potentially other people, want to be a part of God’s group. Because human beings find humor as not only a useful social lubricant, but also as a kind of community glue, we seek to apply this same principle to our relationships with God. If God did create the platypus as a joke, and we see the animal and laugh because we see the same humor in it, then that brings us closer to God. But if God does not have a sense of humor, then our normal patterns of relating to one another cannot be translated to the divine.

Now for some reflections on the conclusions drawn from this thought experiment. The goal of the paper was by no means to perpetuate a belief in God and the importance of Christianity in our society. Rather, by aiming our perceptions of humor at a constructed object more removed from ourselves and seeing what bounced back, a kind of exploratory echolocation of ideas, the hope was to see how our understanding of humor crystallized through application. The Christian God, modeled in a sense after ourselves and yet elevated to an abstracted yet simplified state, seemed an ideal test case. Through a reading of the limited scholarship on this topic, as well as some thinking and theory application of my own, the following provisional conclusions were reached, or at least reaffirmed:

First, the three traditional theories of humor are not satisfactory accounts of what we find amusing. A revised version of incongruity, however, as perpetuated by Roberts, addresses some of the problems of the original theory and seems to hit closer to the mark. In addition to allowing God a sense of humor, it more practically answers the question of why we can find the same joke funny on more than one occasion without forgetting the punch line through the idea of “freshness of construal.” The fact that God is aware of and interested in everything further applies this theory to His sense of humor.

Second, it is necessary from our perspective that God has a sense of humor because that relieves the burden of stolidity from our shoulders as well as allowing us to become closer to Him by
sharing in jokes like the platypus. From this abstract thought experiment, we can deduce that, while we project these ideas about humor onto God, what becomes clearer is that we need God to have a sense of humor because we need to have one ourselves. Even without religion, our lives are structured such that we cannot afford to take ourselves completely seriously, a significance that we might miss when considering our own approach to humor directly. In the words of Morreall, “The biggest jokes I shall ever experience is me.”26 Those moments when we have reached our physical or mental breaking points are the ones when that joke is at its funniest. Humor keeps us sane.

Finally, humor keeps us sane together, a point that is made by play theory. Aristotle’s boor, the person who has no sense of humor, is described as one who contributes nothing to society.27 In order to function in community with others, we have to laugh together, which means give and take as well as mutual understanding. These are the things that helped us survive, even in today’s “concrete jungle”.

There is still a lot of ground to be covered in the philosophical enquiry into humor, but moving toward better understanding does not seem to be a lost cause. This approach of looking at where our perception of humor takes us, or how it is reflected in our actions and relations with others, seems a useful one not only in application to religions (Zen Buddhism has some great jokes), but also to the many parts of our lives which humor sneaks into.
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The Boy and the Man:
Parallel Themes and Structures in James Joyce’s
“The Sisters” and “The Dead”

ALLISON FISCHBACH

JOYCE HAS an undeniable penchant for the use of recurring themes in his short story collection Dubliners. Parallels frequently emerge between corresponding narratives, exemplified early in the collection by the exotic journeys contained in “An Encounter” and “Araby.” In close sequential relation the similarities are easy to see, but some of Joyce’s larger themes are found when two sequentially separate stories are brought into direct contrast, exposing certain parallels between theme and structure that pervade the entire collection. Perhaps the best example of the depth of this relation is found when bringing together the two stories that are farthest apart: the opening tale “The Sisters” and the closing narrative “The Dead.”

When examining these two narratives in direct relation, Joyce’s compositional timeline needs to be recognized. A decade separates the initial 1904 publication of “The Sisters” in the Irish Homestead Journal and the 1914 publishing of “The Dead” at the
end of Joyce’s complete *Dubliners* collection.¹ Based on the time span between composition Joyce must necessarily build parallels by establishing them in “The Sisters” and taking them to their extreme end in “The Dead.”

**Comparing Titles**

The most evident relation between these two narratives is the interchangeability of their titles. In titling “The Sisters” Joyce is making a reference to the Flynn sisters, Nannie and Eliza. They are the main focus of the narrative, being recipients of familial power after the death of their brother. It is they who host the rites of viewing and funeral, which gives them a semblance of Father Flynn’s role as priest. But their existence in a “house of the dead” is dark, with the body of Father Flynn lying above them and only the sparse company of the boy and his aunt for consolation. The Flynn sisters are of the opinion that there are “no friends that a body can trust” exemplifying their solitary tendency to stay in the house and their suspicions of the larger world.² Meanwhile Nannie’s very garb is clumsy and “trod down,” as expected of an old woman so far devoid of life as to fall asleep during the visit. In her actions it seems Nannie too has passed to become one of the dead, and in this mortuary of a household is found a reflection of the final narrative’s title.

In contrast the Morkan sisters in “The Dead” are developed as a mirror for the poorly clothed sisters of Father Flynn. Instead this pair embodies the liveliness of their gathering. While also elderly, these sisters are erect, and Aunt Kate is even described as “vivacious,” retaining both a visage of health and the rich colour of her hair.³ They have energy enough to host the dance, dinner, and sing, appearing lively and personable. The sisters Morkan evidently enjoy the life of social ritual and company in a way the Flynn Sisters do not, especially their own company as sisters, reflecting the opening narrative’s title.

Joyce further confounds the titles by using the name “Morkan” in “The Dead,” alluding phonetically to the Latin prefix *mort-*,
meaning death. It is a conspicuous name relating directly to the title of the narrative, and for two ladies who appear so vivacious the name is strangely morose, perhaps better suited for the solemn sisters of the opening story. Should the Flynn sisters be named “Morkan” there would be little surprise, but Joyce uses the name to draw comparison between the narratives. Joyce seems to say that although the Morkan sisters are still quick they are also like the Flynn sisters, close to death.

The interchangeable titles links the stories at a nominal level, paralleling the repeated motifs of the two narratives and drawing one of the most obvious ties between the opening and closing of the collection. Joyce titles the last story “The Dead” not only because it is the last, but because it takes themes found also in “The Sisters” and reaches out to finish their exploration.

One of these thematic parallels is Joyce’s use of ritual. In both stories, comparison between the depictions of social gathering leads to the development of various examples of a running theme. “The Sisters” introduces the ritual of the funeral viewing, which is a bleak occasion, lacking any comforting verbal or physical contact. The boy’s reservation towards the occasion is best reflected in his refusal of the proffered crackers and wine, denying his hosts’ hospitality and rejecting their rites as ladies of the house.5 Meanwhile in “The Dead” the traditional winter dance hosts a rich layout of sustenance and the welcoming practice of auditory arts, which builds a sense of enjoyable joviality. This contrast is but an introduction to the deeper sense of ritual and social contact Joyce threads throughout both narratives.

“The Sisters” first introduces ritual as something solemn and religious in nature. Father Flynn’s viewing is threaded with allusion to Christian tradition from the monastic connotations inherent in the term ‘sisters’ to the communion-like atmosphere of crackers and sherry.6 Not only is the scene without joviality, it is overtly religious in nature, establishing both the act of hosting and the act of eating within a larger spiritual framework of firm solemnity. The norms of social behavior in this situation are strong, compelling the boy to follow them.
But Joyce refuses the compulsion to follow the course of the ritual, causing the boy to deny the sherry and crackers offered to him. The scene is host to a symbolic communion founded on the image of white cream crackers and sherry wine, making the sister's proffered food a symbolic act of spiritual nourishment and vitality. The boy's refusal paints the already dismal ritual in an even more negative light, denying the sanctity of the custom. He is not willing to receive either spiritual or physical sustenance from the sisters, which Joyce uses as a means of debasing the religious rite and destroying the ritual's intent.

Further perversion of the ritual meal is brought about through the visit of Old Cotter. Like the boy at Father Flynn's home, Old Cotter is a guest in the boy's home, reflecting the theme of visitation twice in the narrative. Here, as in the visit to Father Flynn's, food is offered and while the boy consumes it he does so not for nourishment, but fills his “mouth with stirabout for fear [he] might give utterance to [his] anger.” Old Cotter’s disparaging remarks about the Father make him an unwelcome guest and cause the occasion to lose any vestige of ceremonial action, tainting the allusion to ritualistic meal. The occasion is ruined for the boy and food perverted into a means for suppression of emotion rather than expression.

In “The Dead” Joyce builds on the same ritualistic meal by creating a parallel situation in which the two Morkan sisters, like the Flynn sisters, are host to a gathering. A main tenet of the festival atmosphere created in this story is food, the consumption of which is a communal act. It would not be inappropriate to call the dinner itself a communion, since it is an acquainted community engaging in the act of universal consumption. Joyce draws the comparison here between the boy's hesitant drink of sherry in “The Sisters” and Gabriel's silent, involved consumption of his meal in “The Dead.” Gabriel is more willing to acknowledge and embrace the social atmosphere of the party through willing and eager consumption of food. He allows himself to be nourished in a way the boy does not.
Gabriel’s toast heightens the sense of ritual and provides the gathering with comforting verbal intercourse, as the Flynn sisters neglect to do even in their prayers. Gabriel’s position as speaker elevates him from one man addressing a dinner table to the role of a priest giving sermon prior to communion. Joyce’s description of the toast includes the silent table as Gabriel stands, meeting “a row of upturned faces and [raises] his eyes to the chandelier.”9 Gabriel goes on to imagine people outside with raised heads listening to the music inside as parishioners would to a choir. The image is intriguingly reminiscent of a priest presiding on the pulpit, invoking indirect religious connotations around the meal, just as Joyce does in the symbolic communion of “The Sisters.”

This speech is prior to the act of eating, linking the use of food in ritual. When compared to the instances of meal in “The Sisters” the depiction in “The Dead” includes a much grander spread, from the snacks at the sidebar to the well-laid and plentiful dinner table.10 By placing speech before the meal Joyce is paralleling the boy’s use of food to hinder speech rather than fuel it. Joyce develops these parallels to comment on the use of ritual, first creating ritual in its most undesirable atmosphere of death and solemnity, which causes the boy to become uncomfortable and reject its sanctity.

In “The Dead” the opposite is true, as the gathering is lively and congenial, offering nourishment and entertainment, but oddly Gabriel, like the boy, pines to be away from the atmosphere of the party. He repeatedly envisions himself or others outside in the cold weather away from the stifling gathering, which in its very nature is meant to combat the chill solitude of winter.11 Joyce turns even the use of welcoming communion ritual into an undesirable activity, demonstrating in both narratives the desire to escape the paralysis of repetitive tradition through rejection of action, regardless of the positive or negative atmosphere of that ritual. It is a cycle that both the boy, for whom it is new, and Gabriel, for whom it is old, seek to escape and cannot.
Social Subversion

There is also a theme concerning social hierarchical subversion introduced by the Flynn sisters who act as the main threat to male hierarchy in “The Sisters.” They gain power over the deceased figure of Father Flynn in both physical form and memory. Nannie especially holds the power inherit in viewing the priest’s body. It is she who guides the boy and his aunt into the room and gives “the lead as [they] knelt down at the foot of the bed.” She is the demonstrative person in the scene, and her leadership of the ritual gives the old woman a certain power over the other two occupants of the room. It is Nannie who has guard of the dead and the ability to display how the living should act.

Meanwhile, Gabriel’s social submission occurs as a result of his conversation with Miss Ivors who accuses him of being a “West Briton” in reference to supporters of English occupation. In this context he is being accused of smothering his cultural tradition. His refusal to vacation in Galway, the heart of the gaeltacht, in favor of the cosmopolitan continent climaxes with a firm admission that he is “sick of [his] own country, sick of it!” The voracity of Miss Ivors disparaging conversation traps Gabriel in his sudden and rough admission of dislike for his own nation. A woman who is socially below him reduces Gabriel, like the boy, in status. He has labeled himself an expatriate in a society where national cultural pride is synonymous with high intellectual and social prosperity. In effect he has only further harmed his social standing.

The relation between Miss Ivors’ actions and Nannie’s is the desire to manipulate the form of the male in power, forcing them into traditional poses. While the boy’s pose, kneeling at the foot of the priest’s bed, is physically submissive, Joyce develops the parallel pose of Gabriel’s submission as social. He is forced into the respected and expected form of a retreat to the traditional region of Ireland rather than given the freedom to move to the continent as he wishes.

In these examples the subversion of male power is achieved by placing females in positions of power over form, but Joyce also
uses females to obtain an even more powerful position over male thought. As the Flynn sisters recount the priest’s death and state of mind at the end of his life they also display a greater intimate knowledge of him than the boy does, subverting the boy’s close friendship by the claims of kinship. While the boy dreams his relationship with the priest is intimate enough to receive the Father’s confession, the sister’s recounting of the priest’s life reveals the boy to be the least powerful figure in the priest’s life. His place as confidant is lost and he himself reveled to be lesser even than two decrepit women.

Gabriel encounters the same subversion in “The Dead,” desiring control in light of the Morkan sister’s feminine aspect, but repeatedly his power is tested and found wanting. From the moment he talks with the younger servant Lily, her disparaging comments concerning boys buffet Gabriel’s self-assurance. Rather than gently bending to his expectation of pleasant conversation Lily’s bitter critique that “men that is now is only all palaver and what they can get out of you,” not only breaks Gabriel’s expectations, but reduces the entire male sex below the youngest serving lady in the house. By insinuating men’s lecherous tendencies, Lily is openly and boldly disparaging, but inadvertently accuses Gabriel of the same transgressions by virtue of his sex. She is at the bottom of the social ladder, as are the elderly unwed sisters of Father Flynn, but in an instant she too is able to place Gabriel even lower. Both the Flynn sisters and Lily claim intimate knowledge of the opposite sex, from deeds to motives, and in doing so claim power over the inner lives of the boy and Gabriel.

In order to maintain control, the boy resorts to criticizing Nannie’s poorly dressed skirts and shoes, undermining her femininity based on her attire. By personally criticizing her appearance the boy is taking Nannie’s power as a woman and attempting to maintain a sense of influence over the situation between himself and the others in the room. At the same time, Gabriel uses monetary wealth to fight through the struggle with Lily, attempting to pacify her anger and restore his control by giving her a coin. As the boy is placed against the elderly woman, so the man
is placed against the young girl, paralleling thematic structure, but Joyce’s use of an adult male at the end as a foil for a young male in the beginning highlights the idea that both males are in the same situation regardless of age difference. Each is trapped in the same struggle for power and loss of power over members of the opposite sex, regardless of maturity. Age does not mean power, Joyce seems to say, but the struggle for influence is lifelong.

The boy and Gabriel occupy similar roles in the subversion theme, wrestling with their manipulation by the opposite sex, but the final social subversion comes not from the females in the situation, but from other males whose threat is unforeseen in the struggle to fight against the female force. The boy in “The Sisters” does not take kindly to the subversion of male power, for in the priest’s wake it is he who gains final authority. He is the young, vital male figure groomed to take the place of the priest in his intellectual field of spiritual authority. Now that the priest is rendered impotent, the boy feels “a sensation of freedom as if [he] had been freed from something by [the priest’s] death.” His freedom is from the overhanging power of the priest, and the boy can fill his place without conflict. In his struggle with the sisters’ control he is transformed into the chief power by outliving the sisters as he has already outlived the priest. The boy is the victor in this struggle for authority, displaying the young male against the elderly male as the final subversion of “The Sisters.”

For Gabriel the subversion is the sudden knowledge of the young Michael Furey, who while dead still lives in Gabriel’s wife’s mind. Michael Furey appears as a vital force in Gabriel’s relationship with Gretta because of Furey’s form of eternal youth. Gabriel is subject to the progression of time and laments that the dead boy will not “face and wither dismally with age.” Michael Furey is forever “A young man standing under a dripping tree.” The boy who is forever young in memory is a vital threat in the face of Gabriel’s encroaching age and eventual death. Before his knowledge of Furey, Gabriel feels a swell of emotions, but that feeling is lost to the final subversion of power in the relationship between
himself and his wife. Gabriel succumbs to the powerlessness of his position when physically lying in bed, yielding to the course of his aging paralysis while his mind wanders on its own “journey westwards.”

Gabriel is the impotent male authority in same manner as Father Flynn. Both are usurped of their power first by women, but ultimately by the younger generation, represented by the boy and Michael Furey. Joyce’s parallel construction of these two stories first presents the dead being overpowered by the living in “The Sisters.” He continues this theme in “The Dead” by creating a situation in which the living are confronted by the dead. Impotence is met with young voracity; the unforeseen future comes to push the aging towards the inescapable realm of death.

Repeated Imagery

Both “The Sisters” and “The Dead” utilize the common chiasmic framework of Joyce’s prose. This type of symmetry is evident in both narratives through the repeated opening, central, and closing images. In “The Sisters” this repeated image is of Father Flynn, his body and memory of his life. This structure uses the end action to recall the climax and the opening of the narrative, creating a pleasing circular structure that encapsulates the narrative in itself. There is no progression from one stage of thought to another, but rather the end of the story finds itself in the same place as the beginning. This type of construction limits the story, trapping it in a circle, exhibiting Joyce’s tendency for stasis in the very development of plot.

The chiasmus developed in “The Dead” is similar, if more intense and intricate, bringing focus to the use the image of falling. The story opens with the phrase “falling flat” in relation to the party, the speech at dinner ends up “falling” to Gabriel at the story’s climax, and the falling of the snow consecutive with the falling of Gabriel’s desires at the end all reiterate the same image. The central event is Gabriel’s speech, which starts with the line “It has fallen to my lot this evening.” The repetition of the notion...
The central action in the story of "The Sisters" revolves around the thought of Father Flynn, who embodies the central fear of death. Meanwhile "The Dead" rotates around the notion of falling, which Gabriel associates with the death of his vitality in the closing scene. Neither narrative is able to break the limits established in its opening scene. Instead they stall, able only to reiterate the same action. This is all the more poignant a structure for Joyce whose preoccupation with paralysis is evident from its use in the opening scene of "The Sisters."25

Between the narratives there is an overlap of imagery that transcends the singular story. Left at the end of "The Dead" we have the image of Gabriel looking out from the candle-less, darkened window of his hotel room at the falling snow, contemplating his eventual westward journey into death.26 In relation, the beginning of "The Sisters" describes the boy looking up into the window of the priest, searching for the light of candles that signifies his death.27 The spatial placement of the two narratives and the nature of the collection make the sudden juxtaposition of the beginning and the end surprising, but the coherence of the closing and opening images give the impression that these two narratives are constructed to be purposefully related. Like the microcosm of the individual narratives' chiasmi, the entire collection repeats certain aspect of both theme and structure making the ending of the collection return to flow almost seamlessly into the beginning.

The closing and opening images are the final constructed link between what is a previously developed theme and the growth of that theme. Joyce introduces the tension between the living and the dead in "The Sisters" and reaches a final conclusion on this tension in "The Dead." Rather than being left with the boy's undeveloped thoughts, we are treated in the final of Dubliners stories to an unfulfilling yet intensely thought-provoking end, delving deeper into Gabriel than any character before him. Gabriel's final monologue brings us closer to his motives and the truth of his thought. The
young boy in “The Sisters” continues to remain a mystery for readers, but Joyce creates Gabriel to answer for that mystery. As the boy’s motives are questionable when he denied the crackers because they will make too much noise, Gabriel’s thoughts are plain to see. His life appears a sham of social attempts to keep out the dead when in reality he has been living with specters like Michael Fury the entire time. The death the boy encounters in the opening story is processed in depth in the closing, and Joyce seems to show that one day Gabriel and the boy will too be shades of the living.
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“Augustus and Marcus Aurelius: Two Men, Two Statues, Two Different Types of Rules of Rome”

Fig. 1: Polykleitos. *Doryphorus*. Roman copy of Greek original. Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Naples, Italy.
“Augustus and Marcus Aurelius: Two Men, Two Statues, Two Different Types of Rules of Rome”

Fig. 2: Augustus of Primaporta. Copy of bronze original of ca. 20 BCE, Museo Chiaramonti, Vatican City, Italy.
“Augustus and Marcus Aurelius: Two Men, Two Statues, Two Different Types of Rules of Rome”

Fig. 3: Equestrian Statue of Marcus Aurelius. Bronze. 161-180 CE. Museo Capitolini, Rome, Italy.
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Artist’s Statement

SARAH SHEPPARD

AS A CHILD I realized that I had a flair for putting extraordinary things together. Whether these objects are in a painting or in my closet, the colors, patterns, and structures of these items made me want to construct more. From taking an idea I had in my head, sketching it out on paper, to the final act of construction and completion; all of these were more of a passion than a desire to make into a career.

Yes I am an artist who doesn’t want to be an artist. Perhaps that is why my art has more texture and structure to it, for the simple fact that I want a rather structured life. Art is all around us; something that anyone can create. Therefore everyone is an artist. The idea of being able to take a simple piece of paper, apply paint and sealant to it, then forming it into a dress to wear is where my inspiration lies. My intention of this body of art is to show that fashion is fine art and that ordinary objects can be repurposed environmentally and worn, rather than collecting space in a landfill. To me life is art and art is life, and I hope to never forget that.
In my work, Sustainable Wear, I’ve taken conventional recycled materials and made them into wearable articles of clothing. The idea for this body of work came from the relationship between nature and industry, with environmental concerns and the industrial world reacting to public demands. As a double major in art and political science, my main focus for the past four years has been on environmental and clean energy policy. Thus, the notion of reworking unconventional materials into wearable art, while using all environmentally friendly materials, is the main goal for this collection. Everyone can do their part in environmentally friendly practices and this work shows that there can be another use for everything we use in our daily practices.
I AM interested in the integration of art and psychology. Over the course of the last eight years I have developed a passion for art therapy, which provides this exact integration. Through various forms of exploration—self, educational, research-based, and so on—I have been able to fuse these pursuits. My education in art therapy has given me an invested interest in the directives used to explore emotion and self-expression in varied psychological and medical populations. Through this visual thesis I was able to engage in personal exploration of the clinical applications of art therapy. I specifically focused on mask-making in order to present, discover and/or portray the conglomeration of identities I possess.

The title, “In Transit,” refers to the various transitions I have undergone over the course of my eight-year art therapy “education.” These transitions and experiences include art school in New York City, my transition to Washington College, studying abroad in South Africa and ultimately deciding where the near-future would bring me as I applied to grad schools and was rejected or accepted into grad programs. These varying experiences are able to
merge through the masks I have presented, ultimately allowing for an exploration of the juxtaposition of identity. I believe that the masks presented will likely represent identities many people did not know I had, and by creating them I was also able to discover “alters” I was not consciously aware of. Perhaps it was the material that brought these creations out, or maybe it was just taking the opportunity to sit down and allow myself to experience the act of “art for art’s sake,” something I had not done for a long time.

The work I have created is full of symbolism, which is typical of art therapy. I wanted to simply explore what I was feeling, in the same manner it would be done in a traditional art therapy setting. I allowed myself limited time (1–2 hours) and an enormous variety of materials…herein lies the results—the integration of my art, my psychology, my identity… in transit.
Tyler and Ashley
From the larger work “Friends” Artist’s Statement

MICHAEL KOMAR

MY ARTWORK reflects my life and the people in it. I don’t like to think to deeply about what I am making, just whether or not the image looks good when it is done. I think that a painting should be able to be just a painting. It shouldn’t have to have a symbolic meaning behind it or some kind of revolutionary idea. The images that I choose to paint are from moments in my own life. I don’t like to focus on the background because I feel that the image itself should be enough, anything more would take away from that. When reflecting on what I have done in the past and the work that I am doing now, it is hard for me to figure out how I got here. Not much of the work that I have done in the past makes any kind of a link to the work that I am producing now. The largest difference in my work has been my change in scale. I enjoy working big and so long as I don’t have to, I will never do a small work again.
Augustus and Marcus Aurelius:
Two Men, Two Statues, Two Different Types of Rulers of Rome

KIRSTEN HOWER

FOR CENTURIES the Greeks had been creating sculptures that embodied the perfectly proportioned human figure, exhibiting the idealized body. As the Hellenistic world surrounded and was later incorporated into the state of Rome, these traditions in art passed into the Roman world and were used for many purposes, one being the triumphal remembrance of Roman emperors using this idealistic Greek model. Even while using these standards, the Romans did adapt some of the sculpting to their own culturally confused state, adding signifying features to the sculptures of their emperors to enhance any amount of triumphal remembrance and to tell some of the emperor’s story. Two such statues that embody this Hellenistic and Roman mesh, but in very different yet similar ways, are the *Augustus of Primaporta* and the *Equestrian Statue of Marcus Aurelius*.

The Greek sculpture of the *Doryphorus* (Fig. 1) was the nude male upon which every Greek sculpture, and later most Roman sculpture, was based. This is clearly evident in relation to the *Augustus of Primaporta* (Fig. 2) in stance alone. Augustus stands in
the somewhat traditionally developed stance of *contrapposto*, which gives the illusion that the statue is moving forward and looks far more realistic than a stiff and solid statue created without it. As Honour and Fleming wrote:

> Adjustments were also made to the pose, notably by raising the right arm to a speaking gesture. By these means a highly idealized statue of an anonymous nude athlete was transformed into an image of imperial power personified by Augustus, a Greek model into what seems to be a characteristically roman work of propagandist art—though it may well have been carved by a sculptor of Greek origin.¹

Following the epitome of perfection in Greek art and using it to immortalize the ruler of a Roman-Hellenistic state was the ideal move for this statue. Augustus was known for his skills as a propagandist and this statue is a credit to that. Though the statue dates to the early 1st century AD, which was the closing years of Augustus’ reign as well as his life, it stands as a tribute and memorial to a great Roman ruler. Historians do not doubt the propagandist concept behind this statue given Augustus’ disposition toward propaganda; “Time and again he had returned from the brink of disaster, thanks to his skill as a propagandist, his ability to attract able associates, and his willingness to sacrifice any principle to one overriding purpose.”² While most rulers would most likely have commissioned a work like this in the early years of their reign, to show off their *virtus*, this statue seems more importantly commissioned at the end of Augustus’ life when he was scrambling to find an heir to his construction of the Roman state. As the original placement of this statue is not agreed upon, it is difficult to use this notion to determine any specific reference the statue blatantly intends to make, but some historians believe the statue was placed in the olive grove of the Villa of Livia to establish, with the help of the surrounding olive grove, the eternal glory of the Julio-Claudi-
Therefore, in accordance with this theory, it stands almost as a reminder to the Romans of the nobility and divine lineage of Augustus, of his military prowess and of his great oratory skills which governed the Roman state for years, a reminder that the Julian line was potentially the most powerfully but certainly the most appropriate to rule the Roman state.

The propagandist elements of this statue are most clearly seen in the iconography used in its creation. Riding a dolphin next to Augustus’ leg is Cupid, the son of Venus, who enjoys the same lineage as the Julians. The Julian family was said to have descended from Aeneus, who survived the Trojan War and founded the city of Rome. Aeneus’ son Iulus is where the Julians derive their name and their connection to the once powerful Troy. Virgil, writing during the age of Augustus, used his propagandist text the *Aeneid* to help this claim of divine lineage:

Spare your fears, Cytheran [Venus]. Your people’s destiny
Remains unmoved. You will see Lavinium
And its promised walls, and you will raise
Great-souled Aeneas to the stars on high…
But the boy Ascanius, surnamed Iulus—
His name was Ilus while Ilium still stood—
Will be in power for thirty great cycles…
From this resplendent line shall be born
Trojan Caesar, who will extend his Empire
To the Ocean and his glory to the stars,
A Julian in the lineage of great Ilus.

The dolphin upon which Cupid rides is also a reference to Venus, whose birth is linked to the sea since she was blown ashore in a shell. This divine link to Venus would serve to show that Augustus was not only divine but that he was also devoted to the memory of the god from which he took his lineage. Therefore, he was showing a certain amount of piety, which would also reflect well in the eyes of the public. The fact that the statue is also
depicted barefoot rather than wearing some variety of shoes is a common way of showing either a divine person or a divine area, and here it follows in the line of showing a divine person. This is not necessarily to say that Augustus was depicted as divine himself but that, as a dedication to his memory, he was divinely linked and would remain so even after his death in 14 AD.

The breastplate that is worn by Augustus is also iconographically important and depicts the historical event in which Mark Anthony recovered the Roman standards from Parthia with the help of Crassus and, of course, Augustus. The pair of sphinx posed on the shoulders of the breastplate is a reference to Augustus’s victory over Cleopatra while some of the other people depicted on the breastplate are representative of the peoples conquered by Augustus during his reign. As his divine lineage had already been expressed through the figure of Cupid riding a dolphin, the breastplate serves an equally important purpose to remind the viewer of Augustus’s political achievements and conquests. It also seems like a challenge to successive rulers to take just as much care in ruling the Empire and to continue a powerful and great dynastic rule.

What does this statue say about Augustus and his reign? The statue is definitely a confirmation of Augustus’s struggle to have a well-qualified heir to follow in his footsteps and to continue a dynastic rule of the Roman state. The acknowledgements of his divine lineage are reminders to the Romans that the Julian family has divine origins and that a continuation of this line would be in the best interest of the Roman state and its people. This statue’s date is not solidly established but it is dated to sometime in the first century AD, meaning that it was either completed prior to or directly following the death of Augustus; thus, it could be either a last minute commemoration of glory commissioned by Augustus himself or it could be a posthumous memorial commissioned by either a family member or political supporter who wanted Augustus to be remembered as a great ruler. Since there is no documentation to confirm which of these theories is the actual reason why this statue exists, one can only speculate, though it is clear that the statue is meant to commemorate the glory of Augustus and shows
the interest of a dynastic ruling of Rome. However, this was not the only way of portraying an emperor of Rome and his glory both as a person and as a ruler.

The leaders of Roman were not always men who claimed divine lineage and who would push for the existence of a dynasty, so that power would continue from the ruler to his heir and so forth. Every ruler of Rome had to possess two different qualities: military competence and political savvy, A balance of these qualities made for the best of rulers, and those who possessed it were known as imperators. One such imperator was Marcus Aurelius, who was considered the last of the “Five Good Emperors” of Rome and, as such, is quite different in personality and in empirical actions than Augustus.

A statue that demonstrates this different kind of emperor is the Equestrian Statue of Marcus Aurelius (Fig. 3), which depicts Marcus Aurelius astride a horse extending his right arm, similar to Augustus in his statue, but with a different mannerism. While Augustus of Primaporta stands, most likely, as a posthumous reminder of the greatness of a Roman ruler, the statue of Marcus Aurelius stands not only for the earthly glory of his reign but also of his personal greatness. Art historians do claim some problems with the statue, such as the horse and the rider being separate pieces that were then put together—the claim is because of different proportions used for the rider versus the horse—but that does not ultimately change the effect of this statue. Marcus Aurelius was one of the most memorable embodiments of Plato’s philosopher king, one who combined the best of a man with the best of a ruler, and was himself known for his own philosophical writings which are indicative of this type of “philosopher king:”

…and from him I received the idea of a polity in which there is the same law for all, a polity administered with regard to equal rights and equal freedom of speech, and the idea of a kingly government which respects most of all the freedom of the governed; I learned from him also consis-
tency and undeviating steadiness in my regard for philosophy; and a disposition to do good, and to give to other readily…⁵

The most obvious difference between this statue and the Augustus of Primaporta is the fact that it does not contain references to divine lineage that the Augustus statue readily displays. There is no apparent symbolism to suggest divinity in the statue of Marcus Aurelius: even his feet are covered so as not to indicate standing upon holy ground. This man is a man who ruled the Roman state with a more grounded sense of self, who was not as obviously driven by personal and familial glory, demonstrated in the statue of Augustus. Marcus Aurelius seemingly wanted to be remembered for more than military glory, though that is debated by art historians. It is believed that formerly there was a statue of a Dacian warrior that was soon to be trampled by the horse upon which Aurelius is seated. However, to have his right arm extended in an oratory and almost pacifistic manner seems far more peaceful than a motion that would be depicted on the statue of a man using his horse to trample a conquered enemy.⁶ Although Marcus Aurelius was a conquering emperor, he was not vicious or bloodthirsty, and this particular statue depicts him in a more peaceful manner: an emperor who conquered but did not decimate. However, there is no documentation to completely back up either claim. That is an enduring problem with both statues.⁷

Marcus Aurelius was well known for being a stoic philosopher, a great orator and a trusted and successful military genius. He was much loved by the Romans and therefore idealized in this sculpture. His attire in the statue is a further dedication to his works and actions that were a part of his philosophy:

The figure wears the chiton (short tunic), himation (long mantle), and trochades (traveler’s sandals) of a Greek philosopher. This old-fashioned outfit—symbolizing the plain, austere life of the philosopher—befitted Marcus Aurelius, who wrote in his
Meditations: “From my mother [I learned] piety and beneficence, and abstinence…and further simplicity in my way of living, far removed from the habits of the rich.”

While this quote is not directly related to the Equestrian Statue of Marcus Aurelius, it pertains to a statue in almost identical dress, The Emperor as Philosopher, Probably Marcus Aurelius, which itself is related, most likely, in subject matter to the equestrian statue. Though a philosopher, Aurelius was also a military leader for the state of Rome and this is indicated in the statue as well. The horse is an indication of power that is clearly understood even centuries later, especially in reference to a military leader. Most great leaders in history are depicted on horses, and this statue was not destroyed in the Middle Ages for representing a pagan emperor, since it was misidentified as a statue of Constantine, a Christian emperor. Though there is debate as to whether the horse was originally shown trampling a Dacian chieftain—against whom Aurelius was victorious in battle—this idea would be a propagandist tribute to the emperor’s military prowess rather than a true reflection of his persona. The horse, indicative of military prowess, and the raising of the right hand in a pacifist and almost oratory manner are appropriate for Marcus Aurelius, who is remembered for both his political and military skills.

This statue is also more appropriate to the humble persona that is remembered of Aurelius, whereas the Augustus of Primaporta is appropriate for the propagandist nature of Augustus, who had dynastic views and was interested in his own divine ancestry as well as promoting his image. There is so much that can be said about the symbolism of the Augustus of Primaporta because of the complexity of its images and the multiple references that can be inferred from the accompanying Cupid and the breastplate. This is appropriate for a man concerned with glory. However, the statue of Marcus Aurelius is so humble and simple that it makes it difficult to interpret much else from the statue save that what is written about Aurelius being a humble and philosophical ruler. This alone
speaks volumes to the variety of depictions and remembrances of Roman rulers through art rather than through the literature that survives them.

The Roman state was temperamental and constantly changing attitudes about every aspect of life, which reflected who the emperor was at the time and the way in which he acted. In some cases, there does not exist a substantial amount of written evidence to tell later generations what a given ruler was like. Thus, art was used as a primary source to understand—with interpretation and definitely a grain of salt—the possible perception of a given emperor. While there is some amount of bias that must be considered in the equation, this is just as true of art as it is of primary documents: the winner is always depicted in the best possible light, whether true or fabricated. Nevertheless, these statues are indications of the character of these emperors, specifically in this instance with the statues of *Augustus of Primaporta* and the *Equestrian Statue of Marcus Aurelius*, and the way in which they ruled the Roman state.
END NOTES


6. This can also be seen in the statue of Augustus and is especially supported by the iconography on the breastplate.

7. This statue was, however, constructed by a Roman and therefore is biased in its depiction of a Roman emperor.

8. This piece contains two references in the original article: One a note about different stances concerning two articles by Margarete Bieber—though not quoted from her—and the second is quoted from George Long’s translation of Marcus Aurelius’ Meditations. This piece is quoted from: Arielle P. Kozloff, “The Cleveland Bronze: The Emperor as Philosopher,” *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 74, no. 3 (1987): 85.
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The Break

The insufficiency of the phrase: cutting off contact. As if the cutting, the cleaving of a family were no more than the snipping of loose thread. Better, amputation of the arm or leg made simple with a butcher knife:

with shock and quickness, the cut through bone can be made almost bearable. In an unbelievable moment it’s over,

the subject will almost forget what has been lost.

CLAIRE CASTAGNERA
THERE ARE fifteen people, every Tuesday, who want to make it end.

There’s a woman who only speaks Cambodian. The witness sitting next to her, in broken English, tells us what language it is since none of us knows. The court has to phone for a translator. He arrives within an hour and presents his card. The three raise their right hand and within the structure of a hearing, by way of a stranger’s translation, the woman’s story unravels.

She wants a divorce from the man who brought her to America. He apparently has three other wives. She apparently never knew. He does not show up. She gets a divorce by default.

I wonder how Cambodians find this place. I wonder if I have ever heard Cambodian before. I wonder what it is like not to be able to tell your own story.

There are fifteen people, every Wednesday, who want to care.
There are grandparents in their mid-sixties. They follow a school schedule and recently built new bunkbeds. They probably once thought they’d be boating and golfing by now.

The woman testifying wears a shirt showing her belly, and denim jeans cut-off at the thigh. A lawyer asks her questions about the abuse charges, why her son had a black eye, and why her daughter has bruises on her ribs.

“Did you beat your children?” asks the lady in a pantsuit.

“I might have,”

Questioning continues for an hour.

“And where is their father?”

“In jail… he made a bomb.”

The people in their sixties keep custody. The case will be reexamined in a year.

I think of the kids. We never get to see their faces here because they are not allowed in the hearings. It’s probably for the better that way. She was too proud of beating them.

But a part of me wants to take them home. I would know how to love them. And I wouldn’t know the first thing about making a bomb.

**There are fifteen people, every Thursday, who don’t want to pay.**

There’s a single dad asking for the mother of his child to contribute to day care expenses. He works two jobs as a mechanic, but finds the time to help his daughter with numbers, ABC’s, and
pink tights. She’s five and has cerebral palsy. Her mother lives in another town, does not work, and has never wanted the child. She mispronounces the little girl’s name. She says times are tight; it’s too difficult to come up with the money. But a man in a suit orders her to pay a portion of what she would be making if she had a minimum wage job, and the judge agrees. She yells and stomps out. The mechanic walks away, knowing his little girl will never have her mother.

Everyone is labeled either “Petitioner” or “Respondent.” No one calls anyone a mother or father. It’s difficult when you never know who wants their children.

I realize that neither of my parents would ever be a “petitioner” or “respondent.” I realize that they’ve always wanted me. I realize that in this world, that’s not always the case.

There are fifteen people, every Friday, who don’t know how to make it work.

There’s a man pounding his fist on the conference table. It’s a family mediation session. A social worker tries to make a visitation schedule for him and his girlfriend. They have a two-year-old.

He has to work the schedule around his court dates. The front pages of the paper last month showed his picture with a story about a man running over another man with his car, on purpose. He’s facing vehicular manslaughter and assault charges.

The girlfriend screams at him about his past. He pounds his fist again, this time lunging and spitting.

The social worker wants to make sure he has a car seat installed properly, and that he’s continuing anger management therapy.
I want to make sure the enraged man doesn’t assault me. I run for the bailiff. I quickly understand how not to act around angry criminals. It’s a new lesson because I’ve never known one before.

**There’s a chair in Hearing Room 1 of the Circuit Court of Cecil County.** It sits removed from the litigants, next to the clerk, and offers a good view of the judge. It is also within comfortable range of an armed bailiff.

I sat in that chair for three months. I was an intern and it was my job to observe.

For three months, I saw the faces of family court. I heard all the voices I never knew existed in my small town. I learned all the stories that were never mine.
Lythrum Empire

Not the plague of poppies that dropped the Cowardly Lion, but a sea of purple candied blossoms, whorled leaves and swindling stalks fill the marshlands. Loosestrife salicaria lies dormant, woody root cut and regenerated, sleeping in damp soil. Weevil armies cannot destroy the stems that emerge, an explosion of pollen dust, feast for the bees. Medicine killer for the cordgrass, sweet asylum, and cattails. To kill: cut, wrap in plastic—if the problem persists, spray with chemicals for lasting effects.

ALYSE BENSEL
KNOWLEDGE IS limitless, without restriction, and without law. The formation of ourselves—of our character, spirit, and mind, should be equally free and unrestrained; free from influence and hindrance, and under our own command. These, I believe, are the fundamental ideas which form Ralph Waldo Emerson’s vision of true education, and the making of cultured men and women. He envisioned a student who is free and who gains knowledge not only in academics, but also in the most essential subjects: the world, the life that inhabits it, and perhaps most importantly, himself. This knowledge comes to him in many ways, through his experiences, his surroundings, and the company he keeps—or does not keep. Though Emerson makes no direct reference to the concept of home-schooling, it may easily be said that his vision of education is akin to the principles upon which it is built. He recognizes the importance of freedom in education, the influence of the home, which he refers to as “a school of power,” and of society, on the development of the mind and character. Though first conceived in the nineteenth century, his writing applies to
this day and remains a great influence on how we view education today. Through his beliefs concerning education, we may well come to recognize the limitations of the current schooling system, and better understand and appreciate the advantages and the potential of home-education and, I believe, its ability to foster the unrestrained growth of the mind, soul, and character.

Emerson was born in Boston, Massachusetts in 1803. Over the course of his seventy-nine years, Emerson wrote many of the most significant and influential essays regarding education and the importance of the individual self. Among his most famous works are “Nature,” “American Scholar,” and “Divinity School Address,” in which he writes on the importance of man’s relationship to the world, on the development of the free and independent character, and on the need for new thinking in both the religious and educational realms. Emerson was also one of the leading founders of the Transcendentalist movement, and established its main publication, The Dial, in which his and the works of several now well-known authors were published, among them Amos Bronson Alcott, Henry David Thoreau, and Margaret Fuller. Emerson was, it may be said, one of the most influential writers of the 19th century.\(^2\)

In “American Scholar,” Emerson focuses on what one requires to become what he has named Man Thinking; that is, the embodiment of true knowledge and understanding in one who looks closely at the world, thinks for himself, and learns from everything around him. Emerson’s vision of education puts the world itself is the Scholar’s teacher. It is this world, he writes, whose “attractions are the keys which unlock [our] thoughts and make [us] acquainted” with ourselves.\(^3\) In everything that exists outside of us, there is something for us to learn. The world provokes us into thought and helps us come to know who we are. When everything around us becomes our teacher, there can then be no single place of learning, no set amount of time in which one must study. Instead, the experience of learning “goes forward at all hours.”\(^4\)

There is a regrettable difference between education today and Emerson’s vision of what it ought to be. Though most places
of schooling strive toward creating the well-rounded individual—and some succeed at this, should the students have a strong enough desire to become learned—there are still many concepts that the system fails to grasp. Emerson writes of the connection between nature and the young learner, and suggests that they fit perfectly together; one is a component of the other. “To [the] school-boy under the bending dome of day, is suggested, that he and it proceed from one root; one is leaf and one is flower; relation, sympathy, stirring in every vein... nature is the opposite of the soul, answering to it part for part.” The “school-boy,” when surrounded by nature, becomes aware that it is a part of him, and he a part of it. Each is integral to the other, and in them is kinship. Emerson also suggests that a knowledge of nature leads the schoolboy to know himself, that “so much of nature as he is ignorant of, so much of his own mind does he not yet possess.” As we come to know nature, we come to know ourselves. “In the woods,” Emerson writes in *Nature*, “we return to reason and faith.” That is to say, nature centers us, and reminds us of what is real, significant and true. The faith that he alludes to is most likely spiritual faith, or the trust that man feels in a greater being who controls all and in whom all things find purpose. Often, when in nature and surrounded by the evidence of a great and powerful creator, one feels the presence of divinity. In addition, faith, that essential thing so hard to define and so frequently lost to us in our preoccupations, is strengthened and returned to us. In the commonly unnatural and man-made settings of everyday life, however, the beauty and divinity of nature is concealed, and we are not able to see it or to feel it. Because nature reminds us of what is truly important, and returns our faith to us, we must never allow ourselves to become, or to think that we are, separate from it.

The relationship between man and nature, the importance of nature as our teacher, our inspiration, and the conduit through which our faith is renewed, is often overlooked and undervalued in many of today’s schoolhouses. Students are rarely taught in, or by, the natural world. Instead, they learn in the unnatural setting of a classroom, where, more often than not, their interest in things
beyond books gets pushed aside and is considered superfluous to their education. What is considered most essential to know is what will be on their next exam, and faith of any kind seems of little importance. Emerson reflects a dislike for this mentality in which learning becomes limited. He writes that: “The book, the college, the school of art, the institution of any kind, stop with some part utterance of genius. This is good, say they—let us hold by this. They pin me down. They look backward and not forward.”8 Emerson recognizes that all institutions, which are meant to expand the mind or the talent of man, stop just short of true brilliance, and settle for a somewhat undeveloped intelligence. They do not let the mind travel as far as it could—or as far as it should; instead of being free to completely learn and discover for itself, the mind, as Emerson writes, is “subdued by the drill of school education.”9

In contrast to those who learn in a schoolhouse, those who are home-schooled are often more able to explore their interests and expand upon their knowledge in many different areas and in many different ways. Learning is continuous, and not constrained by, nor confined to, a school’s curriculum and schedule, by the opinions of a teacher, or by what is conventional; instead, it is boundless. That is not to say that any sort of curriculum should be rejected. Rather, it should not be restricted to certain subjects, and nothing should be considered more important to the student’s education, and development as a human being, than the fostering of his interests outside of academics: it is these which make him himself. Unlike the student who must go to school each day and spend his hours not of his own accord, but restricted by a particular schedule, he who chooses to learn in freedom can close his books at any time, without being told to open them again. He can do what he will with his time, and answer whatever calls to him; he can gain wisdom from the whispering of the wind, or sit for hours and study the birds of the air, whose seemingly simple lives make him appreciate the beauty and complexity of his own. This student is a student of the world—he allows it to teach and influence him in ways no man or book ever can. He lives and learns in an environment that fosters the growth of Man Thinking, and I believe this
life and way of learning is very near to Emerson’s own vision of what the education and development of man should be.

In his lecture “Education” Emerson writes of his views on the practices of education—what they should and should not be—and describes his personal feelings toward compulsory education. He writes that he “suffer[s]” when he sees “that common sight of a parent or senior imposing his opinion and way of thinking and being on a young soul to which they are totally unﬁt.” His use of the word “imposing” in reference to education echoes perhaps the most central belief in home-schooling—that is, that learning ought to be free, and the student in control, rather than forced “to warp his ways of thinking and behavior to resemble or reﬂect” the ways of another. Should a certain way of learning or thinking be imposed in this way, Emerson believes that “the genius of the pupil,” will be sacriﬁced, along with “the unknown possibilities of his nature, to a neat and safe uniformity.” That is to say, what makes the student himself, his innate character and person, may be lost entirely, in forfeit to uniformity. It can be said that this uniformity is the enemy of individualism. In place of men so imposed upon that they become something they are not, and are no longer their essential selves, Emerson would have those “whose man-hood is only the continuation of their boy-hood, natural characters still…and not that sad spectacle with which we are too familiar, educated eyes in uneducated bodies.” He would have us stay true to our elemental spirit and character, rather than have us become like those who possess knowledge of the mind, but not of the heart.

In “The American Scholar,” and in his “Divinity School” address, Emerson writes of the value and necessity of a life of action in creating the scholar whose knowledge goes beyond academics. Emerson implies that a man cannot be a true scholar, or see the real beauty and signiﬁcance in the world, unless he has gone into it and experienced life for himself. If he does not, then the world which “…hangs before the eye as a cloud of beauty,” cannot truly be comprehended by him. Our disadvantage, should we live separately from the world, is that it will not only be left undiscovered by us, but that we will not be enriched by it, nor discover ourselves
through it. Emerson writes that we “learn immediately from any speaker how much he has already lived, through the poverty or the splendor of his speech.” 14 Emerson speaks of the formalist preacher in “Divinity School” who, because of the emptiness of his words, seems to his listeners far less real than the snowstorm taking place outside his parish window. 15 It is largely our experiences in the world that builds our character and help us to know more of others and of ourselves, and they serve to animate our words—without them, our speech is devoid of life and meaning.

It is not only our experiences, however, that builds our character and through which we become truly knowledgeable—it is also the setting in which we live and learn each day. Emerson recognizes the importance of the home as a place where the individual spirit can be fostered, and where man may become learned in more areas than the schoolhouse provides. He writes in his lecture, “Home” that “by keeping house [we] go to a universal school where all liberal and all useful knowledges are taught [to us].” 16 It is clear from this line that Emerson believes the home setting itself to be a sort of school, where we are taught without limitation, and all the knowledge that we gain therein is of use to us. Emerson describes some of this essential knowledge when he writes that: “in the lowly household routine spring the sacred relations, the passions that bind and sever. Here [we] shall learn poverty and all the rich wisdom that its hated necessities can teach. Here the affections glow. Here the last secrets of character are told.” 17 The home is a setting in which the individual can cultivate his true self, where his inherent nature and character can develop without influence or interference, where he can become well formed in thought, action, and emotion, and where he can become cultured.

Emerson writes of the importance of culture, saying that it “make[s] man a citizen of the world, at home in nature.” 18 His concept of the cultured man suggests not only one who is well-rounded, but who is also part of the world, so much so that nature, that entity which is always thought to be separate from man, becomes his home and place of greatest familiarity. The acquisition of a cultured self is perhaps made easier in the home setting, in which
one can be exposed to many different aspects of both humanity and nature. He is not exposed each day to one kind of culture, society, way of thinking, or way of living, as those who must learn in the limited atmosphere of the schoolhouse. Emerson suggests that, “the progress of true culture is yet to be felt in public and private Education.”19 It may be said that he believed the schoolhouse setting to be restrictive in the development of the truly cultured man. “And so,” he writes, “let the student, having learned how to use the household as his school, value it above all things.”20

Emerson is aware that society also plays an important role in the education and culturing of men. He writes that “Friendship is an order of nobility; from its revelations we come more worthily into nature. Society he must have or he is poor indeed.”21 This suggests that we are enriched by our friendships, and through them we learn more of the world, and can then enter into it on a more equal or worthy footing. Many question the social aspect of home-schooling, or rather, they feel a concern that there is a lack of society. This concern is unfounded, however. A student may be taught from the home, and have all the fullness of society that others enjoy and by which they are benefitted—there are other modes of societal interaction that exist outside of the schoolhouse, and which offer the same opportunities for friendship and social growth. As I was home-schooled for all of my young education until attending college, I write with experience when I argue that I was never lacking in the companionship of true friends, nor did I spend my time in solitary study. Rather, I was a member of several clubs and sports teams and did many things outside of the home, where I met and befriended like-minded people of all ages. Choosing not to attend a certain schoolhouse at a certain hour did not mean choosing to give up the enrichment of society and the friendship of others; to me, it simply meant choosing freedom.

It may also be argued, however, that a certain amount of solitude, or small measure of separateness from others, is beneficial to man. Emerson writes that, “if circumstances do not permit the high social advantages, solitude has also its lessons. The obscure youth learns there the practice instead of the literature of his vir-
tues; and, because of the disturbing effect of passion and sense, which by a multitude of trifles impede the mind’s eye from the quiet search of that fine horizon-line which truth keeps,—the way to knowledge and power has ever been an escape from too much engagement with affairs and possessions; a way, not through plenty and superfluity, but by denial and renunciation, into solitude and privation; and, the more is taken away, the more real and inevitable wealth of being is made known to us. The solitary knows the essence of the thought, the scholar in society only its fair face.”

Emerson suggests that in solitude we are able to achieve true profundity of thought. In silence, we can come to recognize what is truth, and our thoughts, no longer obstructed and obscured by the distractions of society, are able to move from bud to bloom. We are able to see not only the beauty and truth of a thing, but also what makes it beautiful, and what makes it true. A sunset becomes more than the barely noticed sign of the coming of night; it becomes the golden, dazzling farewell of the day.

In company, it seems, some of the individual may be lost. Emerson writes that, “At the entrance of a second person, hypocrisy begins. We parry and fend the approach of our fellow-man by compliments, by gossip, by amusements, by affairs. We cover up our thought from him, under a hundred fold.” In the midst of others, we do not always act ourselves. Our thoughts, words, and actions are rarely genuine. The student who learns in the home may seek solitude at any moment, so should he choose—he is not required to be in a certain classroom at a certain time. He may allow his thoughts to travel on their own, until they come at last to the end of his mind’s inquisitive path. They will not be interrupted, nor his personality altered or influenced, by the near constant presence of others.

It can be argued that becoming Emerson’s definition of the truly educated is possible, even should one be taught in the schoolhouse setting, and that home-education may not be fitting for us all. I am sure that many greatly prefer a highly structured educational system to the more lenient and self-controlled methods of home-schooling. It is my opinion, however, that Emerson would
have wished for us all to learn in freedom, and not according to a system conceived by those interested mainly in the institution, and not in the individual. He poses the question that many would ask in regard to his conceptions of schooling, saying: “Would you verily throw up the reins of public and private discipline; would you leave the young child to the mad career of his own passions and whimsies, and call this anarchy a respect for the child’s nature?”

Emerson’s answer can be seen in his writing. As for my own answer, I would say, most definitely, yes.
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I’m eight in the back seat of a honda minivan
the hot dry air flying in my face full of dust
rolling leather and jacked up jack rabbit excitement
my brother is twelve
he is reading books while I bop around on the back seat
and I’m too full of bounce to sit still or comply
with his pleas for a moment of stillness
we’re headed out west
I think iced tea is the most sophisticated drink
as I watch mom in the front seat sipping it from a clear
plastic cup smiling at my thrill
and dad is driving winding
miles on black asphalt etched battered into the sand.
hot apples bake in the back seat when we leave the car
right where I was sitting now squats a shriveled little fruit
so much like a head I have to hold it up and laugh
and dad draws an impish face on its skin
this morning and night the road reaches ahead of us scouring
the terrain and leading us through I’m not scared
but as we snake down a curly-cue mountain I sit back in my seat
this trip reminds me that I am small

years from now I’ll read on the road and hear clint eastwood’s
voice in a spaghetti western nothing will seem so true
as this — that every good thing is out west every moment
heading back forward to that place
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