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Faculty Forum President’s Letter

by Mark Bingham

Every summer brings us back to the same old new beginning, doesn’t it? Welcome—or welcome back—to the burdens and opportunities of a new academic year. Like last year’s fall semester, and the one before that, this new start offers all of us the hope that we can accomplish more, that we can leave deeper dents in that remarkably resilient shell of ignorance, that we can help more students discover their latent curiosity, that we can turn our words and gestures into more potent weapons of mass instruction. May all of us who constitute the Union faculty find ways to support one another as we begin again trying to do—even better this time—what we do.

Enjoy this journal, which offers samples of the excellent scholarly work being done by Union’s own. These essays challenge all of us to aspire to such excellence, and they can inspire us to turn aspirations into accomplishments. I hope you will listen thoughtfully to the voices heard in this volume of JUFF; I encourage you to consider seriously letting us hear your voice in the next volume.

Of course, JUFF is just one of the ways in which Faculty Forum gives faculty voices a hearing. In past years, many of you have participated in the Forum’s regular meetings, raising questions, offering praise and blame, deliberating seriously about issues affecting our common enterprise—in short, helping the Forum fulfill its purpose, “to provide a means for the faculty to express its interests/concerns to The Greater Faculty and the Provost, and to make recommendations about issues affecting Union University.” I am convinced the Forum serves vitally to facilitate clear communication between faculty and administrators. Indeed, it may offer the best means for us as faculty to hear one another.

As you set goals for the new year and decide which claims on your time deserve to be written on your calendar in indelible ink, I hope you’ll make Forum a high priority. The other officers for 2000-2001 (Bryan Dawson, Vice President; Terry Weaver, Secretary; and Roger Stanley, JUFF Editor) share with me a desire to serve the entire faculty. By lending your voice to the Forum, you can help the faculty formulate and articulate its recommendations. Please help us, and help Union, through your involvement in Forum this year by letting the officers know of issues that should be discussed, and by participating in those discussions.

I look forward to hearing from you—both in Forum meetings and in future volumes of JUFF. Let’s work together to make this year even better...
A Word from the Editor

As you carve out time from a busy administrative, trustee, or faculty schedule to read some (or all!) of the fine prose represented in this latest manifestation of our in-house publication organ, I hope you will note how each of this year’s six faculty contributors seeks an integration of faith and learning within his or her given discipline. The intersection of the traditional and the modern might be a further commonality in these latest research offerings from professional librarians, social and natural scientists, and historians.

Note how biologist Wayne Wofford finds transcendence in one of the basic material building blocks of our universe, urging us as twenty-first century consumers and citizens to be good stewards of God’s ages-old creation. Library director Steve Baker then parleys his interest and graduate-level coursework in history into an article which finds “social and political implications” for all eras and nations in revolutionary England’s struggle with millennial and eschatological issues so key to us at the start of a new century. Historian Terry Lindley makes perhaps the most overt connection between the traditional and the new with his study of denominational politics and the legacy of mid-late twentieth century countercultural movements.

In her examination of a recent dramatic work by a living legend of the stage, librarian Melissa Moore finds contemporary relevance in family and marital relationships, an area explored by writers of all theological ilks for centuries. This is followed by economist Walton Padelford’s efforts to show how a Lutheran pastor and theologian inclined toward meditation and asceticism felt compelled to enter the public and political arena under the menace of Hitler—surely an area of research relevant to Union’s prospective new major combining economics, political science, and philosophy. Finally, art historian Karen Mulder alternates between the worlds of the medieval European and the contemporary Southern Bible Belt in her application of the traditionally iconic to the violent prose of one of the twentieth century’s greatest writers.

Thanks again to College Services, especially Marjorie Richard, for being more than mere "glorified proofreader"—for in fact playing a large role in organizing and presenting this publication. For funding, appreciation once more needs be given to the office of the Provost.

And I know you join me as a corporate body in both mourning and rejoicing the passage of Ken Hartley earlier this year into a new kingdom. I have many memories of his kindness, most notably when pulling summer short-term teaching duty with him my first year at Union, in 1991. Ken’s concern for a student enrolled jointly in my composition class and his music theory course was reflective of his student-centered mission—and encouraged me heartily in finding the appropriate classroom tenor for my new job. We miss him.

RS
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The Water of Life

by Wayne Wofford

And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. Genesis 1:20

Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. John 3:5

Before you start reading this article, you need to get yourself a “visual aid.” Go get a glass of water and set it in front of you. Now, examine it closely. Your first impression may be that the water in the glass is not particularly remarkable. After all, it just sits there. Upon visual inspection, it has no color. If you try smelling it, it will have no odor. If it is pure, it will have no taste (1). Part of that first impression may come from familiarity. Water is such an integral part of our lives that we tend to take it for granted.

Yet, the water in your glass, which at first seems to be so nondescript and unremarkable, is one of the most amazing chemicals on this planet. In fact, it makes all life here possible. One indication of the importance of water to life is the fact that there is a lot of it on the earth. Approximately seventy percent of the surface of the earth is covered by water, all but about five percent of which is in the oceans. The oceans hold an estimated 1,400,000,000,000,000 tons of water! About ninety-five percent of all the animals found on the planet live in the oceans. Even terrestrial animals seem to be tied to the waters of the ocean. Your blood is very similar in its chemical makeup to that of seawater. In fact, water makes up seventy to ninety percent of the weight of most forms of life (2). Perhaps a more personal indication of the importance of water to life is how thirsty you get when water is not available.

Throughout the history of civilization, philosophers and theologians have contemplated the significance of water. In most human cultures, water has been used as a symbol for the passage of time and change or as a source of nurture and healing (6). To the ancient Greeks, all matter was composed of four elements: earth, air, fire and water (7). Many of the major religions of the world incorporate the belief that water is the source of life. The Bible contains hundreds of references to water. Baptists associate water with being born again, a new life in Christ, through the act of baptism.

Philosophers and theologians are not the only ones who have marveled at the remarkable nature of water. Chemists, physicists, and biologists have studied water and other closely related molecules for many years. They have determined that from a physical and chemical standpoint water is extremely unusual. In fact, it is almost unique in its chemical nature. Water has a higher melting point, boiling point, heat of vaporization, heat of fusion, and surface tension than most comparable hydrides and most common liquids (2).

Biologists have been particularly interested in how the properties of water have made life possible on this planet. Let us now turn our attention to some of these unusual properties of water and how they make life possible on “the third rock from the sun.” I apologize to the non-scientists out there who might be reading this for the inclusion of some of the physical constants
for water. An understanding of the numbers and units of these constants is not really necessary for this discussion. However, I am a trained scientist. I just can’t help myself!

Melting and Boiling Points

Water has a melting point of 0 °C and a boiling point of 100 °C. Both of these are higher than most chemically related substances, and the difference between the melting point and the boiling point of water is unusually large compared to other related compounds (3). As a result of these properties, most of the water on this planet is in liquid form, rather than as a solid or a vapor. All life requires water in liquid form.

Heat of Fusion

The heat of fusion of water (80 cal/g at 0 °C) is a measure of the amount of heat that must be removed from liquid water in order for it to become a solid, or ice (1). Water has one of the highest heats of fusion of any chemically similar compound. Because of this, a great deal of heat must be removed from water before it freezes. This slows down the freezing of the water in lakes and ponds in the winter, helping to keep them from freezing solid. This, in turn, allows fish and other aquatic animals to survive winters.

Heat of Vaporization

The heat of vaporization of water (540 cal/g at 100 °C) is a measure of the amount of heat that must be added to liquid water to convert it to vapor, or steam (1). Again, this is one of the highest of any chemically similar compounds. Thus, water takes a lot of heat with it when it evaporates. This heat is transported by circulation patterns in the air, called Hadley cells, from the equatorial regions to the Northern and Southern latitudes, broadening the zone in which water stays in liquid form.

Since it takes a lot of energy to evaporate water, it tends to evaporate more slowly from ponds and lakes on a hot day than other liquids would. This means that shallow bodies of water tend to hold their water longer during droughts and summer months, increasing the chances of survival of animals that depend on them for reproduction and habitat (4).

The high heat of vaporization of water is also important physiologically to plants and animals. As water evaporates from the surface of an animal due to sweating or panting, it takes heat with it. This cools the animal and allows warm-blooded animals to maintain a constant body temperature even when the air temperature is warmer than their body temperature.

It is also important for plants. More than ninety percent of the water that enters a plant is lost by evaporation through pores in the leaves through a process called transpiration. At first, this may seem incredibly wasteful. However, it is necessary for the survival of the plant. The leaves of a plant maximize the amount of surface area exposed to the light of the sun in order to provide the energy necessary for photosynthesis, the process by which plants make their food. When plants absorb light, some of the light energy is converted to heat. If it were not for the evaporative cooling due to transpiration, the leaves of the plant would be killed by this heat. As
a nice side benefit of transpiration, we get to enjoy some relief from the heat on a blistering hot day by standing in the shade of a large tree. The tree not only blocks the rays of the sun, but the transpiration in the leaves actually cools the air around the tree, providing natural air conditioning!

**Specific Heat**

The specific heat of water is a measure of how much heat water can hold. Water has a higher specific heat (4184 J/kg °c) than any other common liquid except ammonia (3). Thus, water heats and cools more slowly than almost any other liquid (3). This property of water is responsible for moderating the climate of the land around it. On the coast, which is adjacent to large bodies of water, the temperature does not vary much during the day. During the day, the coastal waters absorb the heat of the sun, keeping the air temperature from rising too much. At night, the heat stored in the water during the day is released from the water to the air, keeping it from cooling too much. It is not unusual for a city on the coast to have only about a 5 °c temperature difference between night and day.

In the desert, by definition, there is very little water to moderate the air temperature. As a result, the air temperature fluctuates greatly between night and day. On a backpacking trip two friends and I went on in Big Bend National Park, which is at the northern range of the Chihuahuan Desert, it was 105° F at noon. When we got up the next morning, it was 40 °F, representing a seventy-five degree temperature difference during one day! These temperature extremes pose real physiological challenges for animals living in the desert. I certainly know they did for one visitor there. I had to drink two gallons of water a day to avoid heat stroke.

This same effect also moderates the air temperature across the seasons. When I lived on the Texas coast, freezing temperatures were a novelty. In the Hawaiian Islands, which are found in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, the temperature only varies about 4-5° c from summer to winter.

The high heat capacity of water is also important to animals physiologically. Because of its high capacity for taking up heat, the water in blood is well suited for carrying away the excess heat generated by metabolism in warm-blooded animals (5). Without water to transfer the heat away from our brain cells, they would overheat and die.

**Solvent Properties**

Water is a much better solvent than most common liquids (2). Many salts and ionic compounds, as well as nonionic but polar compounds (sugars, simple alcohols, aldehydes, and ketones), readily dissolve in water. Only completely non-polar molecules fail to dissolve in water (5).

Because of its ability to dissolve such a wide range of chemicals, water has been called the "universal solvent." Of course, this is stretching the point a bit. If water were truly a universal solvent, it would have dissolved the sides of the water glass in front of you! However, water is an excellent solvent and is ideally suited for dissolving and transporting the myriad molecules found in living organisms. It transports gases from the lungs to the cells to support metabolism. It transports sugars, amino acids, and fatty acids from the liver to the muscles to provide energy.
for movement. It transports waste products to the kidney and the liver to be removed from the body.

Water also transports dissolved substances throughout the whole biosphere of the planet (3). This is very important in the recycling of materials, such as minerals, in the ecosystem. For example, runoff of rainwater from coastal areas brings critical nutrients into bays and estuaries. This is one of the reasons these areas are so productive and serve as such important brooding grounds for larval and juvenile animals.

Density

Water is approximately one thousand times more dense than air (5). The density of water provides support for the weight of large aquatic animals such as whales. This allows the whales to be as large as they are. One of the biggest problems with beached whales is suffocation, because air does not support their weight and their lungs collapse.

The density of water compared to air also means that sound, especially very low frequencies, will travel faster and farther in water (5). Because of this, whales are thought to be able to communicate vocally as far apart as three thousand kilometers (4800 miles)! This allows them to find each other during mating season.

Water has its maximum density at approximately 4 °c. As the temperature of water drops below 4 °c, water becomes less dense. As a result of this, when water freezes at 0 °c to form ice, the ice is less dense than the unfrozen water, and it floats. It is very unusual for the solid phase of a chemical to be less dense than the liquid phase.

As a result of the decrease in density of ice compared to water, freshwater freezes from the top down. A layer of ice forms on top of the water, which subsequently serves as an insulating layer that slows down the freezing of the rest of the water (5). If ice sank when it freezes, then more water would freeze at the surface and sink until the whole lake or pond was frozen solid. Thus, this unusual property of water allows fish and other aquatic organisms to survive the freezing temperatures of harsh winters.

In order for the ice to decrease in density as it freezes, it must expand. When water freezes in the cracks of rocks, the expansion sometimes causes the rocks to break apart, starting the process of erosion that converts the rocks to minerals. These minerals get incorporated into the soil, serving as vital nutrients for plants (3).

Surface Tension

Water also has an unusually high surface tension. It is surface tension that holds a drop of rainwater together as it falls through the air. Surface tension is related to the tendency for a liquid to resist an object from entering or leaving the liquid by pushing through its surface. The high surface tension of water allows small insects, such as the water strider, to live and travel on the surface of the water (5).
Dielectric Constant

The dielectric constant of water is 80 D. This is one of the highest dielectric constants of any common liquid (2).

Hydrogen Bonding

For the scientifically inclined out there, all of these very unusual properties of water are the result of the electronic structure of water molecules and their propensity for forming a special type of chemical bond called a hydrogen bond. Most substances that are chemically related to water do not form hydrogen bonds to this extent. Because of the presence of hydrogen bonding, the water molecules in liquid water have relatively high forces of attraction for each other, imparting these properties to this remarkable liquid (2).

Anthropic Principles

Clearly, from a scientific standpoint water has many unusual properties that make life possible on this planet. But is there more to it than that? Does the universe in which we exist just happen to have the right physical and chemical constants that make life possible, though highly improbable? Or does the fact that one of the most abundant chemicals on the earth is almost unique in its properties, all of which contribute to making life possible on this planet, imply a designer or a creator? These questions have been central to a debate that has been going on for some time now.

It is not just the unusual properties of water which we have examined that make life possible on earth. Scientists and other observers have also compiled lists of properties of the universe that ultimately make life possible on this planet, and perhaps on others. These properties include the gravitational constant of the universe, the strong nuclear force coupling constant, the weak nuclear force coupling constant, the electromagnetic coupling constant, the ratio of electron to proton mass, the expansion rate of the universe, the entropy level of the universe, the velocity of light, the structure of our solar system, the fact that the earth has a moon, and the relative abundance of the elements on the earth, to mention just a few (8). While we’re at it, let’s not forget about all those strange properties of water!

Collectively, these ideas are called the anthropic principle. The anthropic principle is expressed in several forms. One, called the strong anthropic principle, states that “the universe must have those properties which allow life to develop within it at some stage in its history, because there exists one possible universe ‘designed’ with the goal of generating and sustaining ‘observers.’” (9) Most people think of God when they think of a designer of the universe.

Many people have asked themselves the following question: is it conceivable that this many constants, properties and functions of the universe just happened to have exactly the right values so that life and intelligence is possible in this universe? One might be tempted to look at this and conclude that the probability of this must, at best, be very small. If it is very improbable that all these properties and constants which make life possible occurred by chance, then isn’t it likely that life did arise by design?
While this is very appealing to me personally, I have to remind myself that the anthropic principle does not constitute a proof of the existence of God. This approach was used extensively by the apologists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Perhaps there is some fundamental, underlying physical principle of nature (of which we are not yet aware) which dictates that all of these physical and chemical properties of the universe have to be what they are. Or perhaps each of these parameters could have varied over some range during the formation of the universe and by chance they just happened to get locked into their present values at the moment of formation of the universe. If they hadn’t been locked in on these values, we wouldn’t be pondering all this at this moment, because we wouldn’t be here! There is really no way from a scientific viewpoint to resolve this. We can’t back off and observe the birth of several universes to see if they always form the same way or not. Thus, we will never be able to “prove” the existence of God or an intelligent designer by use of the anthropic principle. However, it does give me a great deal of comfort to know that the universe gives the appearance of design. To me, it is also important that this leaves room for faith.

Now, let’s go back to that glass of water. It is just water: colorless, odorless, tasteless. And yet, it is so much more!

Literature Cited

Premillennialism and Calendar Reform in Revolutionary England:
Henry Jessey's Scripture Almanac

by Steve Baker

The Fifth Monarchist movement of the English Revolution has not received as much
attention from serious scholars as some other groups, such as the Levellers. There are only three
monographs aimed entirely at a better understanding of this important group.¹ Bernard Capp
suggests this is due in part to the historical disrepute with which the movement was labeled by
both contemporary antagonists and later historians.² The movement suffered most from
comparison to the tragedy that resulted after Anabaptists established their rigid form of theocracy
at Munster. That most prolific historian, Christopher Hill, seems to see the movement primarily
as a reactionary outburst stemming from the millenarian conception of history that was so
pervasive in early modern European society.³ Even in Capp’s study the movement is placed in
the context of “two currents of radicalism” during the revolution: one secular, which was aimed
at achieving liberty, and the other religious, which was focused on attaining godliness.⁴ This
may be setting up a false dichotomy which only tends to blur the reality of a society in which
ideas were in a high state of fluidity. If there were two currents of radicalism in Revolutionary
England, they were running in the same stream of consciousness. Those currents of thought may
have at times churned on either side of some island of despair, only to later mingle in a
confluence of ideas that was rushing toward the establishment of a more progressive society.

The Fifth Monarchists were a loosely structured group held together by a common belief in
the imminent consummation of the age. Scholars tend to classify them into moderate and
militant camps.⁵ Therefore, to understand the program of the Fifth Monarchists it is not only

¹ The most comprehensive treatment is Barnard Capp, The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century
English Millenarianism (Totowa, N. J.: Rowan and Littlefield, 1972). Two others of more limited use are Louise
Fargo Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum
(New York: Burt Franklin, 1911), and Philip George Rogers, The Fifth Monarchy Men (New York: Oxford
University Press, 1966). In addition, two more narrowly focused dissertations that are helpful at particular points
are Stephen Lee Robbins, Manifold Afflictions: The Life and Writings of William Aspinwall, 1605-1662, Ph.D.
Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1988, and Alfred Cohen, The Kingdom of God in Puritan thought: A


³ Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution (New York:
Viking, 1972): 77-78. To Hill’s credit this is an improvement over his earlier portrayal of Fifth Monarchists simply
the broader millenarian context of Fifth Monarchism, see Edward P. Toon, ed., Puritans, the Millenium and the
Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600-1660 (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), William Lamont, Godly Rule:
Politics and Religion, 1603-1660 (New York: Macmillan, 1969), and John Frederick Wilson, Pulpit in Parliament:

⁴ Capp, The Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 13-14. See also Murray Tolmie, The Triumph of the Saints: The Separate

⁵ Ibid., 135-137. See also Robert Michael Rogers, Law Reform and Legal Thought Among English Radicals, 1645-
important to explore its leading proponents, but also some of the lesser known individuals who operated on the movement’s fringe. Only then will the true complexity of the movement come to be fully appreciated. The aim of this paper is to undertake a partial examination of one such figure. The subject is the London nonconformist cleric Henry Jessey (Fig. 1). He either wrote or is closely connected with a number of important millenarian works during the period of the Revolution. These are the primary sources most frequently used by the scholars who have studied Jessey. Most of this secondary literature emphasizes his involvement in political events during the Revolution. More recently, Barbara Ritter Dailey has utilized Jessey’s works to examine social themes in family and women’s history. In addition to the books and pamphlets most frequently cited in these studies, Jessey authored another significant body of literature that has been largely neglected by scholars. Annually from 1645 to 1662, he published an almanac titled *A Scripture Almanack* or *The Scripture Kalendar* (Fig. 2). This particular genre of his output can provide much additional evidence for locating Jessey properly within the broader context of millenarian thought and more precisely among the Fifth Monarchists. The object of this paper will be to explore Jessey’s almanacs carefully in an effort to more securely place him within the context of seventeenth century millenarianism and the Fifth Monarchist movement.

Before turning attention to the contents of the almanacs themselves, it is important to establish the proper context of this genre during the early modern period. Both in England and on the continent, almanacs occupied a special niche in the market of the popular press. They were perhaps the quintessential mass market item of the booksellers. Standardized astronomical data in calendar form was supplemented with information about fairs, moral admonition, medical advice, farming tips, and some historical data. There was also a broad range of other material

---

6 A good example is Robbins’ recent work *Manifold Afflictions*.


11 The most extensive treatment of material from these almanacs is one paragraph in White, “Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion,” pp. 144-145.

12 Henry Jessey, *A Scripture Almanack* (1645-1662). The almanacs for the years 1647-1649, 1651-1655, and 1660 were examined for this paper.
from the practical to the sensational that might be appended by the compiler. This added material frequently contained social and political commentary.\(^{13}\) The almanac served a vital role in society that went far beyond its basic purpose as a calendar. It provided a ready means for the educational purposes of the masses.\(^{14}\) So when compilers placed their own particular political spin on the events of history or spiced their pages with strident religious polemic, they were quite aware of the genre’s potential as a propaganda tool.

The basic character of Jessey’s almanac is derived from its unique purpose. The compiler’s prefatory remarks included in each edition indicate that he aims for “the Reduction of the Months and Dayes, in their Order and Names to the Scripture-language.”\(^{15}\) The almanac was part of Jessey’s unique contribution to the reformation of civil and church structures attempted by some Independents during the Civil War and subsequent years. He advocates not only continued adherence to March as the first month according to the Old Style, but also the adoption of the Jewish lunar calendar. To this end, Jessey presents a parallel between the solar calendar in use at the time and the lunar calendar of biblical times. Furthermore, he indicates that such a parallel is offered as an interim step to accommodate “peoples weaknesse....till they can discern and speak the language used in the Holy Scriptures, and till there be a Reformation of Accounts, Names, and things to be agreeable thereunto: which is much to be longed for, and pressed after.”\(^{16}\)

Jessey, like most other millenarians after the execution of Charles, was hopeful that the Rump Parliament would move forward with thorough civil and religious reforms.\(^{17}\) It is apparent from his almanacs that he maintained an ongoing campaign in support of reforming the calendar. All of them include a good deal of polemical material aimed at the “vulgar Heathen Names” of the Julian calendar. Interestingly, the 1651 edition includes a new section which provides a more systematic defense for reforming the calendar along scriptural lines.\(^{18}\) This section became more formalized the next year when it included the names of several subscribers including the known Fifth Monarchists, John Pendarves and John Cardell.\(^{19}\) The section is titled “Five Motives for Reformation of the vulgar Idolatrous Names of Dayes and Months,” and is constructed in such a way that it might serve as a petition. It begins by arguing from the Covenant:

---

\(^{13}\) Bernard Capp, *English Almanacs, 1500-1800: Astrology and the Popular Press*, (Ithaca: Cornell, 1979), pp. 270-274. Capp’s work is a comprehensive study that examines both the historical development of the genre and its role in society.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., pp. 285-287.

\(^{15}\) Jessey, *A Scripture Almanack* (1647). Quotations from all primary sources follow the punctuation and form found in the original documents. Whenever terms or phrases are reconstructed due to illegible or missing material, this is indicated by the use of brackets.

\(^{16}\) Ibid. Scripture references at this point indicate that Jessey viewed the use of the common solar calendar to be idolatrous.

\(^{17}\) Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 53-56.

\(^{18}\) Jessey, *The Scripture Kalendar* (1651). Jessey notes that this section is taken from a book titled *Scripture Motives for Calendar Reform*.

From the Solemne League and Covenant; Ingaging us all to Endeavor—a Reformation—according to the Word of God; and the example of the best Reformed Churches: As a happie beginning hath been, in Reforming the publick Worship, and Abolishing Idolatrous and superstitious Images and Pictures, etc. So it should be in respect of Dayes and Months also.20

From this opening statement, it might be easy to infer a rather rigorous nature of calendar reform reminiscent of the iconoclasm of the period. However, it must also be remembered that Jesey was also pragmatic enough to accommodate the “peoples weaknesse."

Careful analysis of the almanacs provides much detail about the character of Jesey’s millenarian ideas and how those thought patterns influenced his views of society. Before exploring his ideas and where they originated, it is important to outline briefly the development of millenialism in the English church.21 The expectation of a future period of history in which the church reigns supreme in the secular realm was a small but not insignificant concept in the religious thought of Tudor England. During the upheavals of the seventeenth century, millenarian ideas grew in importance. By the time of the Civil War there were two competing interpretations of the millennial reign of the church. The earlier of these is referred to as postmillennialism because of its belief that the second coming of Christ will follow after the establishment of the millenium. This conception of the millennium draws on the tradition of Joachim of Floris, who was the first to develop a fully systematized millennial theology.22 The Joachim conception of the church developing progressively into a universal kingdom culminating in the return of Christ was further developed by continental divines and popularized in England through the work of John Bale and Thomas Brightman.23 Premillennialism holds that the return of Christ will precede the establishment of the millennium. This idea was developed by Johann Heinrich Alsted early in the seventeenth century and first appeared in England in the work of Joseph Mede.24 Premillennialism quickly caught fire in the heat of the Civil War through the work of Robert Maton and especially Henry Archer.25 It provided a potent intellectual framework for revolutionary conceptions of the English church and society such as those found among Fifth Monarchists.

The examination of Jesey’s almanac uncovers an abundance of material reflecting a premillennial conception of history. The table of contents on the first page always ends with a

20 Ibid.


23 Bauckham, Tudor Apocalypse, pp. 210-212.

24 Ibid., pp. 210, 238.

short expression of expectation for the imminent establishment of the Fifth Monarchy. More importantly, the last page is always devoted to the interpretation of Daniel’s prophecy of five successive earthly monarchies. The first monarchy includes the biblical city of Babel followed by the kingdoms of Babylonia and Assyria. The second is the empire of Media/Persia. The third is the Greek empire. The fourth began with the Hellenistic kingdoms of Syria and Egypt, was continued by the Roman Empire, and is present in the Catholic monarchies of Europe. The fifth is Christ’s coming kingdom. A crude woodcut image accompanying this interpretation appears to be a caricature of Charles I (Fig. 3).

Many premillennialists were obsessed with working out elaborate chronologies that attempted to pinpoint precisely the time of the second coming of Christ and the establishment of the millennium. The most influential of these schemes was Henry Archer’s *The Personal Reign of Christ Upon Earth*, which was published in 1642. Jessey was not entirely immune to this tendency. In a work published in 1650 amid the excitement immediately following the execution of Charles I, he informs his readers that “within a few years, (yea, I have hopes that within fourte years,)….That there will be such a powerful compleating.” This seems to be the closest he ever came to actually setting a firm date, and even here there is a hint of uncertainty. The basis for this uncertainty is made explicit in his sense of humility about his own capacity for understanding such things.

If some doe judge, that I have missed, or failed in this Book, (as I know I have not yet attained to what I aime at, and waite for,) I shall entreat, that by word or writing, they would informe mee wherein, and what their grounds are. And I hope the Lord will humble my heart to receive instruction; or enable to clear it from misconstruction.

There is no doubt that Jessey felt strongly that the coming reign of Christ was imminent. However, in these words he also seems to be admitting a certain degree of contingency about the coming Fifth Monarchy.

Another repeated feature of the almanacs reflecting Jessey’s millenarian thought is a section titled “A Scripture-Chronologie from the Creation.” It begins with a calculation of the time until the fulfillment of Daniel’s prophecy in the form of a typology: “From the Creation of the first Adam, to the end of the old world by Noaas Flood….are 1656 y. From the Incarnation of the 2 Adam, to the beginning of a new and flourishing World, wherein shall be a restitution of all things….tis hoped (by some) will be about the like space,...” In biblical interpretation, Adam is

---

26 In the 1647 almanac, the statement reads simply, “the Fifth is at hand.” This was expanded slightly in 1660 to read, “the Fifth of Chirsts Kingdom to come shortly.”

27 The image was present in all the almanacs studied with the exception of 1660. Since the face on the image is a caricature of Charles I, it probably had become a bit too risky to continue this affront to the monarchy.


30 Ibid., p. viii.

31 This formula statement appears unchanged in each edition examined through 1655. The 1660 edition includes a calculation that is similar but does not include this particular formula.
frequently used as a type of Christ. So here the second Adam refers to Christ, and the “new and flourishing World” is the millenium. It should be noted that the phrase “restitution of all things” is an especially important recurrent theme in Jessey’s works. Only through an examination of his other writings is it possible to get a clear picture of Jessey’s millennial thought. As a minister, one of his special interests was in developing catechisms for use in teaching. Several of his catechismal works have survived and are particularly helpful because they lay out in systematic fashion his thoughts on the return of Christ and the millennium. A good example is one section of A Storehouse of Provision where he explains the events of Christ’s second coming:

The next degree to this, will be, when Christ shall (a) personally come from the heavens above, to restore all things: and having received (b) the Kingdome that he went to receive, when he shall in his Glory Reigne (c) and judge all, according to their workes: The Saints that dyed in him (d) coming with him, he with them (e) shall judge the world namely, First, them that are (f) living, (and this for a thousand yeares)... Secondly, And then after those thousand yeares, there shall be the judging of such as were dead, and had not suffered for Christ before the time.

Jessey’s premillennial construction of Christ’s second coming is unmistakable in this passage. The important recurring phrase appears again in the words “restore all things.”

In the 1651 edition, Jessey includes an advertisement for a book dealing with the Fifth Monarchy. He then cross-references one of his own works by citing “A Storehouse, page 2. 3. Israels Redemption. Israels Rel: Redeemed.” The prophecy of the salvation of the Jews was an important interpretive construction in millennial thought in which he held particular interest. In Miscellanea Sacra, the recurring phrase “restitution of all things” is found again in Jessey’s rules for interpreting the second coming of Christ. This is a reference to Acts 3:21 and refers specifically to the restoration of the Jews to their former state. This is made clear in the same work where Jessey writes at length about Israel’s role in the course of history.

Their Restitution to the former state, or to a better condition, upon their repentance; and the Ruine of their Enemies....Now as these things comprehend the whole matter of God’s work Historically about his Church of


34 Jessey, A Storehouse of Provision, pp. 2-3. The letters in parentheses refer to biblical references in the margin of the catechism.

35 Jessey, The Scripture-Kalendar (1651). Jessey’s reference here is to A storehouse of provision.


37 Jessey, Miscellanea Sacra, p. 32.
Old, so the same things are the subject of the History, and prophecies of the New Testament, and the Design of God towards his People, untill the end of the World.\(^{38}\)

The fate of the Jews is obviously very significant in Jessey’s theological scheme of salvation history. This is not only reflected in his writings, but also in his political activities on behalf of the Jews.

Jessey developed a close association with Menasseh ben Israel, who was negotiating with Oliver Cromwell’s government for the readmittance of Jews to England. In 1655 he participated in the Whitehall Conference called to study the issue and later wrote an account of the proceeding.\(^{39}\) One recent scholar casts him as the principle campaign manager in London for Menasseh’s effort and characterizes his motivation as “Judeocentric millenarianism.”\(^{40}\) Such characterization is probably best illustrated by one passage from the preface of Jessey’s A Storehouse of Provision.

I have often bin much joyed in this, that within a few years, (yea, I have hopes, that within foure years;)...That there will be such a powerful compleating, and perfecting of the winnesse of Jesus Christ in his faithfull Witnesse, as will carry so clear evidence with it, that then, all such Tearms of distinguishing Disciples shall cease, and they shall own, and be owned each of other, as one. And then, when the Beast shall accomplish once more to scatter the power of the Holy people; for three yeares and a halfe, all these things shall be finishing. And then, in due time, the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah.\(^{41}\)

These few sentences reveal the crux of his millenarian thought. The term “Holy people” is a reference to the Jewish people. The importance of their salvation is here put into concrete terms, for it is that crucial event that ushers in the glorious reign of Christ. It is this philosophy of salvation history that provides the context not only for Jessey’s Philo-Semitism, but also for his whole program of calendar reform.

Another theological theme reflective of the Philo-Semitism within Jessey’s almanacs is the pronounced interest in the Sabbath. It is known from a contemporary biographer that in his later years he was a Saturday-Sabbatarian, at least in a private sense. Although he guarded this opinion carefully, it apparently became his practice to gather with a few other like-minded

\(^{38}\) Ibid., p. 30.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., pp. 125-126. See also Henry Jessey, A Narrative of the Late Proceeds at Whitehall (London: L. Chapman, 1656).


\(^{41}\) Jessey, A Storehouse of Provision, pp. viii-ix.
believers in his home on Saturdays. Examination of the almanacs illustrates how Jessey’s Sabbatarian ideas were related to his millenarianism. A chart titled “Seven ages of man” appears in several of the almanacs, organizing the history of mankind into seven periods. In the first four, the human lifespan is shortened by God in response to humanity’s sinfulness. The fifth is the current age with its three score and ten “till those New Heavens and New Earth shall be.” This is followed by the sixth millenial period “of the Tree (of life,… which is reckoned 1000 yeers.” The seventh and final period of mankind is “the Saints glorious Sabbath.” 43 Another recurring Sabbath formulation is a review of the six days of creation. These six days are followed by the seventh, on which “God rested. Therefore God blessed and sanctified it.” The whole formulation is followed by scripture quotations in the Hebrew and Greek language.44 Several of the early almanacs also include an extended commentary on the biblical significance of the number seven or Sabbath. For Jessey, the significance is found in the typology of the Sabbath as the “glorious liberty that beleevers have and shall have in Jesus the Christ.” This section concludes with some stinging anti-Catholic polemical remarks couched in apocalyptic imagery portraying the imminent demise of Babylon.45 Jessey, like other radical reformers, was interested in reestablishing a pure biblical religion. For him, that meant not only altering the civil calendar but also observing the Sabbath on the correct biblical day of Saturday.

Two questions remain to be explored. What were the social and political implications of Jessey’s millenarian thought, and how committed was Jessey to the radical overturning of the present civil order? There is substantial evidence in the almanacs to suggest sympathy toward the reform agenda of the Fifth Monarchists, but these are seldom overt. In his listing of memorable biblical events in the eighth month (October), Jessey notes the revolt of Jeroboam against King Rehoboam in striking language: “Jeroboam revolting from King Rehoboam, framed Religion by State-Policy, made an Altar for Israel at Bethel, ordaining a Feast like that in Juda, on the 15 day of the eight Month, even in the Moneth which he had devised in his owne heart, I Kings 12.32,33.”46 The phrase “framed Religion by State-Policy” is another recurring formula statement in Jessey’s writings.47 Its negative connotations are certainly in keeping with

42 Whiston, The Life and Death of Mr. Henry Jessey, pp. 87-88. Saturday-Sabbatarianism seems to have been almost completely ignored by the Fifth Monarchists, or else the historians have ignored it. The term isn’t listed in the indexes of the three major authors treating the Fifth Monarchy. For its importance, see David S. Katz, “Menashe ben Israel’s Christian connection,” p. 120.

43 This chart appears in all the almanacs studied with the exception of 1660. Sometime between 1655 and 1660, the format of the almanac was altered substantially, with new materials being added and others eliminated.

44 This formulation, which appears in five of the almanacs examined, includes some interesting word-play on the four elements and a hint of geocentric cosmology. The quotations are from Psalms 104:24 and Revelation 15:3.

45 The general Sabbath commentary drops out of the almanacs after 1649 but the anti-Catholic polemic remains for several more years. By 1660 the polemics are also purged.

46 The lists of memorable events are clearly meant to be educational. They appear with little change in each edition studied, with the exception of 1660.

47 This formula also appears in a polemical section of the almanacs as, “March was rightly their first Month, till Numa Pompilius (their grand forger of Religion by State Policy) added two that are put before it.”
the views of some Fifth Monarchists and other Separatists who advocated further dismantling of relics of the old national church such as tithes.  

Further examples of the subtle way Jessey’s almanacs indicate support for the Fifth Monarchist social agenda are comments on the Jewish laws concerning liberty and the redistribution of wealth. In the Sabbath commentary section referred to earlier, he reminds the reader that for Israel every seventh year was a time “of rest to that Land, and of freedom to Debtors and slaves” and every fiftieth year was proclaimed a Jubilee “for liberty, even to such servants as had despaired it before, and to debtors, and for lands and houses sold or mortgaged.” Such biblical teachings can offer support for programs of radical redistribution of wealth. Though the economic program of the Fifth Monarchists was not as radical as the Levellers or Diggers, they did advocate some reforms such as those aimed at land tenures and poor relief.

Recent scholars consider Jessey to be one of the chief proponents of “respectable nonconformity” during the revolutionary period. The almanacs provide additional evidence that more securely positions him politically among the moderate Fifth Monarchists. A standard feature of the almanacs is the synopsis of England’s political history (Fig. 4). These provide a good picture of Jessey’s political views. The 1647 edition includes references to several English Monarchs and Parliaments that portray their good Christian actions. Henry VIII is included as “The first King to put down the Popes Supremacy.” Edward VI is portrayed as a “young Josiah” because he “granted a gracious liberty and protection to persecuted strangers to worship God here.” The list ends with the Long Parliament “on whom the eyes are fixt, that here first rooted up oppressing Prelacy,...and hath engaged the Land to endeavor a Reformation according to the Word of God.” The only non-politician to make the list is John Wycliff, as that “first principall instrument of Restoring Religion after the grossest darknesse of Popery.” Some general observations can be made about this list. First of all, it is packed with anti-Catholic bias. Secondly, monarchy is not inherently evil. Those kings who upheld religious liberty, regardless of motivation, are remembered positively. Lastly, there is a progression from monarchy to republicanism. Good kings served their purpose in moving toward greater liberty until representative government could take on its role of a more thorough reformation.

With the release of the 1652 edition of the almanac, Charles I was added to the list with a brief statement of his demise and the inauguration of a new system: “Carolus ultimus R. deiruncatio xi.M.(vulg. Jan.)30, 1648. Then was this Nation turn’d to a Commonwealth.” The Latin here translates roughly, “King Charles I uprooted by God.” This is a most important development because the execution of Charles I was the critical moment for the development of Fifth Monarchism. The void left by the King’s death unleashed for the millenarians their

48 For details on Jessey’s involvement in Fifth Monarchist reform efforts, see White, “Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion,” pp. 148-151.


51 Jessey, A Scripture Almanack, (1647).

52 Jessey, The Scripture-Kalendar, (1652).
imminent expectation of the coming reign of Christ as no other event could possibly have done. The synopsis of England’s political history was further expanded in the 1655 edition of the almanac, providing more hints of Fifth Monarchist thought patterns. For the first time, Queens Mary and Elizabeth appear characterized, respectively, in negative and positive terms. Allusion to the doctrine of the Norman Yoke is suggested by the statement “Normans began Octob. 14.1066. ended in Charls, beheaded Jan. 30.1648.” The concept of the Norman yoke was common among the Fifth Monarchists. Some of them held that many of the present problems with the legal system could be traced to the Conquest. With the death of Charles, the time had come to throw off the yoke. Even more revealing is the contrasting of the Long and Short Parliaments: “Englands long Parliament Exit Apr.20. Counsel of State ruled then, 1653 Englands short Parliament did much, began July 4. Dissolved Decemb. 2.1653” The sitting of the Short Parliament is generally regarded as the high point of the Fifth Monarchist movement because of the near success of some of their reform agenda in that body. That Jessey comments positively on the Short Parliament while being at best non-committal on the Long should not be ignored. Gone forever are the high words of praise for the Long Parliament found in earlier editions. As negative as the Short was for many radicals, Jessey still had a good feeling for what it had attempted.

Perhaps the most important insight from the later historical lists is the sense of disorder in England’s political life, disorder that only served to heighten millenarian expectations. So he fittingly ends his 1655 list with words from Luke 21:28, “Look up, for your redemption draweth nigh.” With the 1660 edition, he chooses a different scripture text; now he cites a passage from Ezekiel 21:26-27 that reads, “Take off the Crown---I will overturn---it; until He come whose Right it is, and I will give it him.” The suggestion of subversion inherent in such a statement has been noted by one recent scholar. Perhaps this is one reason Jessey was brought before the Council for questioning on numerous occasions after the Restoration.

Examination of Henry Jessey’s almanacs demonstrates clearly that he was squarely positioned in the theological and political company of the Fifth Monarchists. The almanacs he published provide an abundance of propaganda material supporting their reform agenda. He espoused a well developed premillennial view of the end times, including the restoration of Israel to its previous state followed by the personal return of Christ to the earth to reign with the saints for a thousand years. While he expected these events to occur imminently, he wasn’t entirely

53 Capp, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 50-56.
54 Jessey, The Scripture-Kalendar, (1655).
55 Ibid., pp. 158, 167. See also Rogers, The Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 32-34.
56 Jessey, The Scripture-Kalendar, (1655).
57 Ibid., pp. 64-75. See also Rogers, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 35-38.
58 Jessey, The Scripture-Kalendar, (1655).
59 Jessey, The Scripture Kalendar, (1660).
61 Ibid., pp. 151-152.
comfortable with attempts to establish fixed dates. This may be due in part to the general
dissillusionment among Fifth Monarchists. It could also be due partly to his own personal
disappointment over the failure of the Whitehall Conference and his calendar reform scheme.
Above all, his theological constructs were not static or rigid. Rather, they were open to change
as new insights were obtained and applied with a surprising degree of latitude. It is undoubtedly
this same tendency toward contingency and pragmatism that lies behind the positioning of
himself as a leading voice of moderation among Fifth Monarchists.
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“Unknowable Tongues,” Long Hair, and Rock ‘N’ Roll: The Southern Baptists Confront the Jesus Movement

by W. Terry Lindley

According to tradition, the Jesus Movement emerged in the late 1960s from the very pits of hell on earth—the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco. This area of the city was noted for free love and communes; long-haired, male hippies wearing sandals, bell-bottoms, and love beads; braless girls demonstrating their liberation; acid, LSD, and other illicit drugs; and numerous muggings, robberies, and murders because of the presence of the Hell’s Angels and deluded prophets such as Charles Manson with their fanatical followers. Nevertheless, in 1967, Ted Wise, a former drug addict who had accepted Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior, opened a coffeehouse called the Living Room in an effort to share the Gospel with hippies and drug addicts in Haight-Ashbury. While this coffeehouse was an evangelistic success, it also attracted some strange people. Charles Manson frequented the place, and when he tried to pick fights with the patrons, he had to be bodily escorted off the premises. Another visitor, a yet unknown Robin Williams, tried out his unusual and unearthly brand of comedy on the guests. Soon Wise’s coffeehouse format and the Jesus Movement spread all along the West Coast, then jumped the continent to the East Coast before it took root in America’s heartland. This phenomenon received news coverage from Time, Newsweek, Life, CBS news, NBC news, and such an unlikely source as Rolling Stone magazine. Members of the Jesus Movement came from the counterculture, whose members were very open to the existence of a “supreme being,” along with young people from mainline and evangelical churches attracted by the evangelistic fervor of the so-called Jesus People.¹

A number of churches throughout the United States embraced the outpouring of revival among the nation’s youth, but they were the exceptions and not the rule. Most questioned the spiritual validity of the movement, especially since it indirectly spawned a number of cults like the Children of God. The congregations that accepted the Jesus People included Chuck Smith’s Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California; Don Fento’s Belmont Church in Nashville, Tennessee; Jess Moody’s First Baptist Church of West Palm Beach, Florida; as well as Calvary Temple in Fort Wayne, Indiana, out of which came Bob Hartman and the Christian rock group Petra. For many Southern Baptists, the Jesus Movement raised at least four red flags, but for others these so-called warning signs were for the most part false signals and irrelevant.

The first red flag dealt with the music that originated from the Jesus Movement, a music known as Jesus Music or Christian Rock, but now generally referred to as Contemporary Christian Music. Many clergy had condemned rock ‘n’ roll in the 1950s, and their antipathy to this type of music only increased throughout the 1960s and into the early 1970s. For example, in 1966 John Lennon made his infamous statement regarding Jesus Christ. It read: “Christianity will go. It will vanish and shrink. I needn’t argue about that, I’m right and I will be proved right. We’re (the Beatles) more popular than Jesus now; I don’t know which will go first—rock ‘n’ roll or Christianity. Jesus was all right but his disciples were thick and ordinary. It’s them twisting Jesus that ruins it for me.” This statement outraged Christians everywhere, especially Southern Baptists. The editor of The Baptist Messenger of Oklahoma lamented: “It is unfortunate indeed that British and American teenagers should have as their idols young men with such a twisted sense of values and such immature ideas.”² The editor of The Illinois Baptist
added: “Personally, I’m with the little boy who had been collecting Beatle cards and took them all out the other day and burned them.”

The Beatle flap was followed in the early 1970s by the release of the rock opera *Jesus Christ Superstar*. Larry R. Jerden, a Texas Baptist, blasted this piece of music, writing that “it is a witness to an unsure messiah who never declares himself; a witness to a mortal who died for good, nothing more; a witness to a man who didn’t even know where he was going or what he was doing. In other words, it is a million times worse than no witness at all.” He concluded his tirade against the rock opera with these words: “Any kind of story, rock opera, movie or paperback novel that tells of Jesus’ life on earth and omits the last chapter may as well tell of an Apollo moon mission and leave the astronauts stranded somewhere in space.” Pastor Tal Bonham, president of the Arkansas State Baptist Convention, described this rock musical as a blasphemous, unscriptural presentation of Jesus that questions Christ’s divinity, leaves the Savior hanging on the cross, and portrays Him “merely as a great man” who “caused his own crucifixion.” William Hagan of Taylorsville, Kentucky, added: “At their worst these ‘religious rock operas’ are a satanic influence that denies the diety [sic] of Christ, that presents Him as a man only and as a buddy-buddy. At their best they are based on a shallow theology that is not Biblical and on an emotionalism that generates [a] feeling very similar to that generated by secular rock music.” And in Greensboro, North Carolina, eleven Southern Baptist ministers purchased a half-page ad condemning *Jesus Christ Superstar* as a “blasphemous” production that would keep people “from ever knowing the true Jesus Christ as presented in the Bible.” They further admonished that if a Christian “in any way support[s] this rock opera, which by its own admission is contrary to the Word of God, then you are disobeying a definite principle of the Word of God.”

However, a few ministers, such as Mal Utley, pastor of Lexington Park Baptist Church in Maryland, saw *Jesus Christ Superstar* as portraying the humanity of Jesus and thus serving as a starting point to explain the real “superstar” nature of Christ, namely His divine mission to reconcile a sinful humanity with a righteous God through His death on the cross, burial, and resurrection. Even Billy Graham, America’s foremost evangelist and a Southern Baptist, commended the rock opera for causing youth to take a new look at Jesus Christ. “The young can identify with Him,” he said. “He taught love, peace, and forgiveness. He had a beard and long hair. He is seen as a revolutionary in whom they can believe and with whom they can share an experience.” In other words, the presentation of Christ in *Jesus Christ Superstar* could serve as a starting point for sharing the true nature of the risen Savior.

Speaking at a Southern Baptist conference at the Baptist retreat in Glorieta, New Mexico, on “The Drug Crisis in the Church,” Dr. Henlee Barnette, professor of Christian Ethics at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, listed a number of factors that contributed to drug use among America’s young people, one of which was rock music. As models for the nation’s youth, these rock musicians, he charged, had popularized the drug culture. Their “songs are replete with psychedelic terminology and young people do tend to identify with such performers and the message of the experience of psychoactive drugs comes through loud and clear.” Whether Barnette realized it or not, opponents of Christian Rock could use his association of rock music with the drug culture as another reason for keeping Jesus Music out of the church.

With this as background, it is not surprising that many Southern Baptists equated Jesus Music with secular rock and all its negative connotations, and therefore condemned Christian Rock as ungodly. Julian M. Motley, pastor of Gorman Church in Durham, North Carolina, did
just that. He lamented: “Because of the devastating moral impact of hard rock music, even to the point of soul-intoxication, an emotional and mental ‘takeover’ corroborated by the testimonies of many rock singers, it appears that the devil is really ‘slipping one under the table’ in many Christian churches. Christian young people are being wed to the world through music that at once stirs their souls with ‘Christian’ lyrics and their bodies with a demoralizing beat.” Motley concluded: “The music of sensual society and that of the believing church can never truly be the same because of their difference in nature and origin, and yet responsible persons persistently advocate that we fill our churches with the sounds of music rising from the abyss of depraved minds in the unregenerate world.” Thus, Christian rock was a subtle attempt by Satan to get his “foot in the door” of the church, and those who promoted such music were by implication duped by or working for the enemy. Music Minister A. T. Atwood of First Baptist of DuQuoin, Illinois, shared Motley’s concerns and urged “Southern Baptists not to fall into the trap of singing something simply because it is popular at a given time. Let us give our young people great music that truly fosters a worshipful attitude rather than music that appeals to a worldly concept of religion.”

But not all Southern Baptists condemned Christian Rock. A number found such music spiritually uplifting, aesthetically pleasing to the ear, and a legitimate means of reaching young people with the Gospel. The 1971 Southern Baptist Church Music Conference warned music ministers “against rejecting the pop-rock music of today’s youth.” This point was validated at the Crescent Southern Baptist Church in Anaheim, California, where a Christian Rock concert was held which filled the auditorium with youth and saw many decisions made during the invitation at the end of the concert. Also, a number of letters to the editor of The Baptist Standard of Texas defended this musical genre. One wrote that if Christian Rock “is the medium through which they [young people] choose to praise the Father, then they should be given the opportunity.” A second penned that church youth were turned off by “the formality and stuffiness of our conservative services which often are dominated by formal choir music.” Why not permit the young people to enjoy the music of their choice and “bring them back to church?” A third observed that much of the new music was only scripture verses set to contemporary tunes and queried, “Is it so terrible that the beat may not be of our generation?” A fourth, an 18-year old, pointedly asked, “Is music sacred only if it is old, slow, and boring?”

This difference of opinion surrounding Jesus Music/Christian Rock is illustrated by the reaction of Mississippi Baptists to a group of seven musicians, three females and four males, called the Pilgrim 20. Using a mixture of popular songs like “Jesus is a Soul Man” and original compositions, this Wichita, Kansas-based group employed folk-rock to share the Gospel, and from August 1967 to May 1970, sang to over 300,000 people in twenty-six states. After viewing a picture of the band and reading an article about them in The Baptist Record but having never heard their music or seen them in concert, Specialist-Fourth Class Curtis F. Gibson of the 25th Infantry Division of the U.S. Army serving in Vietnam, who was also a Southern Baptist preacher, wrote a letter of “protest” to this Mississippi Baptist newspaper. “I can in no way see how this would edify young or mature Christians, or how it would build up the kingdom of Christ; but believe that this is worldly entertainment and doesn’t have its place in the church. Neither can I see how it would build a wholesome Christian testimony on life.” Two young adult members of First Baptist Church of Vicksburg who saw the Pilgrim 20 perform at the Mississippi Baptist Youth Convention in early 1971 strongly defended this group. These laymen testified that the seven musicians “brought the Spirit’s reality to the fore. With loud sound, long hair, rock and a Christian witness and message, they spoke to the youth in our language,” and the
youth “were rapidly impressed with the sincerity of the group in sharing the Christ-life they had found through the Holy Spirit.” The Pilgrim 20’s message was simple but profound: “Christ is Lord and Savior,” “the Holy Spirit is our present guide in daily life,” and “the Spirit guides us into brotherly love with a Christian inspiration and background.”

Some 20,000 Southern Baptist youth attended Explo ’72 in Dallas, Texas, in June of that year to participate in a training conference on witnessing sponsored by Campus Crusade for Christ International. The participants were treated to what Billy Graham, the main speaker at the Cotton Bowl rally and the honorary chairman of Explo ’72, termed a “Christian Woodstock” concert in the Cotton Bowl, which featured many of the early Jesus musicians. This was followed the next day by an eight-hour “Jesus musical festival” along an unfinished freeway strip that drew an estimated 150,000 people. Graham’s presence at Explo ’72, coupled with his statement about the Cotton Bowl concert, implied, at the very least, a tacit acceptance of Jesus Music.

The outward appearance of the Jesus People, especially the long hair on males, was the second warning sign for many Southern Baptists. Two articles on the editorial page of The Illinois Baptist generated a number of mostly negative letters to the editor. The first column, a reprint from a local church’s youth publication, appeared on 29 January 1969 and questioned the right of a Christian to judge a person by his outer appearance. Long hair, the writer argued, has been recently associated with “the dark side of American society and also the dark side of youth,” namely “the hippies, yippees, and draft card burners.” However, since George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Jesus had long hair, the author concluded, all people with long hair were not bad. The response to this column was three negative letters and only one in support. The former centered on I Corinthians 11:14—“Does not even nature itself teach that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him?”—to argue that Jesus never had long hair. One asserted that long hair on men only served “to degrade and shame them.” The letter of support, however, contended that “Jesus never looked upon the outward appearance” but instead examined one’s heart.

Two years later, Brenda Skibinski, writing under the heading of “Teen Talk,” stated that teenagers wear their “hair long because it is the style.” Respondents again quoted I Corinthians 11:14 to show that Jesus did not have long hair. Only Nazarites wore their hair long, one retorted, and Jesus was no Nazarite. “Was he [Jesus] a Nazarite from birth or was he sent from God to perform a task? Jesus was not a rebel. He came on a mission. He didn’t have time to rebel. Rebels are sent to do their own will. Jesus did the will of God. . .” The Arkansas Baptist News magazine seemed to support the sentiments of the short-haired advocates by carrying a story about Harry A. Eisenberg, a professor and “some-time archaeologist” at Ambassador College in Pasadena, California, who confidently stated that “all men of Christ’s day, no matter what their profession or social status, wore their hair short.”

There are stories of churches which installed a barber’s chair next to the altar, and whenever a long-haired male came forward to make a decision to accept Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior, his first act of witness and obedience was not believer’s baptism but a haircut. This submissive action usually was met by a number of hearty “amens” and “praise the Lords” from the congregation. While I have been unable to document such a practice at a particular Southern Baptist fellowship, there is an interesting letter to the editor of The Baptist Standard on this issue. Vera B. Ruckstahel of Gainesville, Texas, related how her nephew, a student at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, was in the past “forced to shave and cut his hair before a committee would allow him to fill his place on the program” at
Glorieta and “that now some work with foreign exchange students on summer college campuses hinges on whether or not he shaves and cuts his hair.” Lamenting this blatant discrimination because of one’s outer appearance, she prayed, “God grant that we as older Christians act like we’re older—not babes who fear change.”

The third warning sign related to the practice of glossolaia or tongue-speaking, especially since many Jesus People were charismatics, and most charismatics spoke in tongues. Southern Baptist concern about this phenomenon both pre-dates and post-dates the Jesus Movement. In March 1968, The Western Recorder printed an article which examined both the pros and cons on this issue, entitled “Speaking in Tongues: A Valid Spiritual Experience?” Speaking for the affirmative side, Dale Moody, professor of Christian Theology at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, argued that a biblical understanding of tongues avoided “two extremes. One is the aggressive Pentecostalism that thinks it is duty-bound to get the whole Church of God speaking in tongues! The other is the reactionary panic that I find among many of our leaders, both conservative and liberal, that would crush to the earth any such manifestation of the Spirit.” While the former could “create chaos,” Moody warned that the latter was “more dangerous.”

Taking the negative view, John H. Parrott, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Roswell, New Mexico, castigated tongue speaking as “a dangerous heresy.” He added, “I am disturbed about you [tongue speakers]! You are not being used to strengthen the cause of Christ Jesus in the world but to weaken it. You are not being used to build the church of our Lord but to divide it. You are a divisive factor rather than a unifying force in the kingdom of God. Where did you get the idea that the sort of ‘speaking in tongues’ you do is prompted by the Holy Spirit?” Parrott’s implication was that “speaking in tongues” came from someone other than God. He concluded his tirade with these words: “The world needs an intelligent, dynamic, persuasive witness for Christ, not the babbling gibberish of men gone mad.”

During the height of the Jesus Movement, two professors at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, cautiously validated the gift of tongues. In 1971, John Newport, professor of philosophy, told a Lay Renewal Conference that today’s church needs “a rediscovery of the resources of the Holy Spirit. We need the excitement, the joy and the vigor of the spirit’s presence.” Speaking in tongues, he stated, was “not objectionable” if done in accordance with biblical guidelines. The following year in a chapel address, J. W. MacGorman, professor of New Testament, proclaimed that speaking in tongues is a New Testament gift which is still active today. He pleaded with both those who reject tongues and those who claim it is a second stage of the Christian experience not to make their viewpoint a test of fellowship for other believers. MacGorman closed his talk with the hope that “this movement will issue in another thrilling chapter of the book of Acts.”

This issue emerged again on the national stage in the mid-1970s, becoming the top “Baptist Press” story of 1975. In a sermon to an evangelism conference of pastors meeting at First Baptist Church of Dallas, W. A. Criswell, pastor of the host church, blasted the glossolaia practice. After just completing a two-year study on the workings of the Holy Spirit, he argued that “throughout Christian history, wherever this phenomenon has arisen, it has been looked on as an aberration and a heresy.” Labeling tongue speaking as “unscriptural and wrong,” Criswell concluded: “You stop the women from speaking in tongues, and the practice will absolutely disappear from the earth. The tongues movement is a woman[’s] movement. And when she’s taken out of it, it perishes on the vine.” Jaroy Weber, pastor of First Baptist Church of Lubbock, Texas, and president of the Southern Baptist Convention from 1974 to 1976, agreed with Criswell’s assessment of tongue-speaking, saying that the Dallas pastor “spoke the
sentiments of about 95 per cent of the pastors in the Southern Baptist Convention, including me.⁹²xiv O. L. Bayless, associate pastor of Second Baptist Church of Hot Springs, Arkansas, and former editor of The Rocky Mountain Baptist of Colorado from 1962 to 1976, added that the “lack of doctrinal preaching” had led to the rise of tongue-speaking among Southern Baptists. Satan, he argued, was using this heresy, this “spiritual prostitution,” to destroy “churches and denominations” and to impede “the advance of New Testament churches.”⁹²xviii

Such sentiments by denominational leaders produced action against tongue-speaking churches. In October 1975, the Cincinnati Baptist Association disfellowshipped two charismatic churches for “erroneous and disruptive” practices, and later in the month the Dallas Baptist Association followed suit in excluding one church in Dallas and another in Grand Prairie for embracing charismatic doctrine.⁹²xxix Also during October, the Trenton Baptist Association in Louisiana withdrew fellowship from a West Monroe Baptist church for persisting in neo-pentecostal practices.⁹²xxx And in May 1976, the Harmony Southern Baptist Association of Oxnard, California, ousted a Ventura Baptist church for its charismatic involvement and uncooperative spirit.⁹²xxxi A number of other associations, especially in Texas, passed resolutions condemning the charismatic movement and warning churches about allowing it to make inroads into their fellowships, but took no action against any individual church.⁹²xxxii

Yet, not all Southern Baptists felt threatened by or were hostile toward charismatic Christians. In 1975 the Baptist Convention of Maryland passed a resolution on the charismatic movement that read in part: “Be it further resolved that we call upon all Baptists everywhere to practice Christian love and patience toward those with whom we may disagree in the interpretation of Biblical passages relating to the value and validity of charismatic practices.”⁹²xxxiii The 1975 meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention in Miami, Florida, refused to denounce the charismatic movement and merely restated the 1963 Faith and Baptist Message section on the Holy Spirit.⁹²xxxiv Milford Misener, pastor of First Baptist Church of Belen, New Mexico, refused to throw charismatics out of his congregation and argued that these once “back-seat church members” have now become “more concerned, more committed, more loving, more pliable and desirious to learn of and serve God.”⁹²xxxv Numerous letters to the editors of state Baptist newspapers in the mid-1970s also voiced support for those who spoke in tongues. A Kentucky Southern Baptist preacher asked, “When will we learn that there is great variety in the Body of Christ? We preachers are to blame for much of this division. We have not taught our people because many of us do not know what the Bible really teaches concerning the work of the Holy Spirit.” A laywoman from Mississippi lamented, “Why are we Baptists so defensive about the Holy Spirit and what he can do? It’s as if we seek to limit God’s power to just that which we know.” And a Southern Baptist from Arkansas warned, “If being filled with the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues be of God you cannot stop it. We should be more careful lest we find ourselves speaking against God.”⁹²xxxvi

The final red flag for Southern Baptists concerned the Jesus Movement’s reluctance to embrace the institutional church. The Jesus People, especially those who came out of the hippie movement, tended to form Christian communes in urban or rural areas and shy away from the organized church. This trend troubled some Southern Baptists. Nancy Carr, Miss Georgia for 1970, told the 1971 Church Recreation Leadership Conference meeting at the Baptist retreat in Ridgecrest, North Carolina, that “Christian youth who are truly interested in being Jesus people will work through the church.” As of now, she said, the Jesus Movement appeared “to be primarily an emotional experience.”⁹²xxxvii Darryl S. DeBorde, a student at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, agreed in part with Carr, acknowledging that the Jesus People “tend to
stay away from the organized, established church.” However, he asked, what did this say about the Baptist church? It says that the Jesus Movement is protesting “the inconsistencies of our ‘Sunday religion’ and our judgmental hypocrisies” and lamenting “that our churches are not relevant, that we are still bickering over issues that are decades feeble and are ignoring the very people for whom Christ died.” Thus, instead of demanding that the Jesus People change themselves in order to fit into the Southern Baptist-box of Christianity, this seminary student asserted that the church needed to become “the most creative community this world has ever seen.”

In conclusion, the baggage associated with the Jesus Movement affected the Southern Baptist response to it. That baggage included the creation of Jesus Music, which a number of Southern Baptists considered no different from regular rock ‘n’ roll and all its evils; long-haired males, which to some violated I Corinthians 11:14; charismatic practices, especially tongue-speaking, which a lot of Baptists considered a dangerous heresy, if not a satanic practice; and a refusal or reluctance to associate with the institutional church, which angered many. Yet, there were other Southern Baptists who could overlook these red flags and embrace these young believers with open arms of Christian fellowship. To this group, Christian Rock was an effective evangelistic tool, the church needed to become more relevant to young people, tongue speaking (if done in the proper biblical format) was not divisive, and long hair on males was a non-issue. In other words, the Southern Baptist reaction to the Jesus Movement illustrates the denomination’s well-known propensity for diversity of opinion and theology.
For an overview of the Jesus Movement from a charismatic perspective see David Di Sabatino, “The History of the Jesus People Movement: Counterculture Revival and Evangelical Renewal" (Master's Thesis from McMaster Divinity College, 1994). See also Alvin Reid, “The Effect of the Jesus Movement on Evangelism in the Southern Baptist Convention," Baptist History and Heritage, XXX, No. 1 (January 1995), 41-52. This article focuses on the impact of the Jesus Movement on the Southern Baptist evangelism. While briefly touching on the issue of Jesus Music, Reid does not deal with the issues of glossolalia, one's outward appearance, or the reluctance on the part of a number of Jesus People to associate with the institutional church.
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"Two Ounces of Trust": Relationships in *The Last Yankee*

by Melissa Moore

Four relationships exist in *The Last Yankee* which are symbolic of the relationships between men and women. Some interesting observations can be made regarding the various relationships in the play among the four characters, but they all ultimately reveal Arthur Miller's perceived need for effective communication between any two individuals. Focusing on these relationships allows us to see what Arthur Miller is telling us about society as a whole.

**Man to Man**

In the opening scene, two men meet in the waiting room of a state mental hospital. Miller draws distinct differences between Leroy Hamilton and John Frick. Frick is "sixty, solid, in a business suit" and carrying a "small valise" (448). When he enters the room, inhabited only by Leroy, he sits ten feet away. It is only upon getting impatient that he initiates conversation with Leroy. It should be noted that Miller refers to John as "Frick" throughout the course of the play, while Leroy is treated less formally and also more personally. Leroy is younger than Frick, almost flashy in appearance in his "subdued Ivy League jacket and slacks and shined brogans" (448). Leroy is accompanied not by a briefcase but by a banjo case. As a result, while he is the more snobbishly attired, Leroy is much more realistic and human, carrying a banjo with which to entertain his wife and appearing a lot more relaxed.

Frick has a need to make conversation and keeps the dialogue going with Leroy, in spite of the latter's reticence. Leroy's lack of interest in talking to Frick is clear in his "star[ing] ahead," but he is trained in the rules of etiquette and "politely refrain[s] from the magazine" on his lap (449). Frick is initially very shallow in his interactions with Leroy, adopting a superior tone and doubting the observations he solicits from Leroy. Upon discovering Leroy's relationship to Alexander Hamilton, Frick becomes more interested in him as a person and is increasingly confounded by Leroy's refusal to take advantage of his heritage.

Leroy is uncomfortable with some aspects of himself, particularly his inability "to remain seated" when Frick complains about a repairman who charged him seventeen dollars an hour (454). "Wanting escape," it comes out in the conversation that Leroy is a carpenter who works for the same amount but feels unworthy of that much money (454). His work dress of overalls is so different from his dress in the waiting room that it is nearly impossible for Frick to recognize him as the man who loaded plywood in the lumber yard a few years before: "It's those clothes -- if I'd seen you in overalls I'd've recognized you right off . . . . Amazing thing what clothes'll do, isn't it" (455). Obviously, Leroy knows how clothes can be used and is attempting to disguise himself, though whether out of embarrassment for his profession or because of his wife's problems is unclear. He so openly disclaims his shame of his job -- "Am I supposed to be ashamed I'm a carpenter?" -- that he protests too loudly (458). On the other hand, he refuses to accept money from Patricia's relatives to put her in the Rogers Pavillon where "some very rich people go" and inferentially where his wife's emotional state might become known among his peers (453). Even Leroy's language is confused. He is inconsistent with his use of the formal, polished "yes" and the casual "ya" (449), which reveals his playacting in various roles and his uncertainty with just who he is.
When the men discover that their common reason for being at the mental hospital is their wives, they begin to find parallels in their situations. Both men express at least a pretext of wanting to understand what has caused their wives to be depressed. Their wives are experiencing the same symptoms (fright, hearing sounds, sleeping a lot), but the circumstances of the two women are startlingly different. The men assume that since the effects of depression are the same, the causes must be the same, but that is a false assumption: in fact, one expects too much from herself and others, while the other expects too little. Frick and Leroy do not love and cherish their wives equally, which is in part responsible for the directions their respective marriages take.

**Woman to Woman**

As fate would have it, Leroy and Frick's wives are roommates and friends. Patricia Hamilton and Karen Frick are as dissimilar as their husbands. Patricia is younger and, from the moment we see her, she is active and mobile while Karen is "passive" and "timorous" (459-60). As Patricia acknowledges, people who are depressed "don't like exercise" (460). Patricia is clearly a leader, Karen a follower who is easily "charmed" and "slavishly interested" (461). Karen acknowledges her fear of Frick (460) and accedes to his every whim, to the extent that she accompanies him on annual hunting and fishing trips where the sight of dead animals literally makes her sick. Patricia's advice is to "insist that he . . . stop hunting! You don't have to stand for that, you're a person" (461).

Patricia has learned self-worth through experience, but she is also part of a younger generation of women who are willing to fight for their rights. One might say that she has learned to play the game, as revealed in Patricia's suggestion to keep their husbands waiting: "He might start treasuring you more if you make him wait a little" (460). One critic rightly sees this ploy "as an assertion of their powers" (Olson 1139). In all her words, Patricia is pointing to Karen's rights and identity as a person and encouraging her to claim that identity for herself, as no one can do it for her. Patricia has more self-confidence, is more comfortable with who she is, as demonstrated in her willingness to share everything with Karen, whom she has only known for a few days. Karen says that she finds Patricia "beautiful" and "extremely attractive" (462), but what she's really attracted to is Patricia's animated, passionate involvement in life, not her physical appearance. At least part of Patricia's excitement comes from her decision to take herself off drugs, a reassurance to herself that she is in control of her life. Patricia can now realize that the drugs have been a false coping mechanism. She doesn't deny her depression, because "anybody with any sense has got to be depressed in this country . . . unless you're really rich" (465), but she is willing to face life head-on and be more realistic in her expectations of herself and of Leroy. Karen, on the other hand, admits to her suicide attempt, but seeks to excuse it rather than claim it (465). She is extremely insecure, wanting to go to the same grocery as Patricia regardless of her own preferences (466-7). Patricia really encourages Karen when she sings "Cheek to Cheek" and tap dances, proclaiming that she "look[s] great" and dances "wonderful[ly]." but her encouragement is undermined by Frick's "anger" and "embarrass[ment]" (484-5). Ultimately, Patricia can be seen as an individual, but Karen cannot sever herself from her relationships with others, especially her husband.
Husbands and Wives

The Hamiltons once "had a wonderful courtship" which Karen envies, yet they have changed dramatically from being "the handsomest pair in town," not in looks but in their inner selves (464). They are both in the forties and have a very fertile relationship (seven children). Upon seeing Leroy, Patricia "hasn't received something she hoped for from him," most likely an affectionate greeting or kiss (469), but he immediately redeems himself by noticing that she has washed her hair and painted her nails (470). It is easy for Patricia to be demanding and "patronizing" toward Leroy (470). Each is also easily defensive toward the other, but Leroy's natural reaction toward Patricia is long-suffering and sympathy, which keeps the lines of communication from getting clogged.

Patricia does want to share herself with him, albeit at her own pace, as indicated in the "softness" behind her strong words (471). Throughout the course of the play, they are tentatively trying to reach out to one another. Patricia is willing to let Leroy be himself and is resolved "to keep looking straight ahead, not back" (471). Leroy respects his wife's judgment about most things, such as what he should charge for the altar and whether she's well enough to go home (471-2).

Leroy refuses to put Patricia in the expensive institution (even though her siblings are willing to foot most of the bill) because he does not believe it to be the best thing for her (453). If he put her in the Rogers Pavilion eighty miles away, he "could never get to see her," which reveals how much he treasures their relationship (453). This stubborn refusal to "accept anyone's help" financially, along with his pride and independence, makes Patricia angry: "Raise his taxes, rob him blind, the Yankee'll just sit there all alone getting sadder and sadder" (463). Patricia's marriage to a Yankee was considered beneath her by her large, prosperous, Swedish family, and her pride is hurt by "rid[ing] around in a nine-year-old Chevrolet which was bought secondhand in the first place" (464).

Yet Patricia also sees the patient, understanding side of her husband: "I've put him through hell and I know it . . . . Tears threaten her. I know I have to stop blaming him" (463). Leroy has remained faithful to Patricia throughout the long years of her illness, and in a way it embarrasses her: "Dear God, when I think of him hanging in there all these years . . . . I'm so ashamed" (463). His fidelity is due in part to the type of person he is, but also because he would remember Patricia "happy and loving . . . . when you're positive about life there's just nobody like you" (478). He encourages her to have "two ounces of trust" in their relationship (475).

The Fricks are an entirely different matter. Their marriage is sterile, with Frick being a very dominant husband over his "timorous" and fearful wife (460). They are financially in much better shape than the Hamiltons, and John admittedly could afford the Rogers Pavilion at fifty thousand dollars a year, but chooses not to put Karen there, evidently embarrassed by Karen's mental state. We do not see them together until late in Scene Two, but we have been prepared. Frick has no regard for his wife, "overriding her" almost immediately after entering the room to toot his own horn (481). He degrades Karen's desire to dance for Patricia and Leroy, claiming "it's kinda silly at her age" (481). His language is often mixed, calling her "honey" in a voice "suppress[ed] [with] angry embarrassment" (481). In her hesitancy, Karen instinctively turns to Patricia rather than Frick for encouragement and support. Frick derides Karen's inability to be decisive behind her back, not recognizing that his own harshness and her fear of him are what quell her spirit. What had begun to blossom under Patricia's earlier support and kindness now begins a rapid wilting and decay.
While Karen is changing into her dance ensemble, Frick takes the opportunity to thank Patricia for her positive words of encouragement which have wrought such a change: "It's years since I've seen this much life in her" (481). He claims he wants Karen to adopt Patricia's positive, forthright attitude, yet his reaction to Patricia's blunt observations about their relationship ("you... sound so disappointed in her") (482) is to become "visibly angered" (484). He admits he does not believe Karen is "normal" (484). He refuses to be interrupted by Karen in the middle of the night, whatever her needs, revealing his self-interest and unwillingness to be her support. From Frick's standpoint, Karen "has everything, what right has she got to start shooting blanks," but the reader can clearly see that one thing she does not have is an understanding spouse who will allow her to be human, make mistakes, and discover herself (482). Patricia's very forthrightness "bewilder[s] [and] surprise[s]" Frick and "turn[s] him inside out" (484), yet he rejects what she is attempting to reveal and remains unchanged in his attitude toward Karen.

Karen enters in high hat, satin shorts, and tap shoes, and is greeted by praise from Patricia. "Desperate for reassurance," Karen is commended by both Patricia and Leroy. Frick is noticeably silent until Karen "timidly" asks him to sing so she might dance; his response is, "Oh Karen, for God's sake!" (484). He sings, albeit "unhappily" and "angrily" (484). As the Hamiltons compliment and encourage her, she "dances a bit more boldly, a joyous freedom starting into her" while Frick refuses to give her "more than a glance" (485). Patricia openly challenges him to look at his wife, and he "explodes" in an "astonishing furious shout" (485). This explosion causes Karen's "self-esteem [to] just [whistle] away" (Tai 147). She moves from "joyous freedom" to "fear" in an instant, and she comes to Frick's defense, desperately trying to appease him (485). His response, as it must often be when he hates a situation, is simply to leave. Karen tries "to intercept him" and pleads with him not "to be angry" (485). His unemotional, stiff attempts to compliment her ("you... danced better than I ever saw you") (485) render her "immobile" and depressed. As one critic points out, "the agony on her face, her inability to cry and her depressed passivity shows how devastating depression can be" (Tai 147). After twice denying that he is "disappointed," he hastily exits, leaving her "perfectly still, staring at nothing" (486). To break through her depression, Leroy plays for her on the banjo with Patricia singing, and momentarily she "does a few steps," but "with an unrelieved sadness," and she eventually stops and walks out (486).

Their relationship cannot heal and progress because there is no room for living life realistically. Karen cannot trust Frick enough to be herself. Even though she "has very big possibilities," she has no room to pursue a dream of who she might become and no right in Frick's mind to be anything other than satisfied with their life together (483). Patricia and Leroy can leave the stage together, facing "the impending peril of real life," because they are willing to support and undergird one another (Corliss 72). That mutuality is missing from the Frick marriage; thus, the relationship is doomed to failure.

**Works Cited**


Ethics in the Pressure Cooker:  
The Example of Dietrich Bonhoeffer

by Walton Padelford

Dietrich Bonhoeffer lived in the maelstrom of Nazi Germany before and during World War II. He was born February 4, 1906, in Breslau, Germany, and he died at the hands of the Nazis in the Bavarian village of Schönberg on April 9, 1945, at the age of thirty-nine. He came from an outstanding family of professional people. His father was a psychiatrist on the teaching faculty of Berlin University, and his great-grandfather had been a well-known professor of church history in Jena.¹ Bonhoeffer was also a talented musician, but he failed to win a piano scholarship for which he applied. After this, he made the decision to study theology.² He began his studies at age eighteen at Berlin University, from which he graduated with a licentiate in 1927.

Young Bonhoeffer became a world traveler, holding a pastorate in a German-speaking congregation in Barcelona in 1928-29, then studying theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1930. While in New York, he studied under Rheinhold Niebuhr, and through his friendship with Franklin Fisher, a black seminarian, he was introduced to life in the black community in New York. He attended the Abyssinian Baptist Church, where he experienced the power of the preached word,³ and, no doubt, gained a perspective on what it means to be excluded from the mainstream of national life. Writing from his cell in the Tegel prison in Berlin in 1943, Bonhoeffer states in “The View from Below”:

There remains an experience of incomparable value. We have for once learnt to see the great events of world history from below, from the perspective of the outcast, the suspects, the maltreated, the powerless, the oppressed, the reviled - in short, from the perspective of those who suffer. The important thing is that neither bitterness nor envy should have gnawed at the heart during this time, that we should have come to look with new eyes at matters great and small, sorrow and joy, strength and weakness, that our perception of generosity, humanity, justice and mercy should have become clearer, freer, less corruptible. We have to learn that personal suffering is a more effective key, a more rewarding principle for exploring the world in thought and action than personal good fortune. This perspective from below must not become the partisan possession of those who are eternally dissatisfied; rather, we must do justice to life in all its dimensions from a higher satisfaction, whose foundation is beyond any talk of “from below” or “from above.” This is the way in which we may affirm it.⁴

³ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Memories and Perspectives, Gateway Films, 1982.
In 1933-35 he served as pastor of a German-speaking congregation in London. Pastor Bonhoeffer was forbidden to teach publicly by the National Socialists in 1936 and thus ended his association with the University of Berlin, where he had been on the faculty since 1931. In all these travels, Bonhoeffer was developing contacts that enabled him to function for a time as a double agent for the Abwehr, or intelligence service of the Third Reich. He would go abroad on some ostensible errand and at the same time have talks with English or Danish churchmen about the true nature of the resistance to Hitler in Germany.

Since the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor of Germany by Hindenburg in 1933, the church had been influenced and co-opted into embracing a Nazified theology. The group in the church that pledged loyalty to Hitler was called the German Christians. The opposition group was known as the Confessing Church, of which Bonhoeffer was a leader. The resulting church struggle saw the establishment of an underground seminary by the Confessing Church, and Bonhoeffer was appointed teacher of the first group of seminarians at Finkenwalde in 1935:

In 1935 Bonhoeffer, already one of the leaders of the Confessional Church, returned to Germany. He went to Pomerania to direct an illegal Church Training College, first in a small peninsula in the Baltic, later on in Finkenwalde near Stettin. This College was not formed after any existing model. It was not an order comprising men living in ascetic seclusion; nor was it a Training College in the ordinary sense of the word. The attempt was made here to live the "community life" of a Christian as described in one of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's shorter writings. Young ministers who came from all over the Reich learned here what is so sorely needed today - namely, how in the twentieth century a Christian life should be lived in a spirit of genuine brotherhood, and how such a life could naturally and freely grow if there were only men who entirely belonged to the Lord and, therefore, in brotherly love to one another. It was not until 1940 that the College was finally closed down by the Gestapo.5

The young ministerial students were amazed to discover that Bonhoeffer was a pacifist. This was a position that was obviously unknown in the Reich. One's life could be taken for holding such a position, particularly in the face of the fast-approaching military draft. A Swedish seminarian once asked Bonhoeffer: "If it comes to the military draft, and you must take up arms, what will you do?" He spent a long time in reflection, and at last replied: "I hope that God will give me the power not to take up arms," which, of course, meant that he would be willing to suffer death rather than to fight.6

The point here is that a young German theologian was organizing his theology around the theme of peace-making, peace-keeping, and non-resistance: "peace is the opposite of security."7 He taught that we must take risks for the sake of peace. It is here that the dilemma of Bonhoeffer's ethical journey begins to develop. As he taught his young students at the underground seminary through the Sermon on the Mount, it became clear to them that bearing arms was contrary to the spirit of the New Testament. As one of the seminarians said when he was conscripted, "We went into the army with a bad conscience. The pacifism taught us by

6 *Memories and Perspectives*.
7 Ibid.
Bonhoeffer, the will to resist fascism and dictatorship had been planted so firmly in me that these seven years as a soldier were utter hell for me.\(^8\)

The situation in Germany was deteriorating rapidly. The infamous Crystal Night, or the Night of Broken Glass, occurred on November 10, 1938. The Nazi brownshirts broke out the storefronts of Jewish businesses all over Berlin. Bonhoeffer read about this event while he was away from Berlin in the underground seminary. He marked in his Bible the date Nov. 10, 1938 by the passage he was reading that day from Psalms 74:8-9: "They have cast fire into thy sanctuary, they have defiled by casting down the dwelling place of thy name to the ground. They said in their hearts, Let us destroy them together; they have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land."

Through connections with Dr. Karl Bonhoeffer, Dietrich's father, an exit visa was arranged for the United States, and on June 12, 1939, he arrived once again in New York--this time not as a student, but with a career as a teacher, writer, and theologian ahead of him away from the Third Reich. Nevertheless, he was troubled by his relative safety while his friends and family and students were in such grave danger.

From New York he wrote: "I do not understand why I am here….The short prayer in which we thought of our German brothers, almost overwhelmed me….If matters become more uncertain I shall certainly return to Germany….In the event of war I shall not stay in America."\(^9\)

In his further reflections on his situation in America, he wrote:

I shall have no right to participate in the reconstruction of Christianity in Germany after the war if I did not share in the trials of this time with my people. Christians in Germany face the terrible alternative of willing the defeat of their nation in order that civilization may survive, or willing the victory of their nation and thereby destroying civilization. I know which of these alternatives I must choose, but I cannot make that choice in security.\(^10\)

July 7, 1939 was Bonhoeffer's last day in America. He took one of the last ships back to Germany before war broke out. Once back in Germany, he began his involvement in the resistance to Hitler, first by working for Army Intelligence as mentioned, then being brought further into the conspiracy to overthrow Hitler by his brother-in-law Hans von Dohnanyi. His sister-in-law Emmi Bonhoeffer, the wife of Klaus Bonhoeffer, was also instrumental in the thinking of Bonhoeffer at this juncture. She asked him: "How is it with you Christians? You will not kill, yet if someone else does it, you are glad." He responded: "It is out of the question for a Christian to ask someone else to do the dirty work, so that he can keep his own hands clean. If one sees that something needs to be done then one must be prepared to do it; whether one is a Christian or not. If one sees the task is necessary according to one's own conscience."\(^11\)

And so, with General Ludwig Beck, Admiral William Canaris, Colonel Hans Oster, Hans von Dohnanyi, Klaus Bonhoeffer, and others, Dietrich Bonhoeffer began to play a small role in a grand conspiracy to make a coup d'etat by killing Hitler. In April, 1943, Bonhoeffer was arrested. The coup failed as many other attempts had failed, in July 1944. This failure, in effect, sentenced Bonhoeffer to death.

\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Memories and Perspectives.
\(^11\) Ibid.
This brings us to the dynamic ethical situation in which Bonhoeffer lived. How is it possible for an individual to move from a position as a pacifist to participation, albeit oblique, in an assassination plot? Emmi Bonhoeffer says: "It's not a break in his life....moving from being a pacifist to being a 'politician.' There is a clear line of development. The situation changed and the tasks changed." 12

This is the paradox. Situations change and tasks change, but do we have an ethical center to which we can hold, or is the ethical center changing with the tasks in a kind of continual ethical relativism? One word that is continually heard in connection with Dietrich Bonhoeffer is that he is "misunderstood." This must be true. How can one person fully understand another? Bonhoeffer's intellectual and moral struggle for an answer to the great questions of his day was best understood by Bonhoeffer himself. As Ivan Denisovich says in Alexander Solzhenitsyn's great book, "How can a person who is warm understand a person who is cold?" Nevertheless, if we can get a little closer to the struggle that Bonhoeffer went through, this might help us to have courage in our own ethical decision-making.

Bonhoeffer's movement from pacifist to conspirator can be explained by his teaching that there is not a separate morality for the world and for the church.

[There is not] one morality for the world and another morality for the congregation, one for the heathen and another for the Christian, one for the Christian in the secular sphere and another for the homo religiosus. The whole law and the whole gospel of God belong equally to all men. If it is objected that in the world the Church demands the maintenance of justice, of property and of marriage, but that from Christians she demands the renunciation of all these things, if it is objected that in the world retaliation and violence must be practised, but that Christians must practise forgiveness and unlawfulness, then these objections, which have as their goal a double Christian morality, and which are very widespread, proceed from a false understanding of the word of God. 13

There was only one morality for Bonhoeffer: to serve God and to do justice in the world. In Bonhoeffer's reading of the Sermon on the Mount, doing justice in the world meant not taking up arms against others. In his reading of the Proverbs, justice meant holding back those who were heading for death. "If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? And he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? And shall not he render to every man according to his work?" (Proverbs 24:11-12).

Evidently, Bonhoeffer concluded that the only way to deliver those who were marked for death was to conspire with others in the killing of the head of the whole evil system. The will of God comes to us in the clear speech of Scripture, and Bonhoeffer saw the will of God as a moving and developing thing:

The will of God is not a system of rules which is established from the outset; it is something new and different in each different situation in life, and for this reason a man must ever anew examine what the will of God may be. The

12 Ibid.
heart, the understanding, observation and experience must all collaborate in this task. It is no longer a matter of a man's own knowledge of good and evil, but solely of the living will of God; our knowledge of God's will is not something over which we ourselves dispose, but it depends solely upon the grace of God, and this grace is and requires to be new every morning.  

The problem here also involves the question of doing wrong to accomplish a greater good. Although we must be extremely careful here, Bonhoeffer acknowledges that sometimes a person will be called on to incur guilt for the sake of a greater good.

From the principle of truthfulness Kant draws the grotesque conclusion that I must even return an honest "yes" to the enquiry of the murderer who breaks into my house and asks whether my friend whom he is pursuing has taken refuge there; in such a case self-righteousness of conscience has become outrageous presumption and blocks the path of reasonable action. Responsibility is the total and realistic response of man to the claim of God and of our neighbour; but this example shows in its true light how the response of a conscience which is bound by principles is only a partial one. If I refuse to incur guilt against the principle of truthfulness for the sake of my friend, if I refuse to tell a robust lie for the sake of my friend (for it is only the self-righteously law-abiding conscience which will pretend that, in fact, no lie is involved), if, in other words, I refuse to bear guilt for charity's sake, then my action is in contradiction to my responsibility which has its foundation in reality. Here again it is precisely in the responsible acceptance of guilt that a conscience which is bound solely to Christ will best prove its innocence.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in the pressure cooker of Nazi Germany, was forced to live in a total way the ethical stance he had developed through his experiences and his writings. What Bonhoeffer did as a conspirator was not exactly a "normal" ethical response, nor were the times normal. It is difficult to know beforehand what response we will take as events unfold. This uncertain situation is the theme of one of Bonhoeffer's famous poems.

Who Am I?

Who am I? They often tell me  
I would step from my cell's confinement  
calmly, cheerfully, firmly,  
like a squire from his country house.

Who am I? They often tell me  
I would talk to my warders  
Freely and friendly and clearly,  
As though it were mine to command.
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Who am I? They also tell me
I would bear the days of misfortune
equably, smilingly, proudly,
like one accustomed to win.

Am I then really all that which other men tell of?
Or am I only what I know of myself,
Restless and longing and sick, like a bird in a cage,
Struggling for breath, as though hands were compressing my throat,
yearning for colours, for flowers, for the voices of birds,
thirsting for words of kindness, for neighbourliness,
trembling with anger at despotisms and petty humiliation,
tossing in expectation of great events,
powerlessly trembling for friends at an infinite distance,
weary and empty at praying, at thinking, at making,
faint, and ready to say farewell to it all?

Who am I? This or the other?
Am I one person today, and tomorrow another?
Am I both at once? A hypocrite before others,
And before myself a contemptibly woebegone weakling?
Or is something within me still like a beaten army,
Fleeing in disorder from victory already achieved?

Who am I? They mock me, these lonely questions of mine.
Whoever I am, thou knowest, O God, I am thine.16
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Necessary Evils:  
Gargoyles, Grotesquities, and Miss O’Connor

by Karen L. Mulder

In a 1999 New Yorker article on the Southern-driven photography of Sally Mann, Village Voice critic Hilton Als wrote

There have been so many interpretations of the South, and yet it’s still unreconstructed. It’s a landscape choked with words, and its authors—Faulkner, Porter, McCullers, Percy—all write, write, write as if waging war against themselves....Perhaps it’s the air, the tense air that Elizabeth Hardwick, a native Kentuckian, says is part of the region’s gestalt. Or perhaps it’s the tension of colored people and white people living together in a marriage whose civilized veneer coats a history of domestic violence.¹

Als commends one Southern author because she never reduced the South to word pictures evoked by such icons as gumbo, fried green tomatoes, white trash or watermelon crepe myrtle: Flannery O’Connor. She is one of the first Southern artists, Als asserts, who pitted her irony against her times. He applauds her tenacious habit of letting the hard questions go unanswered, and her consistent way of releasing what is called “Southern lyricism” rather than forcing it upon the reader. The lyricism of an O’Connor story seeps out of her characters as if almost against their wills; she lets it ooze in luscious drips or crack like a whip out of people who never internalized the romantic stew that most of us know as the antebellum South. Her people probably never truly accepted the existence of Tara, and a “fiddle-de-DEE” or a “la-de-DAH” coming from their cracked lips would have been tantamount to an obscenity.

O’Connor’s love of the absurdity of human beings, and the self-deprecating sense of humor she applies to her people, are said by some to be genetically-imprinted in the true Southern soul. Yet these qualities are merely the skin of her creations, the container for souls pulsing with sacramental matter. Without her embrace of this deeper substance, she would not be able to absolve the patent flaws, the Aristotelian hamartia, of each one—that fatal flaw which complicates life unbearably and multiplies exponentially as more characters are added to the storyline.

One story which exemplifies this interplay is “Parker’s Back,” the title of which refers both to the physical back of one Obadiah Elhiue Parker, as well as to Parker’s return to his own personhood. It implicates the necessary evil that is Parker’s wife, one dour and bony Sarah Ruth Cates whom he woos with an obscenity and is utterly ill-matched with him, and who Parker assumes is a Christian. In fact Sarah Ruth is nine-tenths of the law, and that is the extent of her religiosity; Sarah Ruth doesn’t believe in churches because she believes people do idolatrous things in them.²

Parker’s unique “skin” is a body covered with tattoos, and he becomes aware in the story that this skin is merely a container for a yawning emptiness. Inspired by the exotic otherworldliness of the tattooed man at a circus sideshow in his youth, Parker attempted to carve out a similar quality with his panoply of tattoos. But he failed. Each of his tattoos, and their juxtaposition to one another, can be analyzed as exhaustively as Hieronymus Bosch’s Garden of
Earthly Delights, with as little comprehension as a result of the process. O’Connor has packed associations into their placement, or lack of it, and their content. But, as Jill Baumgartner points out in Flannery O’Connor: A Proper Scaring, “All his tattoos have no unity. Arranged haphazardly and incongruently, they do not move together. Parker’s body is the emblem of his spiritual condition.”

In the midst of Parker’s dissatisfaction with himself, he is knocked off his tractor, and his shoes are literally blown off of his feet—an experience which Baumgartner likens to Moses and the burning bush. He decides to order a final tattoo on his back, but realizes with sacramental omniscience that it is the last tattoo, the Omega tattoo, and must bring the unity to his disjointed skin and be greater than just the Bible. In fact, it must even be greater than just the symbol of the unifying Christ—it must be Christ himself. Parker, reviewing all the tattoo artist’s designs, chooses to cover his back with the Pantocrator, “the Byzantine Christ,” as O’Connor puts it. As soon as the image is melded to his flesh, he drinks a massive amount of whiskey, gets into a bar brawl, and lands shoeless in the homeless shelter for the night—at the utter end of himself.

Sarah Ruth, representing merciless and reckless justice, meets him with accusations of infidelity, but when she sees the tattoo, she erupts into an absolute rage. “Look at it,” he says. “It ain’t anybody I know. It’s Him. God.” “What do you know how God looks? You ain’t seen him.” Sarah snarls. She then beats Parker so severely with her broom that red welts and blood crusts form on both his back and Christ himself. The Word is truly made flesh; Parker shares bodily in the physical sacrifice. Parker comes home to himself, because it is the only option left.

In some ways, all of O’Connor’s characters compare equitably with the grotesques of the medieval ages as caricatures of reality that contain the possibility of grace and redemption. But unless the reader starts at a place of relative security in the operative strength of grace and redemption, O’Connor’s stories will only be a skin-deep and sassy assessment of human character flaws. And there is so much more, as there was to the imagery of one of the most puzzling periods of church art: the grotesque visages of medieval Romanesque capitals and tympana which featured, among images of grace and redemption, and in a manner as jumbled as Parker’s skin, gargoyles and ghoulish beings worthy of a Tim Burton film, or a Hieronymus Bosch altarpiece.

I imagine that O’Connor’s detractors raise objections to her imaginative ethic that are not much different from the objections of a twelfth century reformer who started the Cistercian order. St. Bernard of Clairvaux vociferously complained about the material excesses and grotesque decorations of the Cluniac churches in his apologia to Abbot William Suger, the Parisian cleric credited with inspiring the beginning of the Gothic style at St. Denis. Bernard first writes testily about the amount of gold and wealth displayed in the cathedrals. “Do you think such appurtenances are meant to stir the penitents to compunction,” he writes, “or rather to make sightseers agog? Oh vanity of vanities, whose vanity is rivaled only by its insanity! The walls of the church are aglow, but the poor grow hungry!”

Suger was definitely not on the same page. Justifying his lavish expenditures and bursting coffers, Suger daintily covers his motives in a booklet about the renovations of St. Denis, expostulating that

when...the loveliness of the many colored gems has called me from external cares, and worthy meditation has induced me to reflect, transferring that which is material to that which is immaterial, on the diversity of the sacred
virtues: then it seems to me that...by the grace of God, I can be transported from this inferior to that higher world in an analogical manner. 5

Anagogical justification, it would seem, has been passed down through the centuries, virtually unchanged, to any number of televangelists—although bouffant wigs or toupees and ersatz Louis Catorze furniture compare rather weakly with gemstones and pure gold.

Returning to the twelfth century: Bernard consequently parted ways with the Cluniacs and innovated the Cistercian order, which set its abbeys far from city centers, maintaining a stance of chastity and poverty. Cistercian architecture was stolid and plain, and beautiful in its solid simplicity. Windows were made of clear glass, not the richly colored glass of St. Denis, allowing the sole decoration of the interior to be the light of the sun, an analogue for God’s purity and light. If a Cistercian order took over a sanctuary, in fact, the abbot and prior were to see to it that within a year and a half all colored glass was removed—else they ran the risk of eating only bread and water until the glass was replaced. 6

But the portion of Bernard’s jeremiad which relates more directly to O’Connor is more to the point. Bernard condemns the use of grotesquity in the sanctuary, and in so doing, leaves nothing to the imagination.

What are those ridiculous monstrosities doing, an amazing kind of deformed beauty and yet a beautiful deformity? What are the filthy apes doing there? The fierce lions? The monstrous centaurs? The creatures, part man and part beast?... You may see many bodies under one head, and conversely, many heads on one body. On one side the tail of a serpent is seen on a quadruped, on the other side the head of a quadruped is on the body of a fish... In short, everywhere so plentiful and astonishing a variety of contradictory forms is seen that one would rather read in the marble than in books, and spend the whole day wondering at every single one of them rather than in meditating on the law of God. Good God! If one is not ashamed of the absurdity, why is one not at least troubled at the expense? 7

In fact, the laundry list of excesses is longer than I’ve allowed here, and in its very length and detail might reveal Bernard’s personal fascination with the very beasts he describes. Moreover, it can be argued that the chiasmic overload of such works did, in fact, “stir the penitents to compunction,” although today it sets the sightseers agog, because twentieth century sightseers are the only people entering (and financially buttressing) these cathedrals. 8

We cannot know the exact imaginative ethic of the medieval carvers because they worked with stone and not with words. It is presumed that they carved to enhance the understanding of the congregation, which was also illiterate. Honorius of Autun, the town where the exemplary concentration of grotesquity is displayed at Saint Lazare, wrote that art was acceptable if it beautified the House of God; if it called to mind the lives of religious figures; and if it served as literature to the laity. 9

As the grotesques contemplated thus far would be considered agents of beautification only in a Maurice Sendak book and represent no saints we would wish to imagine, we must also question whether such works received the bishop’s absolution as “literature to the laity.” This rationale is also compromised by the fact that such capitals, approximately two or three feet in height, are positioned at least thirty feet above the ground, where the unbespectacled medieval
viewer—since glasses had not yet been invented—might not even be able to see them. Tympana are also twenty feet above the ground, perched over huge doors. Could it be that these images, which we so handily view in our mass-produced textbooks, conveniently enlarged, were designed solely as a presence before God, beyond the view of the nearsighted—in other words, can it be that the carver’s justification for grotesquery was precisely that such images were far enough from the congregation to do no harm, yet close enough to heaven to perhaps titillate God? Does this represent the irony of their times?

A list of grotesqueries, similar to St. Bernard’s in syntax if not content, is repeated in a scene from Umberto Eco’s medieval detective mystery The Name of The Rose. Eco merged his erudition of the medieval world, seen most particularly in his book Art and Beauty in the Middle Ages, with a vivid imagination that gives readers a palpable grasp of the feel and stink, if not the paranoid millennial fear, of the age. Mindful of the vast and superstitious sense of mystery which marks the period, Eco describes the thoughts of a naive Franciscan novice, Axel, who stumbles into the narthex of a great basilica for the first time. Before he virtually passes out from visual overload, Axel describes at least twenty of Bernard’s “deformed beauties” and “beautiful deformities” of which, Axel remarks, “only the vague reports of travelers speak slightly.”

...[M]any of them were unfamiliar to me, others I identified. For example, brutes with six fingers on each hand;...sirens with scaly tails who seduce sailors; Scylla, with a girl’s head and bosom, a she-wolf’s belly, and a dolphin’s tail; the hairy men of India who live in swamps; the synocephali, who cannot say a word without barking; sciopods, who run swiftly on their single leg and when they want to take shelter from the sun stretch out and hold up their great foot like an umbrella...  

Eco does not describe the rest of the program, which invariably included dire representations of the fates of the damned and the fates of the saved—in which case, just as in medieval literature and drama, hell was always far more entertaining than the floating, serene haze of heaven. Gislebertus, who even signed the tympanum at Autun with Gislebertus Hoc Fecit [Gislebertus made this], also carved into the grand lintel, “Let all who see this terror be appalled.” While this is a tantalizing clue about the rationale of these carvings, it is not enough to anchor an academic reputation or specialty.  

Eco does not leave the novice’s experience at the level of stupefaction. In the novel, Axel makes a concise but reasonable apologetic for the weird variety of necessary evils carved into the sanctuary. Although Eco does not say it, most of these programs always featured Christ in the center of the tympanum, over the door, in His cosmic mandorla, extending a hand over both the realm of salvation as well as that of the damned. So Axel is able to conclude, without artifice, that the doorway “bore witness that the Word had reached all the known world, and was extending to the unknown...Thus, the doorway was a joyous promise of concord, of unity achieved in the world of Christ.”

Do we really believe this? Is this acceptable? Perhaps our generic skepticism is our birthright. It is no mystery that medieval theatergoers hooted most loudly when the devil took the stage, or the sinner was unmasked, or the hellmouth opened its yawp to consume the damned. These were plot twists that persons could really sink their teeth into, so to say. A perfectly balanced realm of light and understanding and resolution, however...how does the artist portray
it? Not very well, but artists can hardly be blamed for having limited imaginations. For who has seen Paradise? We can only long for the resolution that heaven is supposed to be, with very little descriptive material to go on, and this does not good art make. Generally, it makes flannelgrams, banners and Sunday school curricula.

Dante himself was inspired by Giotto’s mosaics from the late thirteenth century, and Giotto had probably seen carvings like those of Autun and Vezelay, which in turn may have been influenced by so-called eyewitness reports of underworld sojourners such as Tondal, Thurkill, Drythelm, and Albericus in the fifth through ninth centuries. Dante’s Inferno is not purely the writer’s invention, but rather the ultimate synthesis of all which came before it plus a great dose of Dante’s inventive genius; it is still the most widely read book of The Divine Comedy, whose Paradiso seems rather stuffy, bucolic and static by comparison.  

The riot, the visual cacophony of these Romanesque stones represents, possibly, the most inventive imaginative schema—or, alternatively, the least derivative schema—to be found in Christian art. This is a style that is clearly far removed from the neoclassicism of the Renaissance, and certainly not reiterated from the symbolization of something empirically filtered out of nature, which fueled the eighteenth and nineteenth century religious landscapes of Constable, David Friedrich Caspar, Thomas Cole, or the Hudson River School. This is informed by an interior landscape all its own—the cartography of the imagination. Yet as Eco’s study on Augustinian aesthetics reveals, medieval taste was concerned neither with the autonomy of art nor the autonomy of nature. It involved, as Eco explains, the more complicated apprehension of “all of the relations, imaginative and supernatural, subsisting between the contemplated object and a cosmos which opened on to the transcendent. It meant discerning in the concrete object an ontological reflection of, and participation in, the being and the power of God.”

If the being and the power of God is the rock-bottom foundation of the artist, then the contemplation of evil can be frank, and its portrayal can be freed up from fear. After all, the reason people do not receive difficult imagery, or difficult art, or difficult literature, is often justified as a preference for beauty over the horrific, quite understandably. But I would go so far as to say that certain individuals grapple with personal fears in the face of threatening visual imagery. Medievalists faced the same millennial fear and pessimism we recently faced on the eve of the year 2000, but canned foods, wheatgrinders and home generators were not a solution for them. Faith, and getting straight with God, was the only option big enough for the Western Christian to combat the coming destruction, if there were to be destruction.

Anthony di Renzo’s assessment in American Gargoyles: Flannery O’Connor and the Medieval Grotesque makes one of the most assertive connections between the imaginative rationale of O’Connor and medieval art. He suggests that the potency of O’Connor’s characters, in their clearly evidenced human weakness and gross disjunction with life in general, is an modern counterpart of the medieval carvings from French Romanesque cathedrals of the tenth through twelfth century. And I admit that the parallelism is attractive, but only if you take into account the possible motivations behind the imaginations of medieval sculptors, and the possible motivations of an opinionated Catholic writer from Georgia.

Unfortunately, the motivations behind art-making, or the intentional grid of the artist in historical periods other than ours, is banned from contemporary criticism in academia—which therefore robs us of a deep vein of sensibilities which we, as moderns, may have discounted—much as O’Connor’s grizzly scenarios are discredited by that populace in the pews which prefers to candy-coat human nature—a blatant form of whitewashing using the sugar of confected and gracious manners.
It is only from a confident vantage point of belief in a unified and immutable Absolute that one can harness grotesqueness with the ultimate goal of redeeming an image to produce grace. Gargoyles remind us that our moral propensity is to sin and to err, and that we are ugly in God’s sight and less useful than a one-footed scio pod or a synocephalus. The consequences of meanness and small thinking lead Flannery O’Connor’s grotesques into situations that the reader knows could have been avoided. But as Anthony di Renzo writes, “In the cathedral of Flannery O’Connor’s fiction, the gargoyles have the last laugh.”15 Their perversity subverts all efforts to reduce her art to a sermon or a jeremiad—just as medieval workers sabotaged the Euclidean blueprints of church architects by embellishing them with a thousand improvised monstrosities. O’Connor’s grotesques are the emancipators of her fiction. Their maddening ambiguity guarantees her readers an interpretive freedom, a chance to participate in the construction of poetic meaning, as di Renzo has noted.

Beyond the limitations of reasoning and observation, grotesques delve into the reality of the holy—and for this reason, I am of the opinion that they should not be discredited and discounted in contemporary imagery conceived by Christians. As God is infinite and creative, setting no parameters in the Old or New Testament other than the warning against idolatry, we must assume that artists of faith are free to ply an infinitely creative number of solutions to image-making.

Even John Ruskin, the venerable art critic and self-proclaimed advocate for the figurative tradition of painting in the 1800s, appraised gargoyles and grotesques as “the signs of the life and liberty of every workman who struck the stone; a freedom of thought [which ranks] in scale of being, such as no laws, no charters, no charities can secure.” 16

What we have forgotten is the ability to hold things in paradox, to suspend belief in honor of a transcendent cosmos, and to allow a diversity of expression within a general unity of thought. Because unity is no more. We want polyphony, but we hear dissonance; we sense fragmentation, when we long for integration and wholeness. We desire to make big statements with our art, but we can only make small subjective observations.

Here is the greatest paradox of all. Creative liberty is truly at its freest within the orderly confines of a universal absolute. Flannery O’Connor is a timeless contributor to the genre because she understood this; she could envision the small statements— the human details which clog life—in their larger context. O’Connor’s gargoyles are more relevant now to us than, perhaps, the Romanesque demons and beasts, but no less tied into the tradition of grotesqueness that is meant to appall and to “stir the penitents to compunction.” And Christ has remained the unifying presence between the realm of the damned and the realm of the saved; the one who must be believed to be seen, as Parker learned from the beating on his back; the one who urges us to forgive seven times seventy times, so that we might grasp our own forgiveness and land in a place where grotesqueries have no use, and where the necessary evil of gargoyles is forever dispelled.
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honorific, which became widely popular in the Middle Ages. Honorius Augustodunensis writes that Mary Magdalene merited her singular Christophany ("angelum videre meruit Dominusque resurgens primo omnium ei publice apparuit"), and that Christ sent her as an apostle to his Apostles ("eamque apostolam apostolis suis misit"); Honorius sees Mary as a second Eve bearing the message of eternal life instead of subjecting humankind to mortality ("et sicut prima femina mortem viro tradert, ita nunc femina perhennem vitam viris nunciaret"; PL 172.981). In Joseph Szövérffy's survey of medieval Magdalene hymns, Apostola is one of four principal titles that she is repeatedly given (92). Vernacular authors such as Osbern Bokenham (139) and Nicholas Love (206) also observe this distinction in their praise of the Magdalene, and Joseph Harris has argued that the ballad "Maiden in the Mor Lay" draws upon similar Magdalene traditions (79). Possibly the most dramatic illustration of her apostolic role can be found in an English twelfth-century psalter probably prepared for Christina of Markyate. Here the Magdalene, with hand raised, extends her finger in a gesture of address, recounting the news of the Resurrection to eleven wide-eyed Apostles who hang on her every word. This iconography is not common, but it can be found in multiple manuscript illustrations, carvings, and stained glass beginning in the eleventh century (Haskins 220, 452).

Conscience's suggestion that the Magdalene noised her news indiscriminately abroad undermines her quasi-evangelical authority. Even his summarizing statement, "Thus cam it out þat crist overcoom, recoypered and lyuede," implies a random relaying of information. The language of the Vulgate, confirmed by patristic, hagiographic, dramatic, and lyric traditions, stresses Mary Magdalene's role as an appointed envoy to the Apostles, not the indiscriminate speaker we find in Conscience's account.

III

Conscience's portrayal of a garrulous Magdalene offers an ideal opportunity to employ the proverb "What a woman knows may not well remain secret." The garrulity of women was a proverbial commonplace, and its appearance in one of the most encyclopedic poems of the English Middle Ages may therefore be unsurprising. Examination of the contexts in which this proverb occurs elsewhere, however, reveals more specific, and more specifically ideological, agendas which condition its use and which motivate Conscience's apparently gratuitous denigration of the Magdalene.

The "counselle" proverb's first English attestation comes from the widely popular Proverbs of Alfred, in which we are told that King Alfred was "þe wysuste mon þat wes englelon on" (lines 23-24). For the author or compiler of the Proverbs, part of the king's wisdom involved a facility with misogynistic traditions. At "Siford," before a gathering of bishops and earls, knights and clerks, Alfred counsels his men: "Be never so insane nor so drunk with wine that you ever tell your wife all your plans, because she will reveal all in front of all your enemies . . . for woman is word-crazy and has a tongue too swift, and even though she

---

Le Culte de Marie Madeleine en Occident, des origines à la fin du moyen âge.

I translate from the J text (Jesus College Oxford MS. 29). The "counselle" proverb is item W534 in the Whiting's proverb dictionary; compare items F426 and W485, and Tilley's item W649.
might want to, she cannot withhold anything.” In the *Proverbs of Alfred* we first witness what will become a recurrent narrative context for this proverb: the secrets which a “word-wod” woman divulges will be hazardous to men.

No text more strongly emphasizes the danger of confiding in wives than Jean de Meun’s portion of the *Roman de la Rose*, in which the female personification Nature “confesses” to a male Genius for creating that most reprehensible of all creatures, Man. What ensues is a broad parody of Catholic confession in which a priestly Genius uses his authority not only to counsel Nature, but also to embark on a diatribe against the seductive menace and verbal infidelity of women, employing the same sententious advice found a century earlier in the *Proverbs of Alfred*:

No man born of woman, unless he is drunk or demented, should reveal anything to a woman that should be kept hidden, if he doesn’t want to hear it from someone else . . . for if, just one single time he ever dares grouse at her or scold her or get angry, he puts his life in danger—if he deserved death for his deed—that she will have him hanged by the neck, if the judges catch him, or secretly murdered by friends. (276)

As in the *Proverbs of Alfred*, we see the details of the insanity or drunkenness that must afflict a foolish man who speaks his mind to his wife, as well as the disastrous consequence which would befall him. A few lines later, Genius dramatizes the proverb by portraying a sexually seductive wife who weasels her husband’s secret out of him, saying:

I see all these other women who are sufficiently mistresses of their houses so that their husbands confide in them enough to tell them all their secrets. They all take counsel with their wives when they lie awake together in their beds, and they confess themselves privately so that there is nothing left to them to tell. Truth to tell, they even do so more often than they do to the priest. I know it well from them themselves, for many times I have heard them; they have revealed to me everything, whatever they have heard and seen and even all that they think. In this way they purge and empty themselves. However, I am not the same sort. (278)

Jean de Meun’s mention of priests in this passage transforms these loose-lipped wives into metaphorical confessors—a metaphor further explored below.

Chaucer would make liberal use of the “counseille” proverb, employing some form of it in *The Wife of Bath’s Tale* (the digression on Midas and his ass’s ears, line 980), *The Monk’s Tale* (2015-30; 2090-94), and *The Tale of Melibee* (1060). Chaucer’s Monk, for example, does not ascribe Samson’s downfall to fortune, but to his error of confiding in women:

Of Sampson now wol I namoore sayn.
Beth war by this ensample oold and playn
That no men telle hir conseil til hir wyves
Of swich thyng as they wolde han seerec fayn,
If that it touche hir lymes or hir lyves.

*(MkT 2090-94)*
The Wife of Bath is especially fond of quoting proverbs, even to the disparagement of her own gender. In her tale, when she discusses the suggestion that a woman most desires her husband’s confidence, she embarks on a long digression employing, and radically altering, the familiar myth of King Midas and his ass’s ears—a digression in which Midas’s wife, not his barber, betrays his embarrassing secret. She further affirms the truth of the proverb in a confessional passage concerning the secrets of Jankin:

My fiftie housbonde--God his soule blesse!--
Which that I took for love, and no richesse,
He som tyme was a clerk of Oxenforde,
And hadde left scote, and went at hom to bord
With my gossib, dwellynge in oure toun;
She knew myn herte, and eek myn privete,
Bet than oure parisse preest, so moote I thee!
To hire biwreyed I my conseil al.
For hadde myn housbonde pissed on a wal,
Or doon a thynge that sholde han cost his lyf,
To hire, and to another worthy wyf,
And to my nece, which that I loved weel,
I wolde han toold his conseil every deel.
And so I did ful ofte, God it woot,
That made his face often reed and hoot
For verray shame, and blamed hymselfe for he
Had toold to me so greet a pryvete.

(Prol. WBT 531-42)

Thus Jankin joins husbands from the Proverbs of Alfred, the Roman de la Rose, and the Wife’s own tale as men whose lives are ruined or jeopardized by their loose-lipped wives.  

---

7 One might also observe that the verbal promiscuity of these women frequently possesses a sexual correlative. The wife of Genius’s Roman de la Rose diatribe partially undresses as she solicits her husband’s secret, while Delilah and the Wife of Bath are both portrayed as sexually powerful and potentially dangerous. The “counselle” proverb also features prominently in Thomas Hoccleve’s Tale of Jonathas, in which the prying woman is the prostitute Felicula. This correlation between verbal and sexual promiscuity might have prompted Langland’s audience to recall the Magdalene’s traditional status as a reformed prostitute, thereby associating her with the Venerien Wife of Bath, the prostitute Felicula, the temptress Delilah, and the seductive wife of Genius’s diatribe in a sorority of sexually and verbally dangerous women. Langland alludes to the Magdalene’s sexuality in passus 5, lines 496-498 and passus 10, line 428, presenting the Magdalene as one of salvation history’s greatest sinners whose redemption illustrates God’s abundant grace. No one, according to the Dreamer, could have led a worse life in the world than her. Conscience, however, does not make the Magdalene’s presumed sexual past an issue in passus 19.
This selective but representative narrative history of the proverb reveals that loose-lipped and prying women jeopardize men’s crucial secrets, and sometimes their very lives. And in two instances the usually domestic “counseille” proverb carries with it implicit ecclesiastical associations. Genius’s diatribe in the Roman de la Rose, with its portrayal of women as irresponsible secular confessors, reinforces the exclusively male role of confessor by pointing out a woman’s inability to hold an office so dependent upon the ability to “keep counseille.” Chaucer was to repeat these ecclesiastical associations in the Wife of Bath’s Prologue, in which Alisoun asserts that her gossip “knew myn herte, and eek my privetee, / Bet than oure parisshe preest . . . .” If this is how women keep counsel, so the argument would run, they surely would make disastrous priests. In the Roman de la Rose and the Wife of Bath’s Prologue, the proverbial garrulity of women is expanded from a domestic sphere to reflect a religious one.

However, the author who provides the clearest connection between the “counseille” proverb and anxieties over women’s religious authority is Langland himself. In passus 5, Wrath, a former friar, slanders all women while confessing to Repentance:

I haue an Aunte to Nonne and an Abbesse bope;
Hir were leure swowe or swelte þan suffre any peyne.
I haue be cook in hir kichene and þe Couent serued
Manye Monþes wþ hem, and wþ Monkes bope.
I was þe Prioresse potager and opere pouere ladies,
And maad hem loutes of langlyng þat dame Iohane was a bastard,
And dame Clarice a knyþtes douþter ac a cokewold was hir sire,
And dame Pernele a prestes fyle; Prioresse worþ she neuere
For she hadde child in chriyteme; al oure Chapitre it wiste.
Of wikkede wordes I, wræþe, hire wortes made
Til “þow lixt!” and “þow lixt!” lopen out at ones
And eþer hitte ouþer vnder þe cheke.
Hadde þei had knuyes, by crist! hir eþer hadde kild ouþer.
Seint Gregory was a good pope, and hadde a good forwit:
That no Prioresse were preest, for þat he purueiede;
They hadde þanne ben Infamis, þei kan so yuele hele counseil.

(5.153-68)

For Wrath, the “counseille” proverb involves no mere metaphor but stands as the principal argument against women priests. Wrath dismisses the prioresses’ assumptions of authority with the same reproach that Conscience levels at the Magdalene, using the same proverb; they cannot restrain their “janglyng” mouths.

IV

Up to now my focus has been on literary traditions that may help make sense of Langland’s problematical Magdalene, but it is in a social context that Conscience’s proverbial denigration of the Magdalene can be better understood, and gendered controversies of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries recommend such an approach. In the first half of the
thirteenth century, it appears that some prioresses were testing the limits of their religious authority despite the oft-repeated injunctions of 1 Timothy 2:11-12, encroaching upon the priestly duty of hearing nuns’ confessions. Their presumption led to a sharp rebuke by Pope Gregory IX, who forbade prioresses to assume such duties. It is this decretal to which Wrath alludes in passus 5, and Wrath’s use of the “couseille” proverb implies an association on some level in Langland’s mind between the Magdalene and these prioresses who had overstepped their bounds.

Perhaps Langland was concerned with these gendered tensions because his age was uniquely marked by an increasingly public feminine religiosity that became associated with everything subversive and dangerous. The explosion of lay piety, affective devotion, and vernacular translation of Scripture threatened to circumvent the already-besieged clerical community in England. Mystics such as Julian of Norwich were recording their spiritual experiences while Langland was writing his poem, and those who received visions from God authorizing non-traditional actions would prove most difficult to contain. Jean de Gerson, the staunch defender of orthodoxy best known for his vigorous persecution of Wycliff’s continental counterpart, Jan Hus, felt compelled to remind Langland’s generation that “the female sex is forbidden on apostolic authority to teach in public, that is either by word or by writing . . . All women’s teaching, particularly formal teaching by word and by writing, is to be held suspect unless it has been diligently examined, and much more fully than men’s” (Colledge and Walsh 151). Here we may be reminded of a Canterbury monk’s reaction to Margery Kempe: “I wold how wer closyd in an hows of ston pat per schuld no man speke wyth pe” (27).

If contemporary accounts can be trusted, there were not enough houses of stone in all of England to contain the women who were supposedly assuming important roles in heretical movements of Langland’s day. Lollardy especially offered opportunities for women that orthodox Catholicism would never have allowed, as women assumed important but hazardous roles as readers and interpreters of Scripture. Yet the extent to which women were actually involved in Lollardy is the subject of considerable debate. Claire Cross has suggested that through being central to the family unit by which Lollardy thrived, women were spiritual leaders in the heresy. According to Cross, women were active teachers mainly through Conventicle recitation of memorized Scripture (360, 370-71). Margaret Aston continued Cross’s line of inquiry, additionally addressing rumors that Lollard women were actually functioning as priests. However, Shannon McSheffrey has cautioned against exaggerating women’s roles, reminding us that most of these women were illiterate and ancillary to a definite male leadership structure. McSheffrey writes, “Even most influential female Lollards confined their endeavors to informal situations rather than public teaching roles” (21).

Although the extent of women’s actual involvement in Lollardy is debatable, one thing is certain: women were perceived to be usurping traditionally male roles in heretical movements, including preaching and expounding Scripture, and this usurpation was to be a source of great anxiety. Margery Kempe’s public religiosity repeatedly earned her the accusation of “fals loller,” suggesting an association among her contemporaries between the heresy and preaching

---

8 See Friedberg, Decretal Gregor. IX Lib. V. Tit. XXXVIII. cap. x (cols. 886-7).
women. It may be no coincidence that the two great persecutors of Wycliffite and Hussite belief, Thomas Arundel and Jean de Gerson, also made a point of condemning women preachers. Margaret Aston adduces considerable evidence from chronicle and sermon literature, poetry, and polemical tracts to reveal widespread concern over women’s roles among the champions of orthodoxy. By the 1390s rumors were circulating throughout London that women were celebrating masses, and Hoccleve’s oft-quoted verbal assault on Oldcastle shows how women were already established as vigorous heretical interpreters of Scripture in the minds of the orthodox by this time:

Some wommen eek, thogh hir wit be thynne,
Wole argumentes make in holy writ!
Lewe calates! sittith doun and spynne,
And kakele of sumwhat elles, for your wit
Is al to feeble to despute of it!
To Clerkes grete apparteneth þat aart
The knowleche of þat, god hath fro yow shite;
Stynte and leue of for right scelendre is your paart. (13)

Hoccleve responds to the threat of Lollard women scholars in what is by now a predictable pattern: by impugning their authority through misogynistic portrayals of small minds and big mouths. The imagined “kakeling” of Hoccleve’s women is a revealing correlative to Langland’s depiction of “janglyng” priorresses and an indiscriminate Magdalene. The charge of garrulity seems to have been a multi-purpose putdown for any group of presumptuous women.

Aston discusses the most compelling evidence for a late fourteenth-century debate over women’s religious authority in the case of Walter Brut (or Brit), arrested in 1391 on heresy charges. Brought before the Bishop of Hereford, John Trefnant, Brut contended that women did indeed have priestly powers denied them by orthodoxy, expressing such powers in explicitly Petrine terms (e.g., they have the power “to bind and to loose”). Prominent theologians were convened to counter Brut’s claims, and his case evolved into a kind of referendum on whether women could attain religious privileges formerly reserved to men. In the debate between Brut and his opponents, the Magdalene was introduced as proof of the defensibility of women preachers: “multe mulieres constanter predicaverunt verbum quando sacerdotes et alii non audebant verbum loqui et patet de Magdalea et Martha” (“Many women steadfastly preached the Word when priests and others did not dare speak the Word, as evinced by the Magdalene and Martha” (Aston 52; my translation). Brut’s case demonstrates that the symbolic power of the Magdalene’s voice could be and was appropriated by proponents of expanded female religious liberties.10

9 William White was also alleged to have used these Petrine terms in the early fifteenth century; see Aston 52, 59.

10 Here one might also be mindful of allegations made toward Waldensian women. In his Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses (ca. 1241), the Dominican Moneta of Cremona asserts that “the Waldensians appealed to the example of Mary Magdalene to justify preaching
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Brut’s defense benefitted from hagiographical traditions that made Mary and Martha outstanding women evangelists. In the *Legenda Aurea*, St. Peter entrusts Mary Magdalene to the care of Maximin fourteen years after the Resurrection. When the disciples disperse to spread the gospel, Maximin, Mary, Martha, Lazarus, and others are cast out to sea in a rudderless ship by unbelievers. Miraculously arriving safely at Marseilles, the Magdalene immediately sets to work converting heathens through the power of her speech. The composer of the *vita* invests the Magdalene’s lips with both erotic and rhetorical power:

When blessed Mary Magdalene saw the people gathering at the shrine to offer sacrifice to the idols, she came forward, her manner calm and her face serene, and with well-chosen words called them away from the cult of idols and preached Christ fervidly to them. All who heard her were in admiration at her beauty, her eloquence, and the sweetness of her message... and no wonder, that the mouth which had pressed such pious and beautiful kisses on the Savior’s feet should breathe forth the perfume of the word of God more profusely than others could. (376-77)

It is no wonder then, given Mary Magdalene’s status as an emblem of the value—even the privilege—of women’s speech, that she could be perceived as a dangerous role model by later clerics. A figure outside the male apostolic circle of Christ but who was still clearly favored by him, the Magdalene would serve as an inspiration for a growing body of late medieval women who similarly sought an affective bond with Christ independent of a male clerical “inner circle.” Prominent women such as Christina of Markyate and possibly even Richard II’s Queen Isabella owned Psalters depicting the Magdalene proclaiming the Resurrection to the other Apostles. Osbern Bokenham tells us that Lady Bouchier, Countess of Eu, commissioned the English translation of her *vita*, with pointed emphasis on her apostolic role:

“I have,” quod she, “of pure affeeyoun
Ful longe tym had a synguler deuocyeoun
To þat holy wumman, wych, as I gesse,
Is clepyd of apostyls þe apostyllesse;
Blyssyd Mary mawdelyn y mene,
Whom cryste from syn made pure & clene,
As þe clerykys seyn, ful mercyfully,
Whos lyf in englysshe I desyre sothly
To han maad, & for my sake
If ye lykyd þe labour for to take,
& for reuerence of hyr, I wold you preye.”
(5065-75)

And when Margery Kempe portrays herself repeatedly answering the question, “Why wepist þu so, woman?” surely she is engaging in more than a little self-fashioning. Conscience’s proverbial

by women” (Kienzle 105). Of course, since this *Summa* was intended to point out the errors of the heresy, its allegations may be distortions of actual Waldensian practice.
denigration of the Magdalene, then, reflects contemporary tension between a male clerical orthodoxy struggling to maintain ecclesiastical control in opposition to a growing number of women who, like the Magdalene, refused to be silent, who believed in the validity of their spiritual experience, and who sought a greater public authority in matters of the soul.

V

We are finally confronted with an issue raised at the outset of this study: if Conscience is such a courteous character in passus 19, why attribute this proverbial misogyny to him? Any discussion of Conscience’s role must begin with a definition of his function in faculty psychology, and Mary Carruthers offers a useful summary of scholarly readings. According to Carruthers, scholastics held that Conscience represented basic “moral sense,” a blend of synderesis and conscience. Quoting Aquinas, Carruthers defines synderesis as a “habit, a natural disposition of the practical intellect, ‘the first practical principles bestowed on us by nature,’ by means of which the practical intellect is inclined to the good and is able ‘to discover, and to judge of what [it has] discovered’” (Schroeder 15). Conscience, then, is a catch-all term for several “intellectual habits” derived from synderesis, and is a faculty devoted to making distinctions and applying knowledge. Carruthers further comments, “The role of conscience was able to include not only the function of moral judge but also that of intellectual judge distinguishing between truth and falsehood” (16). Given this definition, it appears strange that Conscience would depart from Scripture and portray an indiscriminate Magdalene by means of an antifeminist proverb in his account of the Resurrection. Perhaps Carruthers’ discussion of Conscience’s collective role explains the portrayal. Citing the work of Morton Bloomfield, Carruthers observes that Conscience’s role as knight “may indeed reflect an aspect of the monastic conception of conscience—not only as the guide and protector of the individual soul but as a collective conscience defending the collective soul of the Church” (17-18).

I would suggest that Conscience’s account of the Resurrection results from his collective role as defender of Holy Church, and his use of proverbial misogyny constitutes an attempt to unify and defend an increasingly fractured Catholic orthodoxy. This is a role he will play in greater detail as the final two passus unfold—building and defending the Barn of Unity. Immediately after employing the “counseille” proverb, Conscience tells us that “Peter parceyueth al pis and pursued after, / Bope James and Johan, iese to seke, / Thaddee and ten mo wip Thomas of Inde.” Conscience emphasizes Peter’s intellectual understanding of Mary Magdalene’s words, for these words prompt him and other Apostles to await Christ’s appearance before the Eleven. The sense of 19:157-69 is that Mary Magdalene indiscriminately broadcasts the news of the Resurrection, but it is Peter who first fully understands its ramifications and, with the other Apostles, takes action. Here Langland may have been influenced by an interpretation best developed by Aquinas, who argued that the Magdalene’s Christophany was flawed, that she was unfit to preach and needed the male Apostles to translate her information into action (Børresen 245-46).

Perhaps Conscience, in devaluing Mary Magdalene’s authority and affirming Peter’s, is making clear just who exactly has the power to bind and loose. Given the historical rivalry that
obtains between the two figures, it may be no coincidence that the divestment of Mary’s authority and the investment of Peter’s occurs in the space of a mere thirty-four lines, culminating with the papal privilege given to St. Peter:

And whan þis dede was doon do best he þouȝte,
And yaf Piers pardon, and power he grauntede hym,
Myght men to assolle of alle manere synnes,
To alle maner men mercy and forgifnesse
In coueuntant þat þei come and kneueliche to paie
To Piers pardon þe Plowman redde quod debes.
Thus hap Piers power, be his pardon paied,
To bynde and vnbynde boþe here and ellis,
And assolle men of alle synnes saue of dette one. (19.182-90)

Here Conscience replaces Christ’s post-Resurrection commission to all of the Apostles (John

---

11 Christ’s command to Mary Magdalene to bear the news of the Resurrection specifically to Peter entwines these two figures forever in the narrative of the greatest authority-conferring experience in church history, and calls attention to Peter’s dependence upon Mary Magdalene for the news. The Magdalene’s Christophany granted her a privilege unattained even by Peter, the foremost of the Apostles and the “rock” upon which the church is founded. The respective designations of Mary Magdalene and Peter even betray a kind of hierarchical rivalry, as apostola apostolorum and princeps apostolorum both make special claims for themselves. This rivalry was much more than a nominal one. Gnostic gospels reveal a well-documented and strongly gendered tension between Mary Magdalene and Peter in nascent Christianity. (On the Magdalene in Gnostic writings, generally see Malvern 42-56; Pagels 12-14, 22, 64-66; and Haskins 42. For other early texts that depict a gendered tension among the Apostles, see Schüssler-Fiorenza 304-9, 332-33.) Perhaps Gnostic and medieval writers were elaborating on the same tensions suggested in New Testament accounts in which Peter seems to doubt the Magdalene’s words (e.g., Luke 24:12). Most importantly, Mary’s unequivocal privilege of seeing Christ first was undermined by Paul’s mention of Peter and omission of Mary in the Resurrection account of 1 Corinthians 15:5, thus making them competitors for the distinction and fostering a debate that would prove to be of the highest importance in establishing papal power and the roles of women in the church. In the figure of Peter, medieval dramatists would depict an Apostle angrily dismissive of the Magdalene in terms that emphasized her gender. The Towneley Thomas Indie, for example, begins with Mary Magdalene bringing the news to the Apostles; Peter shouts her down with an impassioned “Do way, woman, thou carpys wast!” (1 line 7). The exchange continues at length, with the Magdalene accusing Peter of heresy and Peter vigorously maintaining that the Magdalene’s lying is shameful. For other medieval texts which depict Peter’s skepticism of the Magdalene, see the Coventry (“Corpus Christi”) Appearance to Mary Magdalene (Davies 343-46), and the Ms. e Museo 160 Christ’s Resurrection (726-29; Baker 191). This rivalry would provide Langland with an inviting narrative context in which to insert a misogynistic proverb so dependent upon gendered tension and mistrust.
20:19-23) with Peter’s singular commission (Matt. 16:18-19). Conscience also undermines the communal sense of John 20 by referring to the gathering as “Peter and . . . his Apostles” — a foregrounding of Peter not found in Scripture. Peter’s special commission is similar to the communal commission, but it occurs well before the Resurrection, even before Christ’s transfiguration. Perhaps Conscience makes these changes in the belief that a resurrected Christ would have greater divine authority to bestow on Peter; the sequence of events is shifted accordingly.

Given Langland’s skepticism regarding the ecclesiastical abuses of the post-apostolic church, perhaps Conscience’s portrayal of the Magdalene is meant to demonstrate how earthly power can corrupt this essential faculty. (Conscience’s unwise decision to allow the friars, particularly Frere Flaterere, entrance into the Barn of Unity will later demonstrate his debilitated powers of discernment). In Conscience we see a figure enhancing the authority of Peter (and, by extension, papal authority) at all costs, even at the expense of a beloved saint. And of course the Great Schism forms the contemporary backdrop for Langland’s narrative — a backdrop of divisiveness in which church authority was fragmented among two and three popes between 1378-1417, and to which Langland alludes in 19.417-27. Conscience’s efforts in the name of unity illustrate the impulses that yield such a state of affairs; his attempts to consolidate Peter’s authority necessarily detract from Mary Magdalene’s. For a church to have one earthly leader, there can be no division of power.

Although it is true that Langland was in many ways a social conservative who probably would have opposed women’s pursuit of greater ecclesiastical authority, Conscience seems too deeply flawed for his views to be considered authorial. Langland might have supported the end of his arguments, but not the means, characterized as they are by a mocking application of proverbial misogyny. Conscience’s prejudices involving Mary Magdalene cannot be attributed merely to a confusion of traditions; Langland manifests a strong familiarity with relevant Scripture and Magdalene hagiography elsewhere. There are six references to Mary Magdalene in Piers Plowman. In 5.497 Repentance says that Christ appeared to the Magdalene first to show that he died for sinners. In 10.428 Will refers to her sinful nature to justify a self-indulgent predestinarianism since even some of the most iniquitous are saved: “Than Marie Maudeleyne who myȝte do worse?” In the speech attributed to Trajan in 11.250-58, Langland employs the interpretation of Luke 10:40-42 that casts Mary Magdalene as a representation of the contemplative life in order to praise poverty. In 13.194 Conscience praises poverty as well, noting that Mary Magdalene gained more from her box of ointment than Zacchaeus did from half his riches. Anima also associates the Magdalene with virtuous poverty in 15.294, observing the extra-biblical tradition that she lived on roots and dew and her devotion to God in her later life. The Resurrection account of 19.157-62 marks the final appearance of Mary Magdalene in Piers Plowman. It seems, then, that for Langland’s characters, as well as for principal actors in church history, Mary Magdalene could be whatever each figure needed her to be—saint, sinner, whore, apostle, gossip—and Conscience is no different. His interest in affirming male ecclesiastical authority leads him to apply the proverb “ȝat wymman witeȝ may noȝt wele be counseille,” with all of its unflattering narrative associations, in depicting a “word-wod” Magdalene unworthy of the momentous news she bears, incapable of using it to establish Holy Church. For Langland, Conscience is the revisionist historian of a church lamentably estranged from a once unified, divine origin.
Works Cited


Honorian Augustodunensis. Speculum Ecclesiae--De Sancta Maria Magdalena. PL 172.981.


The Status of Pollution in Tennessee

by H. W. Wofford

What places come to mind when you think about polluted sites in the United States? Perhaps you think about Love Canal in Niagara Falls, New York, where the Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Co. buried 22,000 tons of chemical waste in a half-dug canal and where a housing development was built on top of it (1). Or maybe Lake Erie comes to mind. It was so heavily contaminated by industrial wastes and sewage that it was closed for fishing and swimming, and many species of lake fish were on the verge of extinction. In 1965, almost one-fourth of the lake was so polluted that its oxygen supply was virtually depleted (2). What about Los Angeles, California? Los Angeles is located in a geological bowl which traps air pollution, and during the sixties smog sometimes got so bad that industries and motor vehicle traffic had to be shut down for several days a year. You may not be as familiar with Boston harbor. At one time it was so polluted that there were reports of rats walking across the harbor on the floating debris!

When people are asked to name polluted states, New Jersey is often mentioned. This is probably because of areas on the coast such as Newark, with its sprawling railroad yards and chemical refineries. Much of Newark is an eyesore, prompting a friend of mine from New Jersey to describe it as the “armpit of the universe.” However, this is probably not a fair way to characterize New Jersey as a whole. When you get away from the industrial areas, the countryside in New Jersey is among the most beautiful and undisturbed in the United States. Sometimes Texas and Louisiana will be added to the list because of the expansive petrochemical industries on the Gulf Coast of these states.

But what about our state? Where would you rank Tennessee as a polluted state? I don’t think most people in Tennessee would consider our state to be very polluted. After all, we have traditionally been known for our agricultural economy, rather than for our industrial output. I must confess that, until I returned to Tennessee after having spent fifteen years training as an ecotoxicologist, I did not think of Tennessee as polluted. It is interesting how differently you look at the place where you grew up after having been away for some time. You can back off and look at it a little more objectively. Coming back as a trained environmental toxicologist, I looked at Tennessee through new eyes. Over the last twelve years, I have been accumulating information about the state of pollution in Tennessee from newspaper clippings, state and federal publications, and web sites. My goal for this paper is to pass on to you a summary of what I have gleaned from all this information. What you read may surprise you.

I can’t possibly write about every environmental problem in Tennessee in a paper of this length. In order to make the task a bit more manageable, I will begin with some overall statistics concerning the status of pollution in Tennessee, and then focus on our immediate environment, Madison and surrounding counties.
Tennessee’s Environmental Scorecard

There are many ways in which the environmental health of an area can be assessed. These include determination of the amount of air pollution, the amount of water pollution, the amount of waste emptied into the sewer system, the rate of deforestation, the public health status, and the status of environmental education. I have summarized some of them in Table 1. As you can see, Tennessee consistently comes in as one of the ten worst polluted states in the nation.

It is informative to go to the Agricultural Museum in Milan, Tennessee. In this museum, there is an exhibit about soil erosion and conservation efforts made by Tennessee to prevent it. There is a picture in this exhibit of a man standing in a ditch caused by soil erosion. He cannot see out of the ditch! Great strides have been made in recent years to control soil erosion, with no-till farming being the most recent such control measure.

Air pollution is also a big problem in Tennessee. It is probably contributing to the destruction of hundreds of thousands of acres of trees in the Great Smoky Mountains Park. Air pollution, mainly sulfur and nitrogen oxides, from industry and the cars of the millions of tourists who visit this park weakens the trees, making them susceptible to infections by fungi, bacteria and insects (5). I had the opportunity to talk to a technician at the Agricultural Experimental Station here in Jackson. He has been measuring the pH of the rainwater falling on the station for several years. Though it isn’t part of his job, he does it out of interest. On several occasions, the precipitation falling on Jackson was acidic enough to be classified as acid rain. Interestingly, this always happens when the wind is coming from the southwest. This shouldn’t be too surprising, since Memphis, the largest center of industry in West Tennessee, is southwest of us. On one or two occasions he recorded alkaline rain. I have never seen this discussed in the environmental literature. What are we putting into the air in West Tennessee that is making our air more alkaline (basic)?

Tennessee Rivers and Lakes

Another way to assess the environmental health of a state is to examine the health of its rivers and lakes. 60,000 stream miles and 540,000 lake acres can be found within Tennessee (27). One way of determining the health of these waterways is to look at whether or not these waterways have been posted. In other words, have some intended uses of these waterways been restricted? This usually means that either body contact, recreation, or fishing has been restricted or banned. In 1996, twenty-six per cent of stream miles and twenty-two per cent of lake acres in Tennessee were classified as not fully supporting their intended use (27). These waterways have been posted for such diverse causes as presence of fecal coliforms, lead, mercury, PCBs, chlordane, and dioxins.

Two Tennessee rivers, the Forked Deer River and the Obion River (which pass through parts of Madison or Gibson Counties), are classified as completely failing to support their intended use (Table 2). The Mississippi River, which is notorious for its pollution, has been added to the table for purposes of comparison. As you can see from the table, our local river systems are not considered safe for the usages we commonly make of waterways and are considered less safe than the “mighty Mississippi.” Having contracted either Giardia or amebic...
dysentery from swimming in the Forked Deer River in the days of my youth, I heartily recommend that you heed the warnings!

**Madison and Gibson Counties’ Environmental Scorecards**

The Environmental Defense Fund maintains a web site that allows individuals to rank almost any site in the country according to its rate of release of toxic chemicals and the health effects of these chemicals (28). In terms of release of Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) chemicals, an inventory of chemicals maintained and monitored by the EPA, Madison County ranks forty-seventh in the state in release of these chemicals, while Gibson County ranks sixteenth. This surprised me. I expected that Madison County would release more chemicals than Gibson County. However, Gibson County has four facilities in the top one hundred for most chemicals released, while Madison County has none. It is important to note that these numbers do not take into consideration non-TRI chemicals, including many agricultural chemicals. I shudder to think of what I was exposed to while “growing up on the farm.”

However, these rankings should not give residents of Madison County too much peace of mind. Although Madison County fares well in comparison to other Tennessee counties, it must be compared to the nation as a whole (28). Madison County ranks in the top twenty per cent of all counties in the U.S. in terms of:

- Release of non-cancer hazards
- Water releases of recognized developmental toxicants
- Water releases of suspected immunotoxicants
- Release of chemicals with ozone-depleting potential.

Gibson County fares even worse. It ranks in the top twenty per cent of all counties in the U.S. in terms of:

- Release of cancer hazards
- Air releases of recognized carcinogens
- Air releases of recognized developmental toxicants
- Air releases of suspected cardiovascular or blood toxicants
- Air releases of suspected reproductive toxicants.

**Problem sites in the Madison County Area - Superfund Sites**

Another criterion that can be used as a yardstick of the environmental health of a region is whether or not that region contains any Superfund sites. Residents of Jackson have the dubious distinction of living within thirty miles of four EPA Superfund sites (Table 3). Two of these are located within the city limits of Jackson and are within two miles of ten of Jackson’s water wells. EPA Superfund sites are sites that are deemed to be so contaminated and pose such a health risk that they are assigned the highest priority for cleanup. The problem with Superfund sites is that when the funding was set up for this program, the cost of the cleanup was grossly
underestimated. As a result, many sites have been identified, but have not been cleaned up. Regarding the four sites in the vicinity of Jackson, only partial cleanup has been undertaken, and cleanup efforts are still underway.

The state of Tennessee also has a Superfund program. Table 3 contains a listing of the Tennessee Superfund sites in Madison and Gibson Counties. As you can see, Tennessee has added an additional seven sites in our area to the Superfund list. Of these sites, only the Owens-Corning site has been declared clean. Table 3 also includes some sites in this area that have not been declared Superfund sites, but have been in the news lately because of environmental problems.

In order to give you a better appreciation of the magnitude of these environmental problems in our area, I have given some of the history and the possible health consequences of some of these sites in the following sections.

American Creosote Works

The American Creosote Works was declared an EPA Superfund site in 1987 and is considered to be one of the worst creosote-contaminated sites in the country (21). The plant operated from the early 1930's until 1981. It was located on fifty-five acres in southwest Jackson just off of State Street, between the Forked Deer River and the 45 Bypass.

Creosote is used as a wood preservative. It is most often seen in old telephone poles and railroad ties. After the wood was treated by placing it in baths of hot creosote, it was stacked on racks outside to dry. The excess creosote dripped onto the ground and has been working its way into the water table. Creosote contains a large number of chemicals called polyaromatic hydrocarbons and related compounds, many of which are potentially carcinogenic (cancer-causing). One PAH, benzo[a]pyrene (BAP), was found in high concentrations in the soil. BAP is one of the five most carcinogenic chemicals that we have currently identified.

In 1991, the EPA started the cleanup of the site. All of the remaining creosote (approximately 200,000 gallons) was removed, and all structures were torn down to the ground. However, funding problems halted the cleanup of the soil at the site (22). The state and federal governments planned to spend $5 to $12 million to clean up this site (21). However, the total projected costs have increased to as much as $50 million. About 8.4 acres of land will be scraped two to five feet deep, removing 35,000 to 88,000 tons of soil. The work was scheduled to begin in 1996 or 1997, but I have not seen evidence of cleanup operations. At one point it was seriously suggested that the site be used as a jail! I can’t imagine how many lawsuits that would have generated. Does being used for bioremediation constitute cruel and unusual punishment?!

Iselin Railroad Yard

The Environmental Protection Agency wants to put Jackson’s old Iselin Railroad Yard on its Superfund list of the most serious hazardous waste sites (12). This eighty-acre site is just south of Iselin Street in Southeast Jackson, directly across from Washington-Douglass Elementary School. It is also near ten of JUD’s city water wells. This site was used for the maintenance and repair of railroad engines for many years by the Mobile & Ohio and Illinois
Central railroads (13). The degreasers used to clean the engines and their parts were often allowed to run onto the ground and into a creek that fed into the Forked Deer River. Often, the water in the creek ran black.

Among the chemicals found at the Iselin site are chromium, lead, vinyl chloride, chloroethane, benzene, copper, tetrachloroethane, dichloroethane, ethylbenzene, and xylene. These chemicals carry such possible health risks as cancer, birth defects, liver toxicity, kidney toxicity and neurotoxicity. JUD is currently monitoring the city water for these chemicals and has plans in place for treating the water if necessary.

Cleanup of the Iselin site was predicted to start in 1996, but to the best of my knowledge this process has not started yet (14).

**Milan Army Ammunition Plant**

The Milan Army Ammunition Plant has been in operation since 1942, manufacturing ordinance for the military. From 1942 to 1978, wastewater from the O-line production area was discharged into eleven unlined settling ponds. In 1991, it was discovered that RDX and other potential carcinogens such as TNT, 2,4-dinitrotoluene, nitrobenzene, and HMX used in the manufacture of explosives, had seeped out of these ponds and had gotten into the groundwater that provides the drinking water for Milan (19). In 1992, the U.S. Army started a $9 million study to assess the degree of contamination of the water, eventually drilling four hundred test wells (16, 20). The results of this testing indicated that the city’s drinking water was below the danger point of 2.0 ppb.

In light of concerns that the levels of these chemicals could increase in the future, the Army agreed to spend $9 to build a water treatment facility at the plant and to drill three new water wells for Milan farther away from the arsenal. In May 1995, the levels of the chemicals in the city water had not increased significantly (17). By 1997, the Army had spent $58 million on the cleanup operation. This involved the design and construction of cleanup systems using a combination of high-tech filtration and UV systems, and a low-tech artificial wetlands where native plants and microorganisms break down the chemicals, a process called bioremediation (18). The O-line ponds were also capped with clay to prevent further leaching of the chemicals into the water table. A recent report indicates that the cleanup of the contaminated ground water is on schedule and should be complete by 2009 (29). Unfortunately, parts of the city park will be unavailable for the next six to eight months as wells are being dug which will be used to filter the groundwater.

**Lead Exposure in Jackson**

Jackson is the only city in West Tennessee to be cited by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for having high lead levels in the drinking water. According to EPA guidelines, lead levels in drinking water must not exceed fifteen ppb. Unsafe levels of lead were found in a small number of homes with lead materials in their plumbing and are not due to lead in the JUD water supply. Although a report in 1994 showed that about twenty-two per cent of the children
in Madison County have elevated levels of lead in their blood, it is believed that most of this lead
did not come from the water, but from lead-based paint and leaded gasoline.

More recently, residents of East Jackson in the neighborhood of the former H. O. Forgy
recycling plant have been tested for lead levels (15). This plant that turned scrap metals into
materials for industry allowed lead to seep into the soil for thirty-seven years, from 1946 to
1983. When evaluated for its risk, this site received a score of 85.26. In order for a site to be
placed on the EPA Superfund List, it must have a score of 28.5. The score for the H. O. Forgy
site is one of the highest ever seen.

Velsicol Corporation Dump Site

The Velsicol Corporation is a Memphis-based company involved in the manufacture of
insecticides. Several hundred thousand drums (seven million gallons) of waste created from the
production of these insecticides were buried on thirty-seven acres between 1964 and 1974 in
Hardeman County near Toone, which is just south of Jackson (23). Over time the drums rusted
and leaked, allowing the chemicals to leach into the water table. It is estimated that over one
thousand acres of groundwater are contaminated because of this leakage (24).

Removing and properly disposing of all these drums could cost in excess of $1 billion. At
this point, a ground water treatment plant has been constructed, and the area has been capped
with clay to prevent further leaching into the water table. This is all the cleanup that is currently
planned. Velsicol has spent $12 million on capping and stabilizing the site to this point (25).
However, the clay cap over the site has been found to be only ninety-eight per cent effective
(26). It is now being capped with plastic, which will be “one hundred per cent effective.” The
workers who went into this site to stabilize it were either very brave or very foolish. This is by
far the worst contaminated site that I have ever encountered, and it’s only a thirty-minute drive
away!

Conclusions

I have presented a large number of facts and figures about the state of pollution in
Tennessee. What conclusions can we draw from all of this? The obvious conclusion is that
Tennessee is a relatively contaminated state. It is very likely that health problems are and will
continue to be a result of this contamination. Many of these sites are areas where chemicals are
entering our water table. Adequate quality drinking water may very well be the next great
environmental crisis for the whole world, including the United States. West Tennessee is blessed
with one of the best aquifers in the world. However, there are many sites in which chemicals are
slowly working their way into this aquifer. These chemicals will not stay localized.
Hydrologists tell us that the aquifer in West Tennessee flows. As it does, it will carry chemicals
to areas that are many miles away from the sites of contamination.

It should be noted that as bad as the status of pollution in Tennessee may seem, it is getting
better. Almost every statistic I have mentioned in this paper has shown improvement in the last
twenty years. For example, in 1996, twenty-six per cent of stream miles and twenty-two per
cent of lake acres in Tennessee were classified as not fully supporting their intended use (27). In
1984, forty-six per cent of stream miles and thirty-four per cent of lake acres were not fully supporting. This constitutes a significant improvement.

How did we get this way? I suspect it has much to do with our state historically having a predominantly rural economy. Thus, some of the problems resulting from urbanization and industrialization have come to us later than for other states, and we are dealing with them much later as a result. Also, I feel there is almost a vacuum of environmental awareness and consciousness in West Tennessee. I was impressed by this when I came back to Tennessee after having spent fifteen years in other parts of the country. Many people think nothing of littering in this area, and they tend to pour out chemicals such as used oil and antifreeze on the ground. This same attitude has carried over into industry. For most of this century, industrial wastes have just been dumped into a ditch. Jackson has only very recently put a tree ordinance in place. In New England, you must get permission from all of your neighbors before you can cut one tree in your yard. Union, as a Christian university, must set an example of environmental stewardship for the community.

I suspect that the contamination of our area also has to do with the loss of contact between our citizens and the environment. As people moved away from the farms, seeking jobs in the cities, they lost their contact with the soil. I grew up on a farm. I spent most of my waking hours prowling around, turning over logs, watching birds fly, and catching insects and tadpoles; in the process, I developed a deep appreciation and love for the environment. The students in my classes have learned this, as I frequently get on my “soap box” about environmental issues. Children who grow up in cities don’t have these opportunities. Studies have shown that inner-city children have no idea where their food comes from, other than the store. These children don’t have a connection to the land, and it is less likely that they will show concern about environmental issues. I have been impressed on many occasions by individuals who will get outraged about the fate of whales, which they have never seen, and not be concerned about the destruction of the environment going on behind their own house.

Ultimately, the contamination of Tennessee is about our population. As the population and economy of Tennessee has grown, so has the demand for food and goods. With this increase, there has to be an increase in the utilization of chemicals and subsequent problems of dealing with the byproducts of the manufacture of these chemicals. My dad understands this very well. He is a retired farmer. During his career as a farmer, he has released thousands of pounds of agricultural chemicals into the environment. He despises these chemicals, but he can’t see any way around the use of them. Without the use of pesticides and herbicides, we wouldn’t be able to feed everyone in the U.S., much less export excess food to starving people in other parts of the world.

What can we do about it? We can’t avoid the use of water. There are some things that we can do at a personal level to help protect ourselves. For example, we could drink bottled water. But recent studies have shown that bottled water, despite its cost, is not necessarily any safer than our tap water. It would be a good choice if you live in an area with a known contamination problem.

Filtration of the water might be an option. However, this also has its problems. The type of filtration employed must match the contamination problem. A different approach is necessary to remove bacteria from water than to remove heavy metals or organics. Another problem is
knowing when to change out the filters. In many cases, there is no obvious way to tell when a filter is saturated other than having the water tested. After a filter becomes saturated, it may start to release its absorbed chemicals back into the water and, in some cases, the concentration of the pollutants in the water may be higher than without a filter.

You can have your water tested. This is especially advised if you have reason to believe that it is contaminated. However, unless you can convince the Health Department that there is a problem, you may have to pay for the testing yourself. Depending on the contaminant you are concerned about, this can range from fifteen dollars up to several hundred dollars per test. If you have city water, it should be tested for a wide range of chemicals on a regular basis, and you should be able to get a report from the city.

The best way to get good quality drinking water is to have uncontaminated water in the first place. This requires us to develop a sound environmental ethic about the proper handling of waste products. Here, education is probably the most important factor. Be informed. I suspect that often chemicals have been released into the environment more out of ignorance than out of greed. Get involved. Attend community meetings on environmental issues. There have been many in this area, some very recently. Write your legislators. Remember that in even the worst cases that I have described, the companies involved were not breaking any laws at the time.

After reading this article, has your opinion about the amount of pollution in Tennessee changed? If so, let me know.
**Table 1 - Tennessee’s Environmental Scorecard**

**Quantity of release**

No. 1 in the nation for soil erosion

2nd worst air-polluting state

139 million lbs of toxic chemicals into the air in 1990

12th worst water-polluting state

8th worst state for toxins dumped into sewers

21 million lbs of toxic wastes

10th worst state for toxins dumped into sewers

15.7 million lbs of toxic wastes

6th worst toxin-emitting facility in the country

New Johnsonville power plant

3rd worst state in the nation overall

5th worst state in the nation overall

**Health Implications of the release**

2nd worst in the nation for protecting the environment

Criteria: Drinking water, Food safety, solid-waste recycling, forest management, and impact of growth

9th worst in the nation in release of chemicals which cause birth defects

11th worst in the nation in release of chemicals which cause cancer

Three cities in top 25 % with premature heart- and lung-related deaths linked to particulate air pollution: Nashville, Memphis, Chattanooga
Table 2 - The Health of Local Rivers in Tennessee (27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Miles in Tennessee</th>
<th>Fully Supporting</th>
<th>Partially Supporting</th>
<th>Not Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forked Deer</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obion</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>175.3</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting - Can be used for body contact, recreation and fishing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPA Superfund Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Creosote Works</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iselin Railroad Yard (Proposed)</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan Army Ammunition Plant</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velsicol Corp. Dump Site</td>
<td>Hardeman</td>
<td>Toone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee Superfund Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. O. Forgy and Son</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone Dry Cleaners</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Cable Corporation</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noma-ITT</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens-Corning (Now declared clean)</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; H Transformer</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michie Dump</td>
<td>McNairy</td>
<td>Michie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Problem Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Milan (Jones Companies Ltd.)</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville Elementary School</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Yorkville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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