

Saving the Grotesque: The Grotesque System of Liberation in British Modernism (1922-1932)

Matthew Henningsen
Marquette University

Recommended Citation

Henningsen, Matthew, "Saving the Grotesque: The Grotesque System of Liberation in British Modernism (1922-1932)" (2015).
Dissertations (2009 -). Paper 511.
http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/511

SAVING THE GROTESQUE: THE GROTESQUE SYSTEM
OF LIBERATION IN BRITISH
MODERNISM (1922-1932)

by

Matthew Henningsen, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2015

ABSTRACT
SAVING THE GROTESQUE: THE GROTESQUE SYSTEM
OF LIBERATION IN BRITISH
MODERNISM (1922-1932)

Matthew Henningsen, B.A., M.A.

Marquette University, 2015

This dissertation re-situates the grotesque in a critical tradition that emphasizes its function as a liberating force, rather than its traditional role as an arouser of terror and amusement. I then apply the grotesque liberation to the High Modern literary environment of Britain in order to reveal the grotesque dimensions of this period. To accomplish these goals of re-situating the grotesque, and applying the grotesque to High Modernism, I create a so-called “Grotesque System of Liberation.” This system consists of three stages (the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic) that trace a specific text’s progress from a state of illusory stability and security, to a state of grotesque destabilization, to a final state of grotesque freedom and liberation. I analyze the grotesque system in High Modern texts by T.S. Eliot (*The Waste Land*), D.H. Lawrence (esp. “The Ship of Death”), and Aldous Huxley (*Brave New World*), and aid this analysis with the application of a series of textual markers and linguistic features to these works. Such textual markers and linguistic features help reveal the specific stages of the grotesque system at work in a text. My dissertation ultimately accomplishes two important tasks. It posits a new understanding of the grotesque as a force for liberation from illusory sources of control and power. By examining this new understanding of the grotesque in British High Modernism, it also reveals the grotesqueness of this literary period, or its use of the grotesque as a device for sustaining a state of liberating division and incompleteness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Matthew Henningsen, B.A., M.A.

Thanks must primarily go to Dr. John Boly, my director. His patience and guidance were invaluable resources. Also my committee members, Dr. John Su and Dr. Leah Flack – thank you for your advice and input.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE GROTESQUE SYSTEM OF LIBERATION.....	1
Part I “Both Ridiculous and Terrifying:” Friedrich Schlegel and the Spread of the Emotive Grotesque Tradition.....	1
Part II The Anti-Schlegelian Grotesque Tradition: From Ancient Rome to the “Betweenness” of High Modernism.....	11
Part III Jacques Lacan and the Grotesque System of Liberation.....	56
Part IV Establishing the Anti-Schlegelian Grotesqueness of T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley.....	62
II. “THESE FRAGMENTS I HAVE SHORED AGAINST MY RUINS:” T.S. ELIOT’S TEMPORAL GROTESQUE SYSTEM OF LIBERATION IN <i>THE WASTE LAND</i>	72
III. “OH BUILD YOUR SHIP OF DEATH:” A VOYAGE THROUGH D.H. LAWRENCE’S CONTRADICTIONARY GROTESQUE SYSTEM OF LIBERATION.....	120
IV. EATING CIVILIZATION: ALDOUS HUXLEY’S SCIENTIFIC GROTESQUE SYSTEM OF LIBERATION IN <i>BRAVE NEW WORLD</i>	162
V. “HYBRID, TRANSGRESSIVE AND ALWAYS IN MOTION:” FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR THE ANTI-SCHLEGELIAN GROTESQUE.....	203
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	226

Introduction

Towards an Understanding of the Grotesque System of Liberation

Now the slave is a freeman, now all the rigid, hostile barriers, which necessity, caprice, or 'impudent fashion' have established between human beings, break asunder. Now, hearing this gospel of universal harmony, each person feels himself to be not simply united, reconciled or merged with his neighbor, but quite literally one with him, as if the veil of maya had been torn apart, so that mere shreds of it flutter before the mysterious primordial unity.

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872)

I. "Both Ridiculous and Terrifying:" Friedrich Schlegel and the Spread of the Emotive Grotesque Tradition

To properly understand the grotesque requires a revision of its standard critical history. This standard history begins with Friedrich Schlegel's codifying definition for the grotesque in 1798. Writing in the first volume of his *Athenäum*, Schlegel believes that "grotesqueness is constituted by a clashing contrast between form and content, the unstable mixture of heterogeneous elements, the explosive force of the paradoxical, which is both ridiculous and terrifying" (Kayser 53). This first, codifying definition unleashes a grotesque tradition that foolishly neglects the liberating power of the grotesque. That is, rather than Schlegel's emotive definition, which views the grotesque as an arouser of comedy and terror, the grotesque, first and foremost, involves a process that culminates in liberation. This anti-Schlegelian grotesque follows the sustained conflict between two incompatible elements. One opponent waves the banner proclaiming security, stability, and order. The army devoted to this side of the grotesque conflict remains zealously loyal due to the comfort derived from assurances of continual security and stability. The opposing army in the grotesque conflict rages against this supposedly secure order. It therefore undermines stability with destabilizing surges of

passionate irrationality, and with wild charges impelled by ungovernable impulses and desires. These destabilizing forces of the grotesque believe that such disruption serves a liberating function. The grotesque army of destabilization frees their stability-entranced opponents from the illusion of continual order and stability. While the army of stability desperately tries to save their coveted illusion of security from their destabilizing opponents, such attempts ultimately fail. Devoid of the comforting illusion of stability, individuals freed by the grotesque conflict must bear the heavy weight of their liberation. To remain grotesquely free from an illusion-enslaved existence, these individuals must suffer, or live permanently torn between the lost and illusory comfort of stability, and the destabilizing forces of the grotesque conflict. John Ruskin, discussed throughout this study, remarks on this liberating imperfection, or freedom from totalizing sources of stability, when he writes, in *Modern Painters* (1856), “it seems not only permissible, but even desirable, that the art by which the grotesque is expressed should be more or less imperfect” (138). Imperfect grotesque art frees individuals from false states of security, stability, and perfection, and, as discussed, in turn creates a suffering-based state of liberation that stands as the crowning achievement of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque.

Unfortunately, Friedrich Schlegel’s 1798 definition above disregards the grotesque as a liberating force, and sets the stage for over 2 centuries of misguided investigations of the grotesque. Schlegel serves as the progenitor of this misguided grotesque tradition when he asserts that the grotesque conflict, while indeed involving “the unstable mixture of heterogeneous elements,” produces a situation “which is both ridiculous and terrifying.” Schlegel, that is, correctly starts the grotesque battle between two “heterogeneous elements,” or between the “heterogeneous” armies of stability and

instability, but goes wrong when he writes that this grotesque battle results in a “ridiculous and terrifying” outcome. The Schlegelian grotesque here indelibly binds itself to comedy and terror. Two “heterogeneous elements” wage a grotesque war that ends, according to Schlegel, with a laugh, and a feeling of terror. Such an outcome imparts an anticlimactic aspect to the grotesque. The grotesque, rather than acting as a liberator of the illusion-enslaved, merely arouses a fleeting smile and a fleeting feeling of terror. Schlegel robs the grotesque of its liberating power. He instead makes it emotive, or an arouser of transitory feelings. In consequence, Schlegel spawns a misguided critical tradition over the next 2 centuries.

During this time, critics of the grotesque continue to ignore the grotesque’s function as a liberator of the illusion-enslaved. These critics in fact write with a type of Schlegelian tunnel vision. They cannot see the grotesque as a liberator because their attention remains preoccupied by the emotive products of the grotesque. Within the nineteenth century, John Ruskin exemplifies this tunnel vision Schlegelian critic by demanding that the comedy and terror aroused by the grotesque be referred to as, the “sportive grotesque” and the “terrible grotesque.” However, Ruskin’s other ideas, especially his writings on the work of art in the Industrial Age, link him to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition (see the discussion of Ruskin later, in Part II, for more information on his unique position in the history of the grotesque). In his 1874 work, *The Stones of Venice*, Ruskin writes of the Schlegelian emotive products of the grotesque when he remarks, “the grotesque falls into two branches, sportive grotesque and terrible grotesque” (126). Ruskin does nothing innovative here. The grotesque as a liberator remains ignored, and Ruskin renames the grotesque’s emotive products. He swaps

synonyms by calling the amusement of the grotesque, “sportive,” and the grotesque’s terror, “terrible.” Ruskin’s unoriginal, Schlegelian approach to the grotesque continues in the writings of 20th century grotesque critics.

Wolfgang Kayser stands as perhaps the most prominent of the 20th century, Schlegelian scholars of the grotesque. In his 1957 work, *The Grottesque in Art and Literature*, Kayser focuses on the terror aroused by the grotesque. He argues that this Ruskinian “terrible grotesque” dominates historical periods marked by upheaval, rebellion, and the overall destruction of ordered, stable societies. Such “terrible grotesque” destruction, for Kayser, understandably terrorizes. Order dissolves, and people must face the terrors of uncertainty and chaos. However, Kayser stops here, content with the claim that the grotesque primarily arouses terror. This over-emphasis on the “terrible grotesque” proves unfortunate for several reasons. On one level, it breeds further studies that hold the dubious accomplishment of reversing Kayser’s claim by asserting that the grotesque in fact primarily produces amusement, rather than terror.

These critics of the “sportive grotesque” include Lee Bryon Jennings, whose 1963, *The Ludicrous Demon* argues that the grotesque amuses far more than it terrorizes. Jennings claims that gargoyles represent the “sportive grotesque.” These creatures, typically hanging from churches, induce, for Jennings, amusement far more than terror. While he reverses Kayser’s argument, Jennings in this way still toils with the Schlegelian grotesque, and therefore cannot escape Schlegel’s emotive definition. Jennings’ Schlegelianism also proves unfortunate because an anti-Schlegelian grotesque approach to gargoyles yields intriguing results. Gargoyles, rather than arousers of fleeting feelings of amusement, become anti-Schlegelian grotesque intruders that reveal the false sanctity

of a religious space. These gargoyles, then, become grotesque agents of freedom. They cling to and mar religious buildings, but, by so doing, serve as harbingers of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. Gargoyles, it could be argued, lead the religious to the true sanctity of the grotesque liberation. However, as discussed, Jennings, as a Schlegelian, cannot argue this intriguing, anti-Schlegelian understanding of gargoyles. He merely states that gargoyles grotesquely amuse.

Kayser also falls within a similar trap, but, unlike Jennings, at least moves closer to the grotesque as a process of liberation. Kayser's "terrible grotesque," that is, dissolves order and stability, and in turn sets the stage for the grotesque liberation discussed above. Rather than emphasizing this grotesque freedom from absolute stability, though, Kayser harps on the terror of the grotesque, terror which dissipates once instability re-stabilizes, or once, as Kayser writes, "The obscure is sighted, the uncanny revealed, the incomprehensible called to account" (202). The grotesque liberation, which thrives within unstable, un-ordered environments, or in environments not "called into account," vanishes with this Kayserian return to order and stability. Such re-stabilizing of the grotesque in fact undergirds the Schlegelian approach to the grotesque, since these Schlegelian critics, as Kayser highlights, and as Bakhtin and Harpham highlight below, attempt to trap and hold the grotesque in its traditional, emotive Schlegelian conception. It preserves and stabilizes (ironically, a tradition sustained by fleeting emotional responses), rather than acting, as the anti-Schlegelian grotesque does, as a force of liberating destruction and destabilization.

In addition to Wolfgang Kayser, Mikhail Bakhtin occupies an important position within 20th century studies of the Schlegelian grotesque. In *Rabelais and His World*,

Bakhtin, unlike Kayser, approaches the grotesque as a comedic device for social upheaval. He specifically associates the grotesque with Carnival, or to the dissolution of social hierarchies that occurs during the masked abandon of this event. People put on amusing, comedic grotesque masks that allow even the lowliest peasant to look like a king. The social hierarchy briefly rearranges due to these Bakhtinian, comedic grotesque masks of Carnival. Mary Russo, in her 1994 study, *The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess and Modernity*, applies the Bakhtinian grotesque Carnival to female liberation. She argues that the grotesque Carnival allows women to shed their subservient positions in the social structure (refer to the conclusion for more insights into the feminine grotesque). Much like Kayser, though, Bakhtin flirts with the grotesque as a liberator, and Russo with the grotesque as a liberator for women, only to ultimately spurn the grotesquely liberating social upheaval and instability of Carnival. Bakhtin's grotesque Carnival, that is, exists temporarily. Once the masks come off, the old social hierarchies return and restore briefly suspended order and stability. In consequence, the grotesque's anti-Schlegelian function as a liberator dies, slain when the promise of Carnival's grotesque liberation dissipates with the conclusion of the revelries. Bakhtin therefore follows Kayser as a Schlegelian writer of the grotesque. He neglects the grotesque liberation for the fleeting "sportive grotesque." Bakhtin's Schlegelianism in fact proves doubly unfortunate because, in *Rabelais and His World*, he associates the grotesque with the wrong term in his diverse critical discourse. That is, rather than linking the grotesque to his notions of Carnival and the Carnavalesque, Bakhtin could apply the grotesque to his conception of heteroglossia and dialogism and, in turn, be understood as an anti-Schlegelian. These Bakhtinian terms, like the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, cut down and undermine

supposedly all-powerful governing bodies with diverse and discordant voices and ideas (consult Bakhtin's "The Dialogic Imagination" for more information on these terms).

When applied to Bakhtin's notion of the Carnavalesque discussed above, the anti-Schlegelianism of heteroglossia and dialogism also add nuance to the nature of the Carnival's grotesque laughter.

Rather than resulting from the entertaining festivities of Carnival, laughter, when understood as a source of Bakhtinian heteroglossia and dialogism, becomes subversive. Individuals add their laughter to the grotesquely liberating and discordant voices and ideas of heteroglossia and dialogism. They use laughter as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque weapon against the status quo by laughing at its obsession with maintaining order and stability. G. Wilson Knight, in his essay, "*King Lear* and the Comedy of the Grotesque," discusses this subversive potential of grotesque laughter. Knight argues that the Fool's laughter mirrors King Lear's gradual fall from power, and descent into madness. The Fool's laughter, that is, aids in Lear's mental collapse, or helps foster the dissolution of the play's social hierarchy. This weaponized anti-Schlegelian grotesque laughter, or laughter that aids in the destruction of supposedly stable and secure social orders, in turn demarcates an important development in Schlegelian grotesque amusement that Bakhtin's study suggests. Individuals no longer simply laugh at grotesque objects, and then, in Schlegelian fashion, move beyond this grotesque laughter to an equally fleeting feeling of terror. They instead laugh as grotesque anti-Schlegelians. They laugh to upset and undermine false sources of stability, and, by so doing, usher in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation from these false sources. Henri Bergson, in his study, *Laughter* (1900), assists in this qualification between Schlegelian and anti-Schlegelian grotesque

laughter when he writes, “certain deformities undoubtedly possess over others the sorry privilege of causing some persons to laugh; some hunchbacks, for instance, will excite laughter” (75). When understood according to the above remarks on the weaponizing of anti-Schlegelian grotesque laughter, the “hunchbacks” of Bergson’s passage, or the Fool of Knight’s essay, turn on those Schlegelian individuals that laugh at their “deformities” and abnormalities. The hunchbacks and fools laugh down their Schlegelian grotesque opponents. Bakhtin, by suggesting (but never fully developing) this anti-Schlegelian grotesque power of laughter, or the subversive power of Carnavalesque laughter that does not cease with the close of Carnival, therefore becomes what could be called a closet anti-Schlegelian. He claims to be a Schlegelian because of his Carnavalesque grotesqueness, but, when analyzed against his other ideas and terms, and with a deeper consideration of grotesque, Carnavalesque laughter, Bakhtin emerges as a Schlegelian grotesque writer with strong anti-Schlegelian grotesque tendencies.

Within the 20th century, the Schlegelian understanding of the grotesque becomes especially pronounced within the writings of reader-response grotesque critics. One such critic, Philip Thomson, describes this connection of the Schlegelian grotesque to reader-response within his 1972 work, *The Grotesque*. Thomson here explains how the grotesque involves, “the unresolved clash of incompatibles in work and in response” (27). The importance of Thomson’s definition within the Schlegelian critical tradition develops from the qualification that the grotesque entails “the unresolved clash of incompatibles” in both “work and in response.” Thomson proclaims that the grotesque produces the emotive reactions of amusement and terror not only within a specific “work,” but also within the reader of a grotesque text. The reader, that is, feels grotesque amusement and

terror. Thomson's extension of the grotesque into the realm of reader-response in fact reaches back to George Santayana's conception of the grotesque in his 1896 work, *The Sense of Beauty*. In his work, Santayana argues that the grotesque at first emotionally addles an individual because of its unfamiliar, unconventional hybridity. This emotional confusion then gives way to emotional acceptance, or to a state where the grotesque, because an individual accepts it as emotionally normal, disappears into the emotions. It becomes part of and fused to an individual's emotions. Santayana remarks on this Schlegelian fusing of the grotesque with the emotions in the following passage:

The incongruity with the conventional type then disappears, and what was impossible and ridiculous at first takes its place among recognised ideals. The centaur and the satyr are no longer grotesque; the type is accepted. (256)

Santayana's understanding of the grotesque proves unfortunate because, like Thomson, he increases the influence and scope of the Schlegelian grotesque. The grotesque as a producer of fleeting emotions, when applied to Santayana's ideas and Thomson's reader-response, seems to crawl out of a text, and embed itself so deeply within an individual's emotions that it fuses with the individual, who in turn becomes an embodiment of the Schlegelian grotesque. This individual, as Santayana writes in the passage above, "accepts" the Schlegelian grotesque. The danger of such "acceptance" stems from the fact that, once the reader appropriates the emotional responses of the Schlegelian grotesque, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque falls into a position of impotency, at the same time that its importance as a liberator comes to the fore. When the reader normalizes and controls the fleeting emotions of the Schlegelian grotesque, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque must free the grotesque from the reader, and, by so doing, reassert its true function as a sustainer of liberation from false sources of stability and control. The anti-

Schlegelian grotesque frees the grotesque from its “accepted,” Schlegelian status as an arouser of fleeting emotional responses. Other Schlegelian critics that follow Santayana and Thomson, and make the reader a false source of control over the grotesque’s emotional responses, include Reuven Tsur and Dieter Meindl. Consult as well the discussion of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system in Part III (pgs. 28-30). The importance of this stage derives from its commitment to preventing the grotesque from taking “its place among recognised ideals.” It permanently de-familiarizes the grotesque in order to both ensure and uphold a permanent state of liberation from a false source of control, such as the reader remarked on above.

In addition to the reader-response critics associated with the Schlegelian grotesque, Geoffrey Harpham, while not directly emphasizing the emotive reactions that Schlegel assigns to the grotesque, nevertheless serves as another, relatively recent Schlegelian-style critic. In his 1982 study, *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*, Harpham applies the grotesque to figurative language, especially to metaphor. He explains that the grotesque “is embodied in the act of transition, of metonymy becoming metaphor” (47). An object, that is, becomes grotesque when it sheds its metonymic, part-to-whole relationship and merges, or fuses, with metaphoric totality. This object literally becomes another, metaphoric object. It no longer exists metonymically divided into parts. While Harpham in this way deserves credit for extending the grotesque into the previously unconsidered realm of figurative language, he still toils within the misguided Schlegelian approach to the grotesque because, by valuing the metaphoric whole of the grotesque object, he creates a position, reminiscent of Santayana’s privileged reader, of assumed stability and control. The grotesque becomes

metaphor, or fuses into a state of metaphoric totality that evokes the illusion of absolute totality (and the absolute stability this illusion appears to create) that the anti-Schlegelian grotesque fights against in the name of liberating instability and incompleteness. With these considerations in mind, Harpham therefore presents a Schlegelian trajectory of meaning. Objects and individuals move towards sources of control and supposed stability, such as the emotive source privileged by the Schlegelian grotesque, rather than towards an anti-Schlegelian, metonymic state of determined incompleteness and instability. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque, by becoming less complete, or made up of metonymic parts, in turn becomes grotesquely free from the Schlegelian, emotive metaphor of absolute stability and control.

II. The Anti-Schlegelian Grotesque Tradition: From Ancient Rome to the “Betweenness” of High Modernism

The claim that the grotesque suffers from 2 centuries of mis-definition proves tenable because it develops directly from ancient Rome’s creation of the grotesque. The Roman source of the grotesque produces the correct understanding of the term. This Roman grotesque fount flows largely from Nero, the often ridiculed Roman Emperor of the 1st century CE. Nero stands as the first known patron for the creation of the artistic style later termed, “the grotesque.” Prior to Nero in the 1st century, the grotesque, although not officially known by this term, appears as a type of monstrous hybridity. Human and animal forms lurk in the pages of Herodotus (circa 450 BCE) and Homer (circa 8th century BCE). Herodotus describes human-goat assemblages climbing in distant mountains, while Homer, in *The Odyssey*, writes about Polyphemus’, the giant with a single eye, gruesome treatment of Odysseus and his crew. Greek mythology also contains

creatures later termed grotesque, such as centaurs, minotaurs, and harpies. These pre-Roman grotesque assemblages, though, primarily fall within the Schlegelian grotesque discussed above. They terrify ancient peoples with the fear of unknown, unexplored lands. However, this pre-Roman emotive grotesque changes when Nero places these assemblages not in some distant land, but instead in the underground heart of Rome. He called upon the Roman painter Fabullus (at times Famulus) to decorate the underground chambers of his lavish Golden Palace, or *Domus Aurea*. Employing an artistic style dating back to around 100 BCE, and that most likely originated in Asia Minor, Fabullus covered the walls of Nero's palace with figures of humans and animals strangely interwoven with various flowers, fruits, and foliage. The assemblages of distant lands in the works of Homer and Herodotus now cover underground chamber walls. Fabullus' artistic style, with its odd assemblages of humans, animals, and plants, ultimately declined with Rome's gradual decline, until finally disappearing with Rome's collapse in the 5th century CE. For the next 1,000 years, Fabullus' underground paintings hid beneath the ruined Baths of Titus, patiently waiting for High Renaissance Italy's re-awakening to Classical Roman traditions.

During the millennium stretching from the collapse of Rome, to the High Renaissance of late fifteenth century Italy, the grotesque reverts back to its pre-Roman emphasis on monstrous, terrifying hybridity. In works such as *Beowulf* (8th to 11th century), *The Wonders of the East* (circa 1000), *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (late 14th century), and *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (mid-14th century), the monstrous hybrids of the ancient Greek world return, and terrify Middle Age audiences with accounts of strange, distant lands. Not until the 15th century, when excavators, digging for

knowledge of ancient Rome, brought Nero's Golden Palace to light in around 1480 did Fabullus' underground grotesque return, and counter this Middle Age emotive grotesque. In fact, a number of artists, inspired by the new discoveries, imitated Fabullus' ancient style. The most famous of these Renaissance imitators of Fabullus' style include Pinturicchio, who, in 1502, painted Siena Cathedral's library ceiling-vaults in a grotesque style. Raphael also dabbled in the grotesque, as evidenced by his decorations in the Vatican in 1515. However, these Renaissance imitator-artists ignore the fact that the excavators of Nero's palace named Fabullus' style, "the grotesque," because his paintings appeared in underground chambers, or "grotte" in Italian. Pinturicchio paints on ceilings, while Raphael paints on above ground Vatican walls. This attention to the etymological connection of the grotesque to the underground proves significant because it provides the groundwork for the anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque.

The grotesque's development within Nero's "grotte," as discussed above, creates both the true definition of the grotesque, or that definition that undermines the Schlegelian emotive understanding of the term that stretches back to ancient and Middle Age accounts of monstrous, terrifying hybrids, and the true, anti-Schlegelian critical history of the grotesque by initiating the grotesque's two realities dynamic. Fabullus' grotesque creations literally exist underground, on the dark chamber walls of Nero's palace. This subterranean, underground reality of the grotesque stands in opposition to the above ground, upper world reality. If the grotesque underworld houses the reality of darkness, than such an above ground reality contains light and brightness. Further qualifying this above and below ground dynamic of the grotesque, the upper reality, already equated with light, becomes the reality of day. It holds the light and sunshine that

prevents objects from hiding in darkness and shadows. This exacting quality of light laying bare every aspect of day time objects also connects the above ground reality to the world of ordering reason, rationality, and science. Penetrating light, revealing objects in precise and exacting detail, fosters scientific-like study, and, further in line with science, orders these objects to best understand them. The day time reality is analyzed, studied, and catalogued using the guiding lights of reason and science.

The grotesque underground reality of darkness opposes and undermines the precise ordering of the upper world reality of light, reason, and science. So behaving, it begins the battle that defines the grotesque. The underworld reality celebrates darkness and shadows, and in turn grotesquely fights the above ground reality's dedication to light and precision. This grotesque underworld therefore functions as the reality of night. It conceals and hides objects within its subterranean gloom. Underworld concealment also suggests that the reality of night harbors elements, such as Fabullus' animal-human-vegetable assemblages, deemed abnormal and potentially dangerous by the supposedly normal, secure, and natural reality of light and science. William Beckford's 1786 work, *Vathek* perhaps most directly depicts the abnormal assemblages lurking in underworld *grotti*. In this novel, Beckford places disturbing assemblages, such as reptiles with human faces, and even flesh-colored marble marked with human veins and arteries, in underground caverns. Beckford's underworld assemblages, which allude to Fabullus' underground paintings, therefore grotesquely battle against and destabilize the upper world's exacting light of reason. They exude irrational impulses and forms, and ultimately reveal that upper world order and rationality, rather than perfectly solving all potential problems, in fact serve a destructive function. The grotesque upper world,

blindly obsessed with science and reason, devalues and denigrates beauty, art, and passion, or all of those irrational pursuits, such as Beckford's creation of his grotesque underworld assemblages, that destabilize and undermine absolute reason's determined campaign to control and order the above ground reality. This underworld association with art and beauty adds additional depth to the subterranean grotesque world.

Dedicated to destabilizing irrationality, and disbelief and skepticism concerning upper world order and stability, the grotesque underworld praises artistic pursuits that, by engaging the passions and raw, ungovernable impulses, help grotesquely break down the above ground reality of clarifying light and reason. This grotesque conflict in turn connects the underworld to the aesthetic mentality of art for art's sake. The association of the grotesque underworld with aesthetic concerns stems from upper world precision, and the creation of exacting formulas and equations to best understand and control reality. Upper world science and reason declares that reality must add up. The penetrating light of reason and rationality must account for all aspects of reality in one all-expansive, all-inclusive equation. This scientific rendering and equating of reality implies that such an above ground world possesses value collectively, or because of what individual objects-as-numbers add up to produce. The individual, upper world object, that is, does not contain any innate value because, by itself, it fails to serve any use or purpose in the precise ordering of reality. Through the prying eyes of upper world science, it takes up space as an isolated, insignificant object cut-off from the grand, all-inclusive above ground formula. The individual object must therefore submit to formulation and precise ordering to possess upper world value. It must, it could be said, become not merely an object, but an object-as-number, or, more specifically, a rational number that behaves

according to rational, predictable mathematical rules. So transformed, this formulated, ordered, rational object aids in producing the all-encompassing equation of the grotesque upper world reality. Martin Heidegger, discussed in more depth later, calls this upper world equating, “standing-reserve” (*The Question* 17). Upper world objects, that is, stand-in-reserve, like money stored in a bank, and prove useful because they can be withdrawn for the sake of bolstering (or buying) upper world stability.

While the above ground world in this way contains Heideggerean “standing-reserve,” or, to refer to William James’ *Pragmatism* (1907), the “cash-value” of helping produce and buy upper world order and stability, the dark, shadowy objects of the grotesque underworld do not serve purposes beyond themselves. They do not possess “cash-value,” or stand-in-reserve. Underworld objects, expressing destabilizing irrationality and boundless passions, defy precise, scientific formulation and ordering. Within the underworld reality, numbers never add up, or behave as irrational numbers, such as the square root of minus one. These underworld numbers go against the mathematical predictability of above ground science and reason, and therefore necessarily frustrate and undermine the upper world’s determination to completely understand reality by rationally formulating and ordering it. Grotesque underground anti-equations in turn internally contain value because any scientifically created solution to an upper world equation does not exist. An underworld object’s internal value develops from the freedom internality allows. The underground object remains free from the exacting tyranny of always adding up. Its determined irrationality protects it from being equated and ordered. Much like Fabullus’ underground creations, then, these grotesque under world objects possess the anti-scientific, aesthetic freedom to contain human,

animal, and even vegetable parts. This determined pursuit of anti-scientific irrationality in fact helps explain the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's prominence during the eighteenth century's so-called Age of Reason and Enlightenment. As discussed in greater depth below, anti-Schlegelian grotesque critics (such as Kant, Schiller, and Shelley) value underworld anti-equations, and the pursuit of irrationality, because they grotesquely counter the Age of Reason's unquestioned belief in the absolute good of reason and rationality. The Gothic, which, at least on the surface, also begins in response to Enlightenment principles, could be said to join the anti-Schlegelian grotesque in its pursuit of irrationality. However, a deeper investigation of the Gothic, as conducted below, not only helps further clarify anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, but also reveals the upper world, "cash-value" tendencies of Gothicism.

As a literary genre, the Gothic seems to relate to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque because of its occasional presentation of irrational scenes and characters. The Gothic, though, uses this absence of rationality and reason for an emotive purpose. The lack of upper world rationality horrifies and terrifies individuals, and in turn compels their return to the upper world's comforting security and stability in rationality and reason. The Gothic, it could be said, scares people back to the upper world. This use by the Gothic of emotional responses to re-instill upper world order separates it from the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. The emotional responses created by the Gothic do not exist in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which, as discussed, casts aside fleeting, impermanent emotions for the permanent state of the grotesque liberation. Sir Walter Scott's 1827 essay, "Novels of Ernest Theodore Hoffmann," adds additional points of differentiation between anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness and this emotiveness of the Gothic. Scott, focusing on

E.T. Hoffmann's prose work, argues that Hoffmann eschews the traditional set-pieces of Gothic literature. Rather than adhering to the Gothic tradition, and inventing stories set in bleak ruins, and containing ghosts and secret doors, Hoffmann creates what could be called anti-Schlegelian grotesque narratives. These stories undercut distant, remote, and bleak settings with contemporary, urban scenes, delve into the dark psychology of characters (such as the disturbed Nathaniel of "The Sandman"), and resist clear moral resolution. Scott especially criticizes Hoffmann's lack of moral resolution, as revealed by his comments in the following passage:

The reader is led astray by a freakish goblin, who has neither end nor purpose in the gambols which he exhibits, and the oddity of which must constitute their own reward. (290-91)

Hoffmann's stories not only break from the traditional trappings of Gothic literature, but also resist imparting moral lessons. Nathaniel of "The Sandman," and the other "freakish goblin[s]" that haunt Hoffmann's narratives, possess "neither end nor purpose in the gambols" they exhibit. This purposelessness of Hoffmann's characters highlights the differences between the Gothic and the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. The Gothic, as discussed above, evokes strong emotional reactions of horror and terror that push people back to upper world safety, contains a series of traditional narrative conventions, and exudes a clear moral purpose. By contrast, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque disregards fleeting emotions, undermines traditional conventions, and values the purposeless, or those underground impulses and actions that go against upper world demands for rational and reasonable behavior. Hoffmann, in this way an example of anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, creates underworld grotesque characters with "neither end nor purpose" in the rational, "cash-value" upper world. Hoffmann's anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness in

turn casts the Gothic and Scott as devotees of upper world stability and order. The Gothic, that is, while emerging in opposition to extreme Enlightenment reason and rationality, becomes, when understood according to Scott's essay on Hoffmann, complicit in maintaining upper world order. It insists on presenting stable, recurring narrative conventions, and imposes strict moral lessons, or exists with both a clear moral purpose, and with the purpose of perpetuating the Gothic tradition.

From the above considerations on the Gothic, and on the upper and lower world realities that develop from the grotesque's underground beginning in Nero's *Domus Aurea*, the anti-Schlegelian understanding of the grotesque emerges. The grotesque, at least partially in line with Schlegel's definition, showcases the sustained conflict between "heterogeneous elements." The exact characteristics of these opposing elements, left largely unspecified by Schlegel, become clear with the above discussion of the grotesque's development from Fabullus' underground creations. As the lower and upper realities dynamic makes clear, one army of the grotesque battle uses order and stability, and the promise of continued upper world security these forces foster, as weapons against the opposing army of the underworld. This underworld force harnesses the power of destabilizing irrationality and ungovernable passions to undercut and rip down the order-obsessed upper world. Schlegel goes wrong, and commences 2 centuries of misguided investigations of the grotesque, by claiming that the grotesque battle ultimately arouses the fleeting feelings of terror and amusement. As the upper and lower world dynamic shows, though, the grotesque in fact frees and liberates underworld objects from the ordered, reason-based upper world, rather than arousing terror and amusement. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque therefore serves as a liberating force. It involves the grotesque

battle between the armies of stability and instability, and ultimately liberates objects into a state of suffering-based freedom. These grotesquely liberated objects, that is, remain grotesquely torn and ripped apart between the forces of stability and order, and the underworld army of instability. Such grotesque liberation persists as long as the grotesque battle persists, with the upper world claim of perfect order continually undercut by the destabilizing underworld. This permanence assigned to the grotesque liberation separates the anti-Schlegelian grotesque from the Schlegelian grotesque, which, as discussed, highlights the impermanent, fleeting feelings aroused by the grotesque conflict. An understanding of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque also allows for an intriguing way of viewing the grotesque's beginning in Nero's underground chambers.

As described above, the grotesque takes its name from Fabullus' human-animal-vegetable assemblage murals painted on the underground chamber (or "grotte") walls of Nero's *Domus Aurea*. A conflict arises when one considers that Nero goes down in history as a cruel tyrant and despot, while the conception of the grotesque outlined above stresses liberation and freedom from such tyrannical sources of power. How can Nero the tyrant patronize the grotesque liberation? A possible answer to this question re-asserts the grotesque's inherent dedication to subversion. It violates and subverts physical norms due to its un-natural assemblages, and, by so doing, violates and subverts the very understanding of "the normal," and the reality that attempts to standardize and uphold normality. The grotesque always disrupts various manifestations of authority. This inherent association of the grotesque with subversion not only explains how the tyrannical Nero could patronize such a style, but also why Schlegel's emotive conception

of the grotesque stands less true, and in fact more dangerous than, the understanding of the grotesque liberation.

Nero, it could be said, commands Fabullus to paint grotesque assemblages because they evoke the fleeting feelings of terror and amusement that Schlegel later stresses as the defining components of grotesqueness. These fleeting feelings appeal to Nero due to their function as sources of control and subjugation. Nero can terrorize people that view the grotesque murals, and keep them weak and vulnerable, while at the same time he can relieve the terror with the soothing balm of grotesque amusement. Such an emotional roller coaster ride from amusement to terror ultimately strengthens Nero's grasp on power because, by controlling people's emotional reactions through the grotesque murals, he reaffirms his tyrannical ability to subjugate them. He terrorizes to break down potentially subversive sources of resistance, and then soothes these sources in order to lull them, through grotesque amusement, even farther away from rebellion. Fabullus' grotesque murals, when understood in this Schlegelian fashion, therefore embody both Nero's tyrannical power, and the tyranny of the Schlegelian conception of the grotesque. This association of tyranny with the Schlegelian grotesque in turn emphasizes why this emotive-based tradition must be viewed as less true in relation to the necessarily truer anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque outlined above. The Schlegelian grotesque behaves tyrannically because, like Nero, it emotionally enslaves individuals by controlling the grotesque's arousal of terror and amusement. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque breaks the Schlegelian hold on tyrannical power, and, in this way functioning as a liberator of the Schlegelian-enslaved, frees individuals into the truer grotesque state of permanent division between the upper and lower world realities that

Fabullus' grotesque underground murals initiate. These anti-Schlegelian grotesque individuals, although grotesquely torn between the above and below ground realities, at least exist permanently free from the impermanent, fleeting feelings of the tyrannical, and therefore less true, Schlegelian grotesque. The permanence of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation in fact also helps further differentiate the grotesque from other, related terms, such as the Gothic remarked on above.

An anti-Schlegelian understanding of the grotesque separates the term from irony, parody, and satire. Irony, much like the grotesque, serves a destabilizing function. It deliberately undercuts and undermines supposedly stable meanings, and in turn infuses nuanced meanings into objects and individuals. This understanding of irony as an undercutting force in fact develops from the beginning of irony in Greek comedy, where the *eirōn* character deliberately undermines and deflates the pompous statements of the *alazōn*. Northrop Frye discusses the *eirōn-alazōn* dynamic in his 1957 work, *Anatomy of Criticism*. Irony, then, based upon its foundational use in Greek comedy, disassembles, undermines, and undercuts. However, irony rests content at destabilization and disruption. An object, or *alazōn*, attacked by irony, sheds its façade of a set, single meaning, and new ways of viewing and comprehending the object become possible. The Greek comedy ends, though, and irony retreats from the stage after this initial disruption, and thereby leaves the *alazōn* object capable of rejecting the ironic undermining, and again asserting its original, pompous claim of a set, single meaning. Irony also typically induces pleasure and amusement, since the audience/reader cheers the downfall of the *alazōn*, whereas the grotesque, as outlined, engenders the pain and suffering of the grotesque liberation. In the twentieth century, irony becomes equated with, as T.S. Eliot

writes in his essay, “Andrew Marvell,” an “internal equilibrium” (210) between various attitudes and evaluations. Other New Critics develop Eliot’s ironic “internal equilibrium,” and include I.A. Richards, Robert Penn Warren, and Cleanth Brooks. However, rather than creating ironic “internal equilibrium,” the anti-Schlegelian grotesque deliberately destroys equilibrium, or destabilizes the “internal” cohesiveness of New Critical irony. This grotesque destabilization of New Critical “internal equilibrium” in fact resembles Romantic irony, which purposefully destroys the illusion of the omniscient narrator. In works such as Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* (1759-67) and Lord Byron’s *Don Juan* (1819-24), the narrator intrudes into their narrative with questions concerning their ability to tell their story. Romantic irony, though, much like the dissembling *ieron* discussed above, typically arouses amusement in the befuddled, self-conscious narrator, rather than the pain and suffering of the grotesque liberation.

Parody, much like irony, also deliberately undermines objects, but usually in a crasser, more overtly sarcastic manner, in order to disrupt an object’s assumed infallibility. Unlike the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which concerns itself with liberation, parody performs this crass, sarcastic undermining through imitation. Parody sarcastically imitates an object in order to undermine it, such as Henry Fielding’s parody of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740-41) in his *Joseph Andrews* of 1742. Finally, satire, like irony and parody, largely employs laughter and amusement in order to undermine and critique objects and individuals. Satiric authors also use satire as a corrective for the vices and follies of humankind. Alexander Pope’s satires profess to correct human vices, while Jonathan Swift, in his, “Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift” (1739), proclaims the same corrective function. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque frees humankind into a state of

divided suffering, instead of amusingly correcting human follies. Satiric correction, that is, gives way to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation.

In addition to irony, parody, and satire, terms such as the uncanny and the macabre have tenuous ties to the grotesque. These terms, though, primarily relate to the Schlegelian grotesque. When the grotesque becomes associated with the fleeting emotions of terror and comedy, related terms, especially those evocative of Ruskin's "terrible grotesque," leave their mark on the grotesque tradition. The uncanny, given its connotations of involving supernatural forces, or even unexplainable phenomena, connects to the "terrible grotesque" because events that resist rational explanations terrorize people with the fear of objects that remain outside the realm of comprehension. Sigmund Freud, in his essay, "The Uncanny," explains that this terror of the uncanny stems from familiar phenomena that become unfamiliar and foreign. Julia Kristeva speaks of the uncanny along Freudian lines when she discusses the terror aroused by a human corpse, which, for Kristeva, also proves uncannily familiar, since the corpse once was a living and breathing human body (consult Kristeva's *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* for more information on her Freudian notion of the uncanny). The uncanny, then, terrorizes because once familiar, explainable objects become unfamiliar, and resist rational explanations. Similarly, the macabre, directly connected to death, and to embodiments of death (such as in danse macabre presentations), arouses feelings of terror because of the fear associated with dying and death. The macabre also typically serves a memento mori function in a text. It reminds individuals that death could strike at any moment, and that therefore repentance should be sought before an individual falls into the grave. However, as discussed above, these terms only relate to the Schlegelian grotesque.

When understood as a liberating force, or a force that frees objects and individuals from the upper world illusion of permanent stability and security, the grotesque diverges from any association with the uncanny and the macabre. These terms exist as the emotive residue and collateral damage that develop from the Schlegelian grotesque. They emphasize terror and fear, and, in the case of the bizarre, a terrifying weirdness and strangeness, rather than the sustained state of liberation that results from the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. This Schlegelian connection proves especially unfortunate for the macabre, since death entails underground burial spaces, or the “grotte” that give rise to the grotesque. The macabre, then, because of its underground connotations, could function as a marker of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. However, it would exist as the macabre of underground burial spaces, rather than the macabre of fear and terror surrounding death.

A final term, “aesthetic,” deserves differentiation from the anti-Schlegelian grotesque because, as the critical history that follows shows, the freedom associated with an aesthetic stance, where an art object exists free from rational and scientific purposes and values, connects to the grotesque liberation. Both the aesthetic and the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, that is, help free objects from the upper world reality. However, while these terms relate because of their liberating powers, the aesthetic, unlike the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, revolves around issues of solipsistic autonomy. Alexander Baumgarten, in his 1750 Latin treatise, *Aesthetica*, first defines the aesthetic along solipsistic terms. He explains that his term, “aesthetic,” derives from the Greek word meaning, “pertaining to sense perception.” Baumgarten then elaborates on this sensory “Aesthetica” by connecting “sense perception” to individuals. How an individual

perceives and senses an object reveals such an object's aesthetic qualities. Future critics and writers of the Baumgarten "aesthetic" increasingly abuse the term's solipsistic tendencies, meaning that the aesthetic individual escapes into self-contained bubbles where only personal feelings and sensations matter. In the twentieth century, Paul de Man and Terry Eagleton pick up on this solipsistic, totalizing quality of the aesthetic, and in fact coin the term, "aesthetic ideology," to express the aesthetic's tendency to dangerously totalize. Consult Eagleton's, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (1990) for more information on the notion of aesthetic ideology. As discussed above, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque breaks apart such aesthetic solipsism and autonomy for the sake of a grotesquely divided and torn freedom. The grotesque frees through division, whereas the aesthetic seeks the freedom of solipsistic, self-contained autonomy. The aesthetic-like critics that follow, including Charles Baudelaire and Oscar Wilde, should therefore be understood as employing the anti-Schlegelian grotesque to in part free themselves from their aesthetic solipsism. These writers stand aesthetically apart from the upper world reality, and free from it because of their grotesquely liberating divisions that defy aesthetic solipsism and self-containment. The critical history that develops from the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, with its emphasis on the grotesque liberation, helps further differentiate the grotesque from the aesthetic, and the related terms discussed above.

The anti-Schlegelian critical history of the grotesque survives the fall of Rome in the 5th century CE in the heady philosophic and literary environment of late 18th century Germany. During this century, the 1790's stand as perhaps the most significant decade, with monumental works relating to the grotesque appearing by Immanuel Kant and Friedrich von Schiller. Kant specifically enters the history of anti-Schlegelian grotesque

scholarship with the publication of his seminal, *Critique of Judgment* in 1790. Within this work, Kant places himself within the grotesque underworld when he argues for aesthetic freedom from upper world reason's exacting, ordering laws. Termed, "purposiveness without purpose," such grotesque aesthetic liberation possesses purposiveness, or a design, such as Fabullus' artistic designs in the underground chambers of Nero's palace, but exists without a purpose beyond itself. This Kantian object containing "purposiveness without purpose" dwells within the grotesque underworld, liberated from the upper world's solipsistic obsession with purpose, or with objects that factor into the ongoing equating of the above ground reality. Kant therefore sets the stage for future developments of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict that produces "purposiveness without purpose," or an aesthetic grotesque liberation that breaks apart, as discussed above, the solipsistic autonomy of the upper world reality. Unfortunately, though, Schlegel, writing eight years after Kant's, *Critique of Judgment*, failed to recognize Kant's connection to Fabullus' grotesque creations. Such oversight led Schlegel, as discussed, to define the grotesque as an arouser of terror and amusement, rather than a conflict resulting in the grotesque liberation. In consequence of this oversight, the grotesque wallows within 2 centuries of Schlegelian grotesque investigations, with writers led astray from the Roman origins of the grotesque.

Following Kant, and his association with the aesthetic grotesque liberation, Friedrich von Schiller stands as the next prominent figure within the anti-Schlegelian grotesque critical history. Occupying such a position, Schiller provides further insight into the Kantian aesthetic grotesque object, while also stressing the importance of such an object in the increasingly scientific world of late 18th century Europe. Writing, "On the

Aesthetic Education of Man” in 1795, Schiller describes what could be called the gradual “scientizing” of humankind. Individuals, ensnared in the Age of Reason’s over-emphasis on science and rationality, slowly shut down their appreciation for anti-rational objects, such as the aesthetic works of the grotesque underworld. For Schiller, people neglect the aesthetic grotesque underworld because, as discussed, aesthetic objects do not possess any value within the grotesque upper world reality. These aesthetic objects become subversive because they rebel against the ordering lights of science and reason. Properly “scientized” people, then, must cast aside the grotesque underworld, and condemn it as worthless, as a waste of one’s scientifically doled out time. Within his essay, Schiller presents these sentiments in the following passage:

Humanity has lost its dignity; but Art has rescued it and preserved it in significant stone. Truth lives on in the illusion of Art, and it is from this copy, or after-image, that the original image will once again be restored. (52)

This passage paints the grotesque underworld as a place of salvation from the upper world reality. As Schiller believes, people of the grotesque upper world have “lost [their] dignity,” or their ability to appreciate underworld objects. These “scientized” people must therefore be saved from their upper world existence by these purportedly value-less creations of the grotesque underworld. They must, in a sense, enter into the anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict in order to reawaken to the neglected grotesque underworld of scientifically ungovernable, irrational existence.

Schiller also occupies an important position within the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition because he places Truth in the grotesque underworld. He writes of how, “Truth lives on in the illusion of Art.” Such a statement proclaims that the grotesque underworld houses Truth, or proves truer to the human condition than reason’s supposed pursuit of

Truth in the upper world reality. This association of Truth with the grotesque underworld in fact explains why the underworld must restore humankind's lost dignity in the first place. Grotesque underworld Truth, as discussed, imparts Kantian "purposiveness without purpose" to the "scientized" upper world. People of the upper world in turn emerge dignified by their new-found ability to appreciate the aesthetic value of grotesque underworld objects. They see, in a sense, with clearer eyes, or with eyes that no longer only and absolutely see the upper world value of objects and individuals. G.K.

Chesterton, writing over a century after Schiller (in 1903), in fact picks up on and emphasizes Schiller's notion of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque as a dignifying force. In his study on the grotesque in the poetry of Robert Browning, Chesterton claims that the grotesque "is not complex or artificial; it is natural and in the legitimate tradition of nature" (149). Chesterton's grotesque therefore coincides with Schiller's grotesque (and, in turn, with the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition) because, by casting down the "artificial," it necessarily attaches itself to the "natural" and "legitimate" Truth of Schiller's development of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. It, in a sense, allows individuals to see the "natural" Truth of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque unpolluted by the "artificial" upper world reality, and this so-called "new vision" allows humanity, as Schiller remarks above, to regain its dignity. Humanity regains, or redeems, its grotesquely liberated status from the upper world reality, and, with cured eyesight, sees and values the liberation offered by the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. The conclusion picks up and expands on the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's curative powers, or ability to save individuals from their upper world enslavement. Refer, then, to the conclusion for further insights into this aspect of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, as well as to the authors below, such as Shelley

and Emerson, who, like Schiller and Chesterton, highlight the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's ability to impart a cured, grotesquely liberated eyesight.

After Kant and Schiller's resurgence of the grotesque in the 1790s, the anti-Schlegelian critical history of the grotesque moves to England in the first years of the 1820s. This migration, in addition to continuing the grotesque's emphasis on liberation and redemption, increasingly views the grotesque in relation to poetry. Percy Shelley becomes the first writer to stress such a poetic connection to the grotesque. In his 1821 essay, "A Defence of Poetry," Shelley situates poetry in the grotesque underworld when he argues against the cash-value, overly reasonable upper world mentality specifically celebrated by Thomas Love Peacock. Peacock, in his 1820 essay, "The Four Ages of Poetry," angered Shelley by declaring that poetry, "like all other trades, takes its rise in the demand for the commodity, and flourishes in proportion to the extent of the market" (4). Poetry, to Shelley's horror, becomes a commodity, or an object possessing value because of its ability to garner the upper world gold of stability and order. Poetry, that is, functions as a commercial stabilizer of the upper world, and the poet, in order to succeed in the marketplace, must peddle their wares, or think like any other money-minded merchant, and function with a quid pro quo mentality. A poet sells their poetic merchandise and expects some form of upper world remuneration in return. Such compensation adds value to the exchange, meaning that the money possesses value, not the poem. These Peacockian poets in turn become, in many ways, Benthamite utilitarians. Like their poetic creations, they possess value because of their utility, or because of what they add to and produce for the benefit of the upper world reality. For Shelley, though,

such ideas prove noxious and unendurable because they relegate and confine poetry to the cash-value, grotesque upper world.

Taking arms against Peacock, Shelley believes that poetry must grotesquely liberate individuals from the upper world's "cash-value" ordering of reality. Shelley asserts this belief when he explains that poetry's "secret alchemy turns to potable gold the poisonous waters which flow from death through life; it strips the veil of familiarity from the world, and lays bare the naked and sleeping beauty which is the spirit of its forms" (74). This passage situates Shelley in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition. He begins by describing the grotesque conflict between the upper world, cash-based understanding of value, and the underworld forces of "purposiveness without purpose." Shelley then calls the result of this anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict the "potable gold" of the grotesque liberation. This liberation frees poetry from the upper world's "veil of familiarity," or that veil that prevents people from appreciating the aesthetic value of underworld objects. The grotesque liberation, it could be said, rips apart the upper world veil, and reveals, as Shelley writes, "the naked and sleeping beauty" of underworld poetry valued for its own, purpose-less sake. Shelley's veil imagery for the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation in fact resembles Thomas Carlyle's critique of the "cash-value," rational upper world in his work, *Sartor Resartus* (1836). In this work, the character, Teufelsdröckh, like Shelley, wants to tear apart the "old rags of Matter" (165) to see the "naked... universal HERE, an[d] everlasting NOW" (42-43). The upper world reality, that is, conceals and hides "the naked and sleeping beauty" of the grotesque underworld. Other writers within the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition expand on Shelley's development of the grotesque's application to poetry, especially in the United States.

Ralph Waldo Emerson extols the poetic grotesque liberation in his 1844 essay, "The Poet." In this piece, Emerson evokes William Wordsworth's 1800, "Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*" by ascribing supreme importance to the language of the countryside and to Nature. Emerson, like Wordsworth, views this language as purer in its simplicity than the overly rational, merchant-used language of the city. This Emersonian Nature language, then, grotesquely pitted against upper world, rational city language, possesses underground irrationality because of its anti-city simplicity. For Emerson, much like Shelley, the poet must harness this anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict in order to communicate the underworld Nature language that liberates individuals from the rational upper world reality. Emerson expresses this responsibility of the grotesque poet in the following passage:

Poets are thus liberating gods. Men have really got a new sense, and found within their world another world, or nest of worlds; for, the metamorphosis once seen, we divine that it does not stop. (217-218)

The Emersonian grotesque poet imbues the rational upper world with "a new sense" of the irrational underworld. This "new sense," similar to Shelley's "potable gold," makes upper world individuals appreciate grotesque aesthetic objects. Emerson also explains that the "new sense" of the poetic grotesque liberation perpetually inundates the upper world when he writes, "for, the metamorphosis once seen, we divine that it does not stop." Such perpetuity proves important because it helps secure the liberation that separates the Schlegelian and anti-Schlegelian conceptions of the grotesque. As discussed, Schlegel neglects the liberating force of the grotesque for the fleeting feelings of amusement and terror. Conversely, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, as Emerson reveals, perpetually imparts the "new sense" of the grotesque liberation. Writers following

Emerson continue to highlight this anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque, while also stressing the importance of the grotesque liberation in the increasingly scientific world of the 19th century.

Anti-Schlegelian writers that emphasize the importance of the grotesque liberation include Victor Hugo. In the preface to his 1827 play, *Cromwell*, Hugo in fact declares that the grotesque best defines modern human life. The scientific and technological advancements that drive the 19th century's Industrial Age necessarily place people in overly rational upper world environments. Hugo also credits Christianity with this grotesqueness of the modern age. He claims that the rise of Christianity first awakened humankind to its grotesquely divided existence. According to Christianity, humans live with two distinct, disparate realities. One human reality lives in a mortal condition, while the other reality exists in an immortal condition. Hugo, as stated, sees this Christian dualism as grotesque, since it entails an irreconcilable conflict between opposite realities. In the nineteenth century, Hugo implies that the Industrial Age supplants grotesque Christianity, and in turn breeds a perverted, polluted religion for modern individuals. These people deny their grotesqueness by worshipping the scientific and technological advancements of the Industrial Age upper world reality.

Thomas Carlyle develops Hugo's concerns for grotesqueness in the modern world when he laments this Industrial Age juggernaut of science and technology in his work, *Chartism*, where he describes the rational upper world as a "World-Steamengine" that imprisons people "in its own iron belly" (146). Carlyle repeats this entrapment of individuals in the "iron belly" of the rational upper world throughout his writings (consult, for example, "Signs of the Times"). The grotesque underworld, cast aside in

such a “World-Steamengine” Age, in turn assumes supreme importance. It must rise up and grotesquely battle against the scientifically-ordered upper world in order to free modern life, trapped inside the Industrial Age’s “iron belly,” to the irrational underworld. By so doing, the grotesque helps stem the juggernaut of upper world science, and the overly rational, ordered outlook it fosters. It returns, it could be said, modern individuals to Hugo’s divine-like grotesqueness, or to an anti-Schlegelian state of permanent grotesque division. Due to their renewed anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, people therefore embody the grotesque. They exist grotesquely free, with upper world reason offset by underworld irrationality. All aspects of humanity, even those involving the irrational underworld, matter, and possess value. Grotesque humanity, then, lives completely because grotesquely, since it creates a well-rounded, free, and divided existence, or one grotesquely torn between the competing forces of the grotesque conflict. John Ruskin works alongside Hugo by emphasizing the almost divine-like importance of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque in the Industrial Age of the nineteenth-century.

As discussed, John Ruskin occupies an interesting position in the history of the grotesque. His direct remarks on the grotesque in *The Stones of Venice* (1874) cast him as a Schlegelian. He understands the grotesque as an arouser of fleeting emotions. The fleeting emotional products of the grotesque Ruskin calls the “sportive grotesque and terrible grotesque” (126). However, when viewed in light of his other ideas, especially his trenchant criticism of the Industrial Age, Ruskin becomes an anti-Schlegelian. Works such as “The Work of Iron, in Nature, Art, and Policy” (1858) reveal Ruskin’s closet grotesque anti-Schlegelianism. In this text, Ruskin bemoans the Industrial Age’s ability, through its glorification of the machine and science, to create an eternal, unchanging, and

absolutely stable upper world state. Ruskin describes a metallic nature, where “all your meadows instead of grass, grew nothing but iron wire – if all your arable ground, instead of being made of sand and clay, were suddenly turned into flat surfaces of steel” (378). “Iron wire” and “steel,” the offspring of Industrial Age machines, turn the natural world into an undying, stable upper world. Iron grasses never decay, and steel sand and clay never change. For Ruskin, such a mechanized upper world proves especially harmful because it mechanizes humankind as well. People become like the machines they mindlessly toil over, or exist, in accordance with Marx’s ideas on the alienation of labor, cut off from the products produced. In the twentieth century, writers such as Oswald Spengler, in his, *The Decline of the West*, and Martin Heidegger pick up and develop these nineteenth century insights into the Industrial Age put forth by Carlyle and Ruskin. Ruskin comments on this Marxist alienation of labor, or division of labor, in his work, “The Nature of Gothic.” In this piece, Ruskin writes, “It is not... the labour that is divided; but the men: Divided into mere segments of men – broken into small fragments and crumbs of life” (196). In order to liberate these “men” from their enslavement to the upper world, Industrial Age machine, which, as Ruskin explains, makes them subhuman, or “mere segments of men,” art of the grotesque underworld must intervene.

In “The Nature of Gothic” and “The Work of Iron, in Nature, Art, and Policy,” Ruskin insists that art of the grotesque underworld saves the “mere segments of men” enslaved to the upper world, Industrial Age reality. Ruskin’s art in fact becomes as important as bread and air to these enslaved individuals because it grotesquely frees them from their servitude to the industrial machine. It nourishes them, or builds them back up from their subhuman, industrial existence. Ruskin’s notion of art in the Industrial Age

therefore identifies him as an anti-Schlegelian. Ruskin's art grotesquely battles against an order-obsessed, industry-driven upper world reality in order to liberate individuals from the machines they serve. These grotesquely liberated individuals, rather than confined and degraded by their upper world reality, re-connect, through art, to issues and ideas outside of upper world science and reason, such as the underworld passions of artistic pursuits. William Morris, a disciple of Ruskin's, continues to proclaim the importance of art as a type of anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberator in the Industrial Age during the closing half of the nineteenth century (see especially his lecture series, "Hopes and Fears for Art"). The aesthetic grotesque critics that follow also view art as vitally important in the nineteenth-century's Industrial Age. However, rather than using art to grotesquely liberate individuals from their degrading enslavement to the Industrial Age machine, the grotesque critics below insist on the scientific uselessness of art as the source of its anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. Art, that is, stands apart from the Industrial Age, and exists grotesquely liberated from the upper world machine because of its uselessness, or deliberate refusal to serve a specific purpose in the Industrial Age machine. This scientific uselessness of art, it could be argued, re-instills what Walter Benjamin, writing in the twentieth century, calls the mysterious "aura" of art. Art sheds its Industrial Age emphasis on machine-like replication and duplication. It regains its "aura" of ineffableness, or its originality and ability to subvert the upper world obsession with absolutely understanding and cataloguing all objects and individuals.

Charles Baudelaire, like Hugo, Ruskin, and Morris believing in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's central position in modern, Industrial Age life, further explains the importance of the grotesque liberation in his 1863 work, "The Painter of Modern

Life.” The detached dandy figure of this piece embodies the grotesquely liberated individual of modern life. Baudelaire describes such a figure in the following passage:

The distinguishing characteristic of the dandy’s beauty consists above all in an air of coldness which comes from an unshakeable determination not to be moved; you might call it a latent fire which hints at itself, and which could, but chooses not to burst into flame. (29)

The Baudelaireian dandy exists within the upper world, but, rather than crushed by its rigid dedication to science and reason, the dandy remains removed and detached from it. The dandy seems to look on from afar, watching the scientific preciseness of the upper world with “an air of coldness which comes from an unshakeable determination not to be moved.” Baudelaire’s dandy refuses to blindly accept the upper world’s scientific and rational outlook, and in turn breaks free from the solipsism these upper world pursuits foster. This freedom from the scientific confinement of the upper world results from what Baudelaire calls, “the dandy’s beauty.” As an embodiment of the grotesque, the dandy offsets upper world reason with its underworld uselessness. The dandy only observes the upper world, and never actively serves a rational purpose within it. Due to this detached purposelessness, the dandy exists beautifully liberated by the grotesque. Baudelaire helps explain this beautiful grotesque liberation when he writes, “you might call it a latent fire which hints at itself, and which could, but chooses not to burst into flame.” The dandy burns with an underworld fire, and in turn remains beautifully liberated from the necessity of applying to the upper world for sustaining fuel and kindling, or for a scientifically designated purpose. It could be said, then, that the dandy becomes a grotesque aesthetic object, beautiful for its own sake, and free from upper world confinement. This Baudelaireian dandy figure also prefigures late-19th century

developments of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition by such English writers as Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde.

During the 1870s, the “latent fire” of the Baudelaireian dandy morphs into a steady flame of anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness in the work of Walter Pater. In his 1873 book, *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, Pater describes the outbreak of the grotesque aesthetic fire when he writes, “To burn always with this hard, gem-like flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life” (219). The grotesque aesthetic flame, burning steady (“hard”) and “gem-like,” rages in its grotesquely liberating beauty against the upper world reality. Rather than beautiful for its own purpose-less sake, the flame hardens and dies in the upper world, extinguished by scientifically sanctioned purposes and uses, and swallowed up by the solipsism this reality creates. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation dies in turn. As if to prevent this death of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, Oscar Wilde turns Pater’s grotesque aesthetic flame into a raging torch of liberation. Wilde succeeds in this task by literally living like the Baudelaireian dandy.

Dressing in flamboyant, flashy clothing, and shocking upper world society because of his eccentric and irrational behavior, Wilde represents the liberated underworld aesthete grotesquely clashing with the rational upper world. He becomes, it could be said, grotesquely extravagant, or lives, as the etymology of the word, “extravagant,” reveals, outside (“vagrant”) the limits of the supposedly normal (“extra”) upper world reality. Wilde describes his anti-Schlegelian, extra-vagant grotesque lifestyle in the preface to his 1890 novel, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. He writes in this work, “They are the elect to whom beautiful things mean only Beauty” (3). The aesthetic dandy proves “elect” because their grotesque struggle against upper world rationality frees the

dandy from scientific notions of value. For the Wilde-like dandy, that is, “beautiful things mean only Beauty.” These “beautiful things” are aesthetic objects grotesquely liberated from the upper world reality, and include the eponymous Dorian Gray, whose depraved lifestyle underscores both his pursuit of “beautiful things [that] mean only Beauty,” and his moral distance from the stodgy morality of the upper world. Gray, that is, increases his grotesque liberation as he increases the power of his moral affronts against the upper world. His portrait, then, which represents his moral debasement, could be said to depict the Beauty of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. It portrays the grotesquely liberated individual free from the moral shackles of the upper world reality. This association of anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness with grotesquely liberating moral decay also appears in Joris-Karl Huysmans’ 1884 novel, *Against Nature (Á Reboours)*. Jean Des Esseintes, the Gray-like dandy of Huysmans’ novel, decadently and extravagantly adorns his pet tortoise. The tortoise, though, cannot bear the weight of the “beautiful things” (jewels and precious stones) that Des Esseintes attaches to its shell, and ultimately dies, crushed, it could be said, by the extremeness of its anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation.

Wilde’s extravagant grotesque dandyism also relates to the *fin-de-siècle* world he inhabits, in that the end of the nineteenth century, and, by extension, the erosion of the absolute trust placed in Industrial Age progress and rationality, creates a divided, fragmented reality that fosters grotesqueness. Bernard McElroy comments on this connection between Wilde’s anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness and the end of the nineteenth century when he writes, “decadence and the grotesque have long been at home in each other’s company” (*Fiction* 129). As the nineteenth century and the Industrial Age wither and decay, it could be argued that the grotesquely liberating underworld emerges from

the destruction. It comes up from the grotesque underground as a decadent dandy, or as a grotesque aesthete like Wilde, whose love and admiration for beautiful uselessness reveal the ruptures in the Industrial Age upper world reality, where, as discussed, such uselessness remains condemned and suppressed. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque, then, as McElroy makes clear, flourishes in periods of decay, or when a dominant reality gradually gives way to another reality. The High Modernism of the 1920s, discussed later, expands on this association of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque with periods of “betweenness” and transition.

In addition to Wilde and Baudelaire, Friedrich Nietzsche writes as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque critic when he develops his ideas regarding the Apollonian and Dionysian forces in his 1872 work, *The Birth of Tragedy*. Nietzsche argues that the Apollonian orders and contains reality. The Apollonian, as Nietzsche writes, “must include that measured limitation, that freedom from wilder impulses, that wise calm of the image-making god” (16). In its campaign to curb the “wilder impulses,” and to instill “measured limitation,” the Apollonian behaves much like the grotesque upper world reality. Both tame the upper world to control and govern it with Apollonian light and rationality. The Dionysian force grotesquely fights against the taming Apollonian. Nietzsche explains how this Dionysian grotesque conflict against the Apollonian “is best conveyed by the analogy of *intoxication*” (17). The Nietzschean anti-Schlegelian grotesque frees the Apollonian curbed “wilder impulses” through a type of liberating intoxication. The grotesquely liberated individual, drunk with relaxed Apollonian prohibitions, therefore exists in an underground environment of irrationality and

uninhibited passions. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche compares this individual to the Greek tragic hero, Prometheus.

Guilty of stealing fire from the Gods to give to humankind, Prometheus behaves much like Wilde by embodying the grotesque liberation. However, the Promethean embodiment of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque proves more important than Wilde's because Prometheus clarifies the conditions that result in the grotesque liberation in the first place. Prometheus, Dionysically-driven, grotesquely rages against what could be called the upper world Apollonian illusion of order. The Gods, as Prometheus highlights through his theft of their fire, possess only the Apollonian illusion of having sole control over such an element. God-only fire can be stolen, and given to humankind. This Promethean theft that reveals illusory sources of power finds further clarification in Mary Shelley's 1818 novel, *Frankenstein*. Such a work deserves attention because of its typically ignored subtitle, *The Modern Prometheus*. Rather than stealing fire like Prometheus, Frankenstein steals life, or what could be called, the secret fire that gives life. With this theft, he creates the so-called "monster" of Shelley's novel. This being in fact represents a type of grotesque figure. He exists as a literal assemblage of human body parts, and, because of his extreme height and strength, transgresses normal human appearance. Frankenstein's monster, then, seems to arrive from the grotesque underworld reality. He in turn embodies Frankenstein's Promethean theft, or that theft of life that grotesquely breaks apart the Nietzschean Apollonian reality's monopoly not only on fire, but also on the giving and taking of life.

In consequence of Prometheus' and Frankenstein's robberies, such an upper world Apollonian reality, in line with the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, becomes understood

as illusion-bound. The reason, rationality, and obsession with maintaining the status quo (such as the status quo of the upper world ruling over fire and life) that control this reality serve as tools that help build up and sustain the upper world illusion. Prometheus and Frankenstein therefore free objects, or at least fire and the secret to life, from the illusion of absolute upper world control. This anti-Schlegelian grotesque freedom from upper world illusions also adds to the importance of the grotesque in an overly scientific modern age. By revealing upper world illusions, the grotesque necessarily frees individuals to a truer state of existence, or one devoid of ordering illusions. Frankenstein, by the end of Shelley's novel, certainly bemoans his zealous dedication to science. His blind belief in the absolute truth and good of science gave birth to his monstrous, grotesque creation, which ultimately destroys his life, or at least his life dedicated to science. Frankenstein, interestingly, resembles his grotesque underworld "monster." He grotesquely liberates himself from upper world science, and in turn learns the truth of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation in a modern age falsely devoted to the scientific illusions of the grotesque upper world reality.

Nietzsche adds further depth to the importance of the grotesque as an instiller of truth by emphasizing how the individual, although freed by the anti-Schlegelian grotesque from upper world illusions, discovers that the truth of their new, liberated existence entails perpetual suffering. Prometheus, like Frankenstein discussed above, suffers for his grotesque, Dionysian-led battle against the Apollonian upper world. Each day birds ravenously devour Prometheus' liver. Such suffering, though, both ensures the continuation of his grotesque liberation, since the birds endlessly devour Prometheus'

liver, and highlights the importance of the individual in maintaining their freedom.

Nietzsche discusses this important position of the individual in the following passage:

That sudden swell of the Dionysiac tide then lifts the separate little waves of individuals on to its back, just as the Titan Atlas, brother of Prometheus, lifted up the earth. This Titanic urge to become, as it were, the Atlas of all single beings and to carry them on a broad back higher and higher, further and further is the common feature shared by the Promethean and the Dionysiac. (51)

Like the mythic Atlas, the individual must carry “on a broad back” the heavy weight of their grotesque liberation. This heavy burden causes individual suffering because, to remain grotesquely free from upper world illusions, it must be forever upheld. The individual, like Prometheus, must perpetually suffer for their anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation, or, like Frankenstein, endlessly search for the “monster” that gave birth to their grotesque liberation. Such endless individual suffering reveals the great importance of the individual in the grotesque conflict. That is, the individual must find and sustain the strength to suffer, or to keep at bay the upper world illusions that tempt the individual Atlas to throw down the great weight of their grotesque liberation. Nietzsche’s emphasis on an individual’s self-sustaining grotesque liberation sets the stage for Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytic connection to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque.

Freud primarily develops the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition by, like Nietzsche, emphasizing the individual suffering that fuels the grotesque liberation. Freud applies this grotesque suffering to the realm of the unconscious. In his 1900 book, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud establishes a grotesque relationship between the unconscious and conscious realities. Freud’s unconscious world, much like the grotesque underground, houses unfettered passions, desires, and irrational impulses. Grotesquely pitted against these underworld, unconscious urges is the conscious, upper world reality

governed by the illusion of perfect order and stability. This conscious upper world maintains its illusory existence by repressing the destabilizing impulses of the unconscious underworld. According to Freud, then, the conscious upper world apparently remains victorious in its grotesque fight with the unconscious underworld. Underground impulses are repressed, and an individual appears to lead a reasonable, ordered life in the upper world. However, dreams, for Freud, escape upper world repression by setting free and expressing unconscious urges and desires. The dream world therefore allows the unconscious to strike a decisive blow against the repressive conscious upper world. Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, following Freud, also associate the grotesque with the repressed unconscious breaking free from conscious controls (consult their, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (1986) for more information on the grotesque repressed unconscious). An individual, using their dream world to grotesquely assert their repressed unconscious, in turn breaks free from the upper world illusion, and must, in a sense, enter the illusion-less grotesque liberation as a dream-fueled, Nietzschean Prometheus ready to suffer for their anti-Schlegelian freedom. These Freudian individuals, grotesquely liberated from the conscious upper world by their destabilizing, unconscious dreams, in fact resemble Freud's comments, in his "Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis," concerning the excavations at Pompeii. Freud explains that the unconscious saves individuals from absolute consciousness because, as the excavations at Pompeii reveal, "the destruction of Pompeii was beginning only now that it had been dug up" (176). Therefore, the grotesque underworld, or that buried, unconscious world of Pompeii, preserves, or, as Anne Fernihough writes, "denotes cure" (61). It preserves, cures, and ultimately liberates the individual from strict upper world consciousness.

Freud continues to expand on his dream-driven, anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation when he explains that uncensored, unrepressed dreams reveal that the conscious upper world, rather than absolutely ordered and controlled by reason and rationality, in fact seethes with uncontrollable underworld urges and passions. These uncensored dreams further grotesquely undermine consciousness by, as Freud explains in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, creating a number of interpretations. Unconscious dreams, that is, grotesquely batter down conscious attempts to maintain order through precise, single explanations (see pg. 105 for Freud's ideas on the interpretative quality of dreams). In this way awakened by their dreams to the conscious upper world's illusory claims to perfect order and stability, the Freudian grotesquely liberated individual resembles Prometheus and Atlas. The Freudian individual, that is, suffers due to their grotesque liberation from the strict censoring of the conscious upper world. Their existence becomes defined by the heavy weight of liberating loss, or by their permanent removal from the conscious' illusory order. An incomplete state results, since the individual, although grotesquely liberated from the upper world illusion, still yearns for the comfort derived from its order and predictability. Therefore, to remain grotesquely free the individual must push aside these upper world, conscious temptations. Like Prometheus and Atlas, the individual must continually suffer for their anti-Schlegelian grotesque freedom by upholding the destabilizing passions and impulses of the grotesque underworld. Freud, in his later writings, such as *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1919-20) and *Ego and Id* (1923), continues to expand on the anti-Schlegelian grotesque relationship between the conscious and unconscious realities. In these works, he establishes his ideas concerning the id, ego, and superego. This psychological trio

engages in an anti-Schlegelian grotesque relationship. The embattled ego, which, it could be argued, represents the grotesquely liberated individual, exists grotesquely torn between the irrational, underworld impulses and urges of the id, and the rational, controlling power of the upper world superego. Freud's anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness therefore runs throughout his work. It surfaces in his early work of the 1900s, and continues, in the form of updated and revised terminology, in his writings of the 1920s.

After Freud's psychoanalytic writings on the anti-Schlegelian grotesque during the first decades of the twentieth century, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition becomes especially pronounced in the modern age during WWI, and during the High Modernism in England that followed the war. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque occupies such a prominent position during this time because the large scale, senseless slaughter and devastation of the Great War blatantly and traumatically reveals the dangers of the Industrial Age's absolute belief in an upper world reality stabilized by reason, rationality, science, and unimpeded progress. Virginia Woolf, in her essay, "The Fleeting Portrait," critiques this Industrial Age upper world when she writes of how this reality, "shrieked and gibbered... danced and sidled! Honour, patriotism, chastity, wealth, success, importance, position, patronage, power – their cries rang and echoed from all quarters" (211). For Woolf, these upper world values, that ring and echo "from all quarters," feed and drive the Industrial Age. They justify the upper world, and its deliberate neglect of the grotesquely liberating underworld. Therefore, it could be said that the anti-Schlegelian grotesque critics already discussed, such as Shelley, Ruskin, Carlyle, Baudelaire, and Nietzsche, prove correct in their assessments of the modern age. Shelley and Carlyle's "veils" remain unbroken, and keep the grotesquely liberating underworld

hidden, individuals remain as Carlyle's "mere segments of [mechanical] men," and Baudelaire's scientifically useless art remains ignored in favor of scientifically created and manufactured objects (such as the machine guns and bombs of the Great War). Due to the Industrial Age neglect of the liberating powers of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, WWI represents the anti-Schlegelian grotesque at last coming to the fore, since the war destroys absolute faith in the Industrial Age upper world reality, and the values Woolf lists above. The individuals that emerge from the war in turn enter the High Modern environment grotesquely liberated. They exist grotesquely torn between the destabilizing, irrational horrors of the war, and the lost Industrial Age upper world reality stabilized by the Realistic belief in the shared, communal values of rationality and scientific progress. The Great War, that is, destroys Realism's faith in a world governed by reason, and creates an unstable, modern world populated by lone, anti-Schlegelian grotesque individuals. This anti-Schlegelianism of High Modernism explains the chapter focus on authors writing in this post-War, grotesquely liberated environment. These authors (discussed in Part IV, and including T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley) write as anti-Schlegelians, or, in various ways, sustain the grotesque liberation from the Industrial Age upper world reality. In addition to Eliot, Lawrence, and Huxley, a number of writers help further explain why grotesque anti-Schlegelianism flourishes in High Modernism.

Among nineteenth-century writers, Matthew Arnold serves as a type of prophet that foresees the eventual collapse of the Industrial Age upper world reality, and the subsequent rise of High Modern grotesque anti-Schlegelianism. In his 1855 poem, "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse," Arnold describes an anti-Schlegelian grotesque

predicament when he writes, “Wandering between two worlds, one dead, / The other powerless to be born, / With nowhere yet to rest my head, / Like these, on earth I wait forlorn” (2093, 85-88). Arnold wanders between the “two worlds” of the grotesque conflict. In line with Ruskin and Carlyle, one world, the Industrial Age upper world reality, “deadens” humanity, or enslaves individuals to the drudgery and mindlessness of a mechanical world. Arnold’s “other,” destabilizing grotesque underworld, still “powerless to be born” in the nineteenth-century’s Industrial Age, waits for the horrors of WWI, and the work of figures like Freud (who destabilizes the individual psyche) and Saussure (who destabilizes language), to at last grotesquely counter the upper world reality. Arnold’s “Dover Beach” (1867), with its “ignorant armies clash[ing] by night” (2091, 37), also speaks towards the gradual grotesque dissolution of the Industrial Age upper world. In addition to Arnold, Joseph Conrad adds to the growing grotesque anti-Schlegelianism of the modern world in his 1899 novella, *Heart of Darkness*. In this work, Marlow’s journey encounters increasingly irrational people and places as it proceeds. It could even be said that Marlow voyages away from the Industrial Age upper world until ultimately reaching an underworld, grotesquely destabilizing reality headed by the enigmatic Kurtz. Kurtz’s famous line, “The horror! The horror!” (86) in this way bespeaks the horror of the Industrial Age upper world, and its ultimately malicious, war-inducing values, that foster the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation of High Modernism. In fact, showcasing this High Modern indebtedness to the growing grotesque anti-Schlegelianism of the Industrial Age, T.S. Eliot originally used this line from Conrad as the epigraph to his High Modern masterpiece (discussed in chapter 1), *The Waste Land* (1922). While Ezra Pound convinced Eliot to change the epigraph from Conrad to

Petronius, Eliot nevertheless realized Conrad's important place in the gradually crumbling Industrial Age upper world reality (see Harriett Davidson's cited piece for more information on Eliot's original epigraph). Conrad, like Arnold, foresaw the grotesque "two worlds" conflict that would come to the fore in the post-WWI, High Modern environment.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels also discuss the rise of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, "two worlds" conflict in their 1848, *Communist Manifesto*. In this work, Marx and Engels write about the "Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of social relations, [and the] everlasting uncertainty and agitation" (52) that distinguish the modern world. Modern individuals exist in a state of constant "uncertainty and agitation," or live in Arnold's "two worlds" reality, where the "uninterrupted disturbance of social relations" casts people into an unstable, volatile environment ripe for anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness. Capitalism, it could be said, attempts to stabilize this "uncertainty and agitation" for the sake of perpetuating the bourgeoisie's control of the modes and methods of production that undergird the capitalistic endeavor. The bourgeoisie want to choke off the growing anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness of the modern age, and erect a type of upper world reality stabilized by the supposedly rational creation of profits, because, simply put, grotesque instability is bad for business. In light of capitalism's development of an illusion of stability and security amidst the "uninterrupted disturbance" of the modern world, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque must act as a check on capitalism. It must break the bourgeoisie's hold on an illusory state of stability, and reveal the grotesquely liberating instability of the modern world that other writers, including several 20th century Marxist critics and theorists, such as Bertolt Brecht, Pierre

Macherey, and Fredric Jameson, continue to emphasize. Brecht, in his so-called “epic theatre” plays (e.g. *Mother Courage* (1941) and *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* (1949)), behaves as both a Marxist and anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer because he insists that art, rather than reflecting supposedly stable social conditions, and in this way feeding the social stability sought by capitalism’s upper world illusion of security, must urge and impel social change. It must, through a series of dramatic devices, such as simple staging, montage, and deliberate resistance to the audience, reveal the grotesquely liberating instability, or the “everlasting uncertainty and agitation,” that mark the modern age. Jameson, largely building off Macherey’s ideas relating to the upper world’s attempt to suppress the destabilizing “silences” and “gaps” in a text (cf. Macherey’s, *A Theory of Literary Production* (1966, trans. 1978)), argues, in his, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (1981), that the critic must “rewrite” a text in order to give voice to, in a sense, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. This rewritten text represents the anti-Schlegelian grotesque’s successful countering of capitalism’s upper world reality. It lays bare the destabilizing grotesque underworld, or unleashes the anti-Schlegelian grotesque forces that combat capitalism, and return the modern world to its grotesquely liberating “disturbance of social relations.” Martin Heidegger, discussed, along with other writers, below, calls this modern state of grotesque instability, “betweenness.”

José Ortega y Gasset and Martin Heidegger, much like the writers and critics above, understand the modern world as an Arnoldian “two worlds” conflict conducive to anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness. Ortega y Gasset, in his work, *Man and Crisis*, views the twentieth century modern world as an epistemological crisis. That is, individuals

emerging from WWI can no longer trust the rational, scientific knowledge of the Industrial Age upper world reality. These disillusioned masses do not “know what is happening to us, and that is precisely the thing that is happening to us – the fact of not knowing what is happening to us” (119). Or, these High Modern individuals exist grotesquely liberated. The Industrial Age reality upheld by absolute faith in science and technology dies on the battlefields of WWI, and individuals, behaving much like Eliot’s befuddled and unstable Prufrock, live in a grotesquely liberating state of uncertainty and indecision, in that their search for new meaning represents their grotesque liberation from the values of the Industrial Age. This High Modern, Prufrockian disillusionment with so-called Industrial Age “civilization” also helps explain the modern esteem for, as Arthur Machen writes, “primitive man before he was defiled by the horrors of civilisation” (*Hieroglyphics* 90). Modern writers (such as D.H. Lawrence, and James Frazer in his, *The Golden Bough*) and artists (especially Picasso and Paul Gauguin) celebrate, in a sense, grotesquely liberated “primitive man.” These primitives exist grotesquely free from the upper world, “civilized” reality responsible for “the horrors” of WWI. Clive Bell echoes Machen, but adds that “primitive man” possesses the ability to see beyond the extreme rationality ardently professed by the upper world reality. Bell’s primitives, that is, look with a type of innocent eye, or with the eyesight of the grotesquely liberated (consult Bell’s *Art*, pg. 81, and the conclusion to this study, which picks up on the grotesque’s curative, “new eyesight” powers). War-poets such as Siegfried Sassoon and Wilfred Owen, in line with the ideas above, describe the war-time disillusionment with the Industrial Age upper world. Sassoon writes about the gruesome dismemberment of soldiers that results from efficient Industrial Age technology in “They” (1916), while

Owen reveals “The old Lie” (1387, 27) of the Industrial Age’s unflinching, Realistic belief in upper world reason and rationality in “Dulce Et Decorum Est” (1917-1918). Martin Heidegger calls this anti-Schlegelian grotesque condition that Sassoon and Owen describe, and that develops from the High Modern loss of the Industrial Age reality, “betweenness” (“Holderlin” 289). High Modernism, that is, exists in the Heideggerean “betweenness” of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation, or exists in the grotesquely liberating space “between” the lost Industrial Age reality, and this reality’s attempt to reassert its legitimacy after WWI. Anti-Schlegelian High Modern writers, like those discussed in Part IV, must therefore preserve their “betweenness” in order to sustain High Modernism’s ideal conditions for the flourishing of grotesque anti-Schlegelianism.

III. Jacques Lacan and the Grotesque System of Liberation

The anti-Schlegelian history of the grotesque culminates with Jacques Lacan. He deserves such a prominent position because he systematizes the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, and in turn creates an ideal model for measuring the anti-Schlegelianism of the High Modernist environment discussed above. Lacan’s systematized grotesque therefore protects the grotesque liberation, and casts aside the fleeting emotions of the Schlegelian grotesque. Lacan succeeds in this task of further undermining the Schlegelian grotesque by largely following in Freud’s grotesque footsteps. In fact often dubbed the “French Freud,” Lacan applies Freud’s insights to a grotesque system of liberation. Lacan begins his grotesque system with an individual’s recognition of the upper world conscious illusion. This recognition stage of his grotesque system Lacan calls, “the Mirror Stage.” He explains the meaning and importance of this beginning stage of his grotesque system in his 1949 lecture, “The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed

in Psychoanalytic Experience.” During this lecture, Lacan describes the Mirror Stage in the following passage:

The *mirror stage* is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation – and which manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies that extends from a fragmented body-image... and, lastly, to the assumption of the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject’s entire mental development. (1288)

Lacan here associates the Mirror Stage, and therefore the first stage of his grotesque system, with infancy, or to that time when a child remains incapable of speech, and absolutely dependent upon the mother for nourishment. Wrapped up and warmly coddled, the infant inhabits the ordered, stable world of perfect upper world consciousness. For the infant, its consciousness stands solid and undivided. It clings to and draws nourishment from the maternal source, unaware of another, removed reality. Julia Kristeva, in her work, *Desire in Language*, calls this state of perfect maternal comfort and nourishment the “semiotic.” It exists as “the first echolalias of infants as rhythms and intonations anterior to the first phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, and sentences” (133). In other words, the Kristevan “semiotic” exists before language divides individuals and objects into specific categories (such as “phonemes, morphemes, [and] lexemes”), or before the infant breaks away from the all-nourishing maternal bosom. According to Lacan, this stable infancy ceases, and the grotesque system moves towards sustained, individual liberation, when a child gazes into a mirror.

Seeing their reflected image, the infant breaks away from their complete upper world consciousness. Grotesque division in turn begins in light of this recognition of individuality, or of an existence increasingly removed from the all-nourishing maternal bosom. Virginia Woolf, in her 1933 work, *Flush*, narrates this loss of infancy through

her presentation of an infant's gradual dissociation from the eponymous dog, "Flush," with every word learned. This infant individual, that is, becomes grotesquely torn between the lost, upper world reality of absolute consciousness (represented by Flush), and the unconscious underworld unearthed by language giving voice to destabilizing urges and passions. Such a grotesquely divided individual in turn inhabits, as D.W. Winnicott explains, an "intermediate" space, or that space between the all-nourishing maternal source, and the underground reality (see *Playing and Reality*, pgs. 1-25). However, rather than embracing this Mirror Stage commencement of the grotesque system, the individual quickly retreats from the "intermediate" space of their grotesque division. Lacan remarks on an individual's yearning for lost upper world consciousness when he writes, in the passage above, "caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies... extends from a fragmented body-image." The rapidly dying infant, "caught up in the lure of spatial identification," or in the isolated individual image reflected in a mirror, creates "phantasies" to hide their grotesque, "fragmented body-image," torn between the upper and lower world realities. Lacan describes these "phantasies" that attempt to return an individual to absolute upper world consciousness when he writes of the "assumption of the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject's entire mental development." The post-Mirror Stage individual copes with their loss of absolute upper world consciousness by hiding the grotesque behind "the armour of an alienating identity." This "armour" therefore re-institutes lost upper world consciousness, and in turn temporarily halts the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system. Lacan calls this re-institution of upper world consciousness, "the Symbolic."

Such a name, “the Symbolic,” applies to the illusion of stable upper world consciousness because a symbol stands in for an object, but does not actually possess the object. A symbol, that is, points at what it represents, or only gestures at what it claims to present. So behaving, a symbol creates the illusion of fully possessing the object it describes, just as the Symbolic illusion claims to fully reinstate the upper world security lost during the Mirror Stage of the grotesque system. The real, actual object hides behind the symbol, like the temporarily halted anti-Schlegelian grotesque system. This understanding of a symbol proves significant because the Symbolic similarly hides the destabilizing underworld from the upper world illusion. In the Symbolic only stable consciousness appears to reign, or exists undisturbed by the irrational underworld unconscious. The danger of this Symbolic stage stems from an individual’s willingness to remain locked and trapped within the upper world illusion. Shun-Liang Chao remarks on this allure of Symbolic stability and security when he writes, “the grotesque (re)awakens our awareness of the chaotic nature of the *real* human condition, that which we always strive to overcome in the attempt to satisfy our constant desire for mastery (a unified ‘self’) (17). The individual, although awakened to “the chaotic nature” of the destabilizing grotesque underworld, nevertheless attempts “to overcome” this grotesquely liberating instability in order “to satisfy our constant desire for mastery (a unified ‘self’).” Therefore, in order to force the individual to renounce their illusory Symbolic security, the next stage of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system must commence. This stage kick starts the temporarily stalled grotesque system, or reveals “the chaotic nature of the *real* human condition,” and in turn pushes the individual towards their eventual anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. Lacan calls this stage, “the Real.”

Slavoj Žižek, a prominent Lacanian scholar, helps explain the Real stage of the grotesque system, and its interaction with the Symbolic, in his 1989 book, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. Žižek writes of the Real in the following passage:

The symbolic order is striving for a homeostatic balance, but there is in its kernel, at its very centre, some strange, traumatic element which cannot be symbolized, integrated into the symbolic order. (132)

The Symbolic stage of the grotesque system strives “for a homeostatic balance,” or for a pre-Mirror Stage state of perfectly stable and secure upper world consciousness. This stage achieves this “homeostatic balance” by, as discussed, forcing objects into easily controllable symbols. These Symbolic objects accept as stable their specific places in the seemingly secure upper world reality. However, as Žižek makes clear in the passage above, the Symbolic stage cannot permanently uphold its illusion of absolute stability. The Real grotesquely attacks the Symbolic illusion, and in turn breaks down the Symbolic’s grip on individuals that eventually culminates in their anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. So behaving, the Real becomes a “kernel, at its [a Symbolic’s] very centre, some strange, traumatic element which cannot be symbolized, integrated into the symbolic order.” Flannery O’Connor, in her work, “Some Aspects of the Grotesque in Southern Fiction,” applauds un-symbolizable, Real objects and individuals. She explains that these Real grotesque objects, by behaving as “some strange, traumatic element[s] which cannot be symbolized,” make “alive some experience which we are not accustomed to observe every day, or which the ordinary man may never experience in his ordinary life” (40). The Real grotesque underworld opens eyes. It allows individuals to encounter experiences “which the ordinary man may never experience in his ordinary life,” or to realize, as O’Connor writes, “that there are strange skips and gaps which

anyone trying to describe manners and customs would certainly not have left” (40).

O’Connor, later in her essay, in fact suggests that grotesque objects, or those Real objects that, in terms evocative of the Žižek passage above, behave as “strange skips and gaps,” live a truer existence. The Real, that is, because it “cannot be symbolized,” and incorporated into the Symbolic’s illusion of perfect stability, not only recommences the anti-Schlegelian grotesque battle for liberation, but also creates a truer, more “Real” existence. The grotesque conflict rages between the stabilizing Symbolic and the destabilizing Real, and individuals, caught up in this conflict, see the truth of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque.

Focus on the designation, “the Real,” aids in further clarifying the Real stage’s importance in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system, and, as discussed above, its ability to create a truer form of existence. The word, “the Real,” in fact self-defines when placed in relation to the Symbolic stage illusion. Such an illusion presents a fake reality, or one that displays the illusion of pre-Mirror Stage order and security. Behind this illusory façade, actual, real stability does not exist. The Real dwells within such a post-façade place, and therefore possesses, because of its status as “some strange, traumatic element which cannot be symbolized,” or, as O’Connor writes, its ability to reveal “experience[s] which we are not accustomed to observe every day,” a more “Real” reality. Individuals see beyond the Symbolic illusion of stability and security. In *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Žižek elaborates on this more “Real” reality, and explains how this “Real-ness” helps create the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation, in the following passage:

The Real is the fullness of the inert presence, positivity; nothing is lacking in the Real – that is, the lack is introduced only by the symbolization; it is a signifier which introduces a void, an absence in the Real. But at the same time the Real is in itself a hole, a gap, an opening in the middle of the symbolic order – it is the

lack around which the symbolic order is structured. The Real as a starting point, as a basis, is a positive fullness without lack. (170)

This long excerpt demands attention because it highlights the Real's pivotal place in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system. On one level, the Real, as discussed, recommences the grotesque conflict, and creates "a hole, a gap, an opening in the middle of the symbolic order." This understanding of the Real relates to Kristeva's notion of the *chora*, which she explains as introducing "wandering... into language" (*Desire* 136). The Kristevan *chora* "wanders" away from a Symbolic, and in turn leaves a Real "hole" and "gap... in the middle of the symbolic order." On another level, the Real, by grotesquely opening up this "hole" and "gap... in the middle of the symbolic order," establishes an unbridgeable "gap" that separates an individual from the lost comfort and security of complete, absolute Symbolic upper world consciousness. This "gap" in turn creates the suffering and grotesque division that sustains the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. The individual, to remain grotesquely free, must live in the "gap," and exist forever divided between the distant and lost comfort and security of the Symbolic illusion, and the inescapable destabilization of the Real. To prevent and protect the individual from renouncing the heavy burden of this grotesque liberation of permanent, destabilizing "between-ness," and falling back into the Schlegelian trap of perceiving the grotesque's shattering of the Symbolic illusion as terrifying, rather than liberating, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system must develop.

The Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system serves, as stated, the important function of helping sustain the grotesque liberation. The individual, that is, persists in the grotesque division that preserves their grotesque freedom, and in turn accepts destabilizing Realness over the false comfort of the

Symbolic illusion of perfect stability. The name, “Non-Symbolic Symbolic,” reveals this important function of the stage. This closing stage behaves “Non-Symbolically” by keeping the grotesquely liberated individual within the Real instability that grotesquely undermines Symbolic drives for renewed, but illusory, stability. Such “Non-Symbolic” behavior nevertheless takes place in a “Symbolic” style environment, since, as outlined, the pre-Mirror Stage of actual completeness and stability, once lost, can never be regained. A Symbolic, even one grotesquely undermined by the Real, and in this way becoming a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, remains alive and threatening to the grotesquely liberated individual. It offers the allure of comfort to the individual struggling to uphold their grotesque liberation. The grotesque battle must therefore permanently rage in the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Real elements of destabilization (specified in Part IV) must grotesquely overwhelm Symbolic elements of stability (also specified in Part IV) for the individual to maintain their grotesque liberation. The individual, caught up within this sustained grotesque conflict of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, searches out lost Symbolic stability in vain, or, it could be said, engages in a futile search for the comforting closure of the Symbolic space. The Symbolic illusion remains continually out of reach, and the individual, denied Symbolic comfort and closure, exists grotesquely free because grotesquely divided and torn between the permanently dueling realities that, since Fabullus’ underground murals, define the anti-Schlegelian grotesque.

The Non-Symbolic Symbolic also protects the grotesquely liberated individual from the Schlegelian amusement and terror that, as discussed in relation to Nero, control and bully the individual into a state of subjugation. Schlegelian terror and amusement,

and an individual's or a reality's ability to control and manipulate these emotions, keep people trapped, much like the Symbolic traps people in its illusion of stability. Such individuals cannot escape the Schlegelian grotesque's emotional roller coaster ride between amusement and terror that a power external to themselves controls for the sake of maintaining stability and order. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic safeguards these people from such a ride (or takes them off the ride) by supplanting Schlegelian grotesque emotionalism with the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. Individuals, in this stage of the grotesque system, remain grotesquely divided, and must endure this state, as a type of act of self-actualization. They brave anti-Schlegelian grotesque division, with the help of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, for themselves, or for their liberation from the tyrannical grasp of the Schlegelian grotesque, which uses emotional responses to, in a sense, terrorize individuals into submission. Anti-Schlegelian's, in contrast, repudiate the Schlegelian grotesque's terrifying roller coaster ride of emotional responses for the liberating, self-actualizing, Non-Symbolic Symbolic state of permanent grotesque division. Such a state, while hard to bear and uphold, therefore becomes associated with liberation, rather than with the terrifying emotional subjugation that marks the Schlegelian grotesque.

A Non-Symbolic Symbolic in this way answers what Heidegger calls the "challenging claim" (*The Question* 19) of Symbolic "standing-reserve" with an assertion of an individual's power to combat terrifying sources of external control with a self-sustained state of grotesque liberation. Upper world individuals, that is, break free from a Symbolic, or no longer stand-in-reserve as objects that possess value because of their ability to bolster permanent stability through their emotional, Schlegelian subjugation.

They reject their “orderability” and “readiness-for-use” (*The Question* 17-19) for the previously discussed Baudelaireian and Ruskinian freedom of a deeply personal grotesquely liberated existence. These individuals, it could be said, stand-for-themselves in the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, or exist free and liberated because of their determination to remain useless to the upper world Symbolic. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic therefore resembles Roland Barthes’ notion of “scriptible,” and even the idea of “defamiliarization,” or *ostranenie*, put forth by the Russian Formalists. Non-Symbolic Symbolic spaces grotesquely “defamiliarize” objects and individuals away from their Symbolic enslavement, or Heideggerean position of “standing-reserve,” in order to create the sustained grotesque liberation reminiscent of Barthes’ inexhaustible, “scriptible” (writerly) text. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic, though, upholds a grotesque liberation defined by individual determination and grit, whereas Barthes associates pleasure (“jouissance”) with the inexhaustibility of the “scriptible” text (consult Barthes’ *S/Z* for more information on a “scriptible” text, and its Non-Symbolic Symbolic similarities and differences). This “scriptible”-like Non-Symbolic Symbolic ultimately preserves the grotesque liberation that serves as the dividing line between the Schlegelian and anti-Schlegelian traditions. As discussed, the Schlegelian grotesque suppresses the liberating power of the grotesque in favor of using the emotions of terror and amusement as external, terrifying agents of control and subjugation. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque replaces Schlegelian external terror with an internal, individually-sustained state of liberation. The grotesque frees, and individuals, aided and compelled by the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, maintain their liberation in order to repel the terror of being

controlled and subjugated by the Schlegelian grotesque's manipulation of emotional responses.

IV. Establishing the Anti-Schlegelian Grotesqueness of T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley

If, as outlined, the Lacanian-derived system that progresses from Symbolic, to Real, to Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages best displays the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system, then a specific text that fits within this system can be called grotesquely anti-Schlegelian. That is, a text that moves from a Symbolic stage of illusory stability, to a Real stage of instability, to a Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of sustained liberation from a Symbolic source can be called an example of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. 3 authors that construct such an anti-Schlegelian grotesque text include T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley. While each of these authors creates a unique anti-Schlegelian grotesque text, and reveals the presence of each stage of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system through unique textual markers, they all abide by the governing rule of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition. Their texts showcase the grotesque as a liberating force, rather than a Schlegelian arouser of fleeting emotions. T.S. Eliot, in his text, *The Waste Land*, shows the temporal anti-Schlegelian grotesque at work, while D.H. Lawrence, in his poem, "The Ship of Death," displays the contradictory anti-Schlegelian grotesque at work. Finally, Aldous Huxley's novel, *Brave New World* highlights the scientific adaptation of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation.

The first chapter traces T.S. Eliot's temporal anti-Schlegelian grotesque system through his 1922 poem, *The Waste Land*. Eliot's temporal adaptation of the grotesque system involves his construction of Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages

according to the relationship between time present and time past. In addition to *The Waste Land*, Eliot's *Sacred Wood* essays, especially "Tradition and the Individual Talent," and his indebtedness to the philosophical ideas of F.H. Bradley and Henri Bergson, help elucidate his temporal anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness. The first chapter therefore reserves space for these writings and philosophers. Eliot ultimately creates a present time Symbolic, or a Symbolic that ensures the illusion of perfect stability and security by trapping time in the present. Within the poem, Eliot presents this present time Symbolic in Part I, "The Burial of the Dead," and in Part II, "A Game of Chess." Real past time therefore becomes the grotesque enemy of the present time Symbolic. It grotesquely surges against and batters down the present time Symbolic illusion, and ultimately instills grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Eliot's present time Symbolic, because of its grotesque conflict with Real past time, pulses with temporal flux, or with time present continually intermingling with time past. Part III, "The Fire Sermon" houses the poem's first appearance of this grotesquely liberating temporal flux, while Part IV, "Death by Water," marks temporal flux's peak. Eliot's temporal grotesque conflict in turn creates a temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic. This Non-Symbolic Symbolic, which, as discussed, ensures the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation, uses temporal flux to preserve the grotesque liberation. Real past time grotesquely undermines and subverts the present time Symbolic illusion, and the individual, caught up within this temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic, must remain grotesquely free in their division between time present and time past. Part IV, "What the Thunder Said," presents this temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, especially the closing stanza of the poem. In *The Waste Land*, Eliot

employs a series of specific textual markers that reveal the presence of his temporal anti-Schlegelian grotesque system.

Eliot's textual markers all revolve around Symbolic attempts to maintain present time stability, and Real past time's grotesque destabilization of the Symbolic illusion with temporal flux. Therefore, issues relating to setting, characterization, progressive mobility, allusion, anti-allusion, symbolism, anti-symbolism, and metamorphosis must be understood according to temporal Symbolic stability and Real instability. While Chapter 1 elaborates in greater depth on these textual markers, a brief discussion here shows that Eliot's *Waste Land* settings, for example, possess Symbolic and Real characteristics. Present time Symbolic settings display either bleak, barren environments, or, conversely, numbing, intoxicating spaces that help keep characters trapped in present time. Eliot's Real settings in turn showcase growth and rejuvenation that mirror the temporal rejuvenation brought on by grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Eliot also employs issues of character, progressive mobility, allusion, and symbolism. Symbolic characters, trapped in present time settings, remain docile and submissive, and in turn exhibit negative progressive mobility. They actively resist progressing beyond the comforting closure of the present time Symbolic. To help preserve this Symbolic, these characters suppress allusion (anti-allusion), which connects to Symbolically destabilizing temporal flux, and support symbols representative of the present time Symbolic's illusion of permanent stability and security. Conversely, Eliot's Real characters exude ungovernable passions, and rebel against the present time Symbolic with their positive progressive mobility. They depart and move away from Symbolic sources, and use allusions, which connect to temporal flux, and symbols (anti-symbols) representative of Real temporal

flux as grotesque weapons that help batter down the present time Symbolic. Eliot's occasional use of montage, especially in the closing stanzas of "The Fire Sermon" and "What the Thunder Said," as a device for arranging Real allusions adds to the grotesque dissolution of the present time Symbolic. Eliot also uses Real metamorphosis in *The Waste Land*, which involves Real characters or anti-symbols that metamorphose beyond Symbolic control. These Real textual markers ultimately overwhelm the Symbolic textual markers in Eliot's Non-Symbolic Symbolic closing stanza to *The Waste Land*. In this stanza, Real markers appear more often than Symbolic markers, and in turn preserve the temporal grotesque liberation that ensures Eliot's anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness.

The second chapter focuses on D.H. Lawrence's contradiction-based adaptation of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation. This adaptation uses contradiction, especially Lawrence's contradiction of incomplete-completeness, to construct the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages of the grotesque system. Lawrence's Symbolic stage therefore sustains the illusion of deliberately anti-contradictory existence, or of an existence perfectly secure, complete, and whole. The Real stage in turn grotesquely battles against this anti-contradictory Symbolic with the contradiction that existence in fact proves most complete and whole when incomplete and broken. Individuals live in contradiction, incomplete but grotesquely free from false Symbolic sources of anti-contradictory completeness. In his novel, *Women in Love*, Lawrence writes about this grotesquely liberating incomplete-completeness when he remarks, "You have to be like Rodin, Michael Angelo, and leave a piece of raw rock unfinished to your figure. You must leave your surroundings sketchy, unfinished, so that you are never contained, never confined, never dominated from outside" (356-57). For Lawrence, art

and individuals exist most complete (and “never contained, never confined, [and] never dominated from outside”) when incomplete, or like “a piece of raw rock unfinished.” Lawrence’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic therefore preserves this grotesquely liberated “raw rock” created by the Real contradiction of incomplete-completeness. The “raw rock,” or grotesquely liberated individual, remains free from Symbolic confinement and containment. This freedom of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic in turn secures Lawrence’s position as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer, since he emphasizes the grotesque as a liberating power, rather than a Schlegelian arouser of fleeting emotions. While this second chapter uses a variety of Lawrence texts (such as his many novels, essays, and poems) to highlight his contradictory, anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, his poem, “The Ship of Death” serves as the main source under analysis. Over half of the chapter walks through this long poem in order to trace Lawrence’s anti-Schlegelian grotesque system discussed above.

Like Eliot, Lawrence employs a variety of textual markers to indicate the presence of the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages of his grotesque system. Lawrence’s specific markers include issues of setting, character, progressive mobility, relative spatiality, symbolism, *vers libre*, second person voice, and metonymy. The Symbolic and Real characteristics of setting, character, symbolism, and progressive mobility largely follow the explanations already discussed in the Eliot paragraph above. Refer, then, back to this paragraph, and also to chapter 2, for Lawrence’s use of setting, symbolism, progressive mobility, and character. Attention here will instead be paid to Lawrence’s unique textual use of relative spatiality, *vers libre*, second person voice, and metonymy. Relative spatiality refers to the increase or decrease in grotesque freedom

relative to an individual's distance from an anti-contradictory Symbolic center. Grotesque freedom from anti-contradiction increases as an individual voyages away from a Symbolic, and decreases as the individual moves closer to a Symbolic source. This marker proves relevant to Lawrence because his eponymous "Ship of Death" literally voyages away from an anti-contradictory Symbolic as the poem proceeds. By so doing, his "Ship" reveals relative spatiality. Lawrence also helps grotesquely disrupt the anti-contradictory Symbolic by using vers libre, second person voice, and metonymy. These three markers break down the Symbolic to reveal Lawrence's grotesquely liberating contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Vers libre, or "free verse," literally frees verse from the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion of completeness by breaking Lawrence's poem into rhythmically and metrically broken stanzas, or stanzas broken free from predictable rhymes and meters. Lawrence's use of second person voice also grotesquely breaks down the supposedly all-complete Symbolic voice because it inserts an uncontrollable element, the outside, "you" reader, into the text. Finally, metonymic parts reveal the piecemeal nature of Symbolic wholes. That is, the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion crumbles into incomplete, Real metonymic parts. These various textual markers, as in the Eliot paragraph above, ultimately coalesce in Lawrence's Non-Symbolic Symbolic, which appears in the closing parts of "The Ship of Death." In these parts, various Real markers, especially vers libre, second person voice, and relative spatiality, overwhelm the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion. As a result of this Real inundation of the Symbolic, the grotesque liberation into the contradiction of incomplete-completeness remains secure, and Lawrence sustains his position as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer.

The third chapter analyzes Aldous Huxley's scientific adaptation of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation in his 1932 novel, *Brave New World*. Huxley's adaptation involves his use of science as a Symbolic stabilizer. That is, scientific advancements, such as genetic engineering, social conditioning, and the development of easily accessible, numbing drugs, stabilize and secure the Symbolic illusion. Dorothy Richardson, in the second volume, *The Tunnel* (1919) of her *Pilgrimage* series of novels, discusses this use of science as a stabilizer when she writes, "science was the only enlightenment, science would put everything right; scientific imagination, scientific invention... chaos was decreasing, order increasing" (122). As discussed in the third chapter, Huxley, in his Preface to *Brave New World*, calls this ability of science to "put everything right" the "really revolutionary revolution." Chaos decreases and order increases to such an extent that destabilizing revolution becomes impossible. Science creates a Symbolic of absolute order and stability. Huxley's Real forces that grotesquely subvert this scientific Symbolic therefore proclaim deliberately anti-scientific and anti-rational stances. These Real forces act on ungovernable passions and impulses. In *Brave New World*, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic that results from this grotesque conflict preserves an ascetic liberation from the scientific Symbolic. John, the grotesquely liberated individual in Huxley's novel, deliberately deprives his body in order to suffer and feel deeply. This commitment to pain, and other impulsive, irrational acts, such as his suicide, ultimately secure John's grotesque liberation from the numbing, scientific Symbolic. He remains grotesquely free, and in turn an example of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation at work.

As with Eliot and Lawrence, Huxley employs a series of textual markers that reveal the presence of his Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages. These markers include issues relating to character, relative spatiality, setting, progressive mobility, and symbolism already discussed above. Refer to the Eliot and Lawrence paragraphs, or chapter 3, for information on these markers. Huxley's new textual markers of monologic voice, ineffableness, polysemous anti-symbolism, and repetition will instead be briefly introduced. Monologic voice, the first of these markers, specifically applies to the scientific Symbolic. This single, governing voice in fact serves as a social control mechanism. It calmly proclaims the virtues of continued scientific Symbolic stability to the blindly accepting masses of the Brave New World. Such a Symbolic monologic voice also employs repetition to further bolster the Symbolic illusion. The governing monologic voice in a sense endlessly repeats certain proscribed phrases that speak towards the virtues of permanent Symbolic stability. If repeated enough, these phrases further condition Brave New World subjects to remain loyal to the scientific Symbolic. Real ineffableness and polysemous anti-symbolism grotesquely oppose these Symbolic textual markers. Rather than the Symbolic monologic voice calmly and rationally supporting the scientific Symbolic, Real ineffableness uses deliberately non-rational language that slips past the understanding of the Brave New World. Characters, such as John, speak about scientifically ineffable topics, such as poetry, the passions, and the value of an individual's freedom from the scientific Symbolic. Real polysemous anti-symbolism also grotesquely undermines the Brave New World Symbolic because of its anti-symbolic symbols that symbolize many signs of grotesque, anti-scientific freedom. That is, these many signs of Real destabilization grotesquely subvert the Symbolic's

scientific codifying and cataloguing of reality into a single, easily controllable symbol. Huxley's Non-Symbolic Symbolic ultimately maintains the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation created by the grotesque conflict between the scientific Symbolic and anti-scientific Real through the textual dominance of the Real markers over the Symbolic markers. The Real markers grotesquely overwhelm the Symbolic markers, and, in turn, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation remains secure.

The chapters on Eliot, Lawrence, and Huxley attempt to not only exemplify the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation in modern texts, but to also highlight the enduring presence of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque throughout the centuries. These 3 modern authors, that is, writing in the 1920s, and, for Huxley, the early years of the 1930s, connect, because of their grotesqueness, to Fabullus' 1st century CE paintings in the subterranean gloom of Nero's *Domus Aurea*. These authors join Fabullus, and the other writers and critics discussed above, in the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition. In fact, due to the illusion-based liberation assigned to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, this tradition could reach back to the Greek world. Plato's famous "Allegory of the Cave" in his *Republic* of circa 380 BCE, with its presentation of illusion-enslaved individuals content to stare at shadows on a cave wall, possesses anti-Schlegelian grotesque qualities. The sun of this allegory, which only those individuals that break free from their enslavement to illusions can behold, begs comparison to the grotesque liberation. However, while Eliot, Lawrence, and Huxley exist within this long critical history of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which, as suggested, potentially reaches back to the Greek world, their placement within this tradition does not mean that the grotesque absolutely defines them. Like the modern environment they inhabited, with its diverse concerns, its

multi-faceted structural and thematic experimentations, and, as discussed, its liberating “betweenness,” these authors represent anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, but are not confined and pigeon-holed by it. In fact, if the anti-Schlegelian grotesque revolves around the liberation of individuals and objects from precise Symbolic cataloguing, than Eliot, Lawrence, and Huxley must necessarily slip away from their anti-Schlegelian grotesque designation (consult the conclusion for further insight into the anti-Schlegelian grotesque’s inherent resistance to definition). These authors must resist the anti-Schlegelian grotesque label in order to freely enter into the long history of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition.

Chapter 1

“These Fragments I Have Shored Against My Ruins:” T.S. Eliot’s Temporal Grotesque

System of Liberation in *The Waste Land*

I sat upon the shore
Fishing, with the arid plain behind me
Shall I at least set my lands in order?
- *The Waste Land*, lines 234-236

A recurring critical refrain associated with T.S. Eliot’s monumental 1922 poem, *The Waste Land* speaks towards the work’s seemingly explosive power. Writers describe the poem with words that paint the piece as a type of vitally destructive bomb that rips apart and decimates faith in an ordered and rational reality. For example, the poet, William Carlos Williams voices such a sentiment when he writes that *The Waste Land*, “wiped out our world as if an atom bomb had been dropped upon it” (174). Eliot’s poetic “atom bomb” wiped out a world held down by its belief in the virtues of rationality and unimpeded progress. Using reason as a guide, humankind must inevitably advance by creating a rational, ordered, and easily comprehensible world. *The Waste Land*, though, as Williams apocalyptically describes, shatters this governing, seemingly infallible world view. The poem’s radical, broken form, its arcane allusions, and its overall bleak view of the world “wiped out” humankind’s unshakable faith in the virtues of progress and rationality. In Eliot’s hands, that is, poetry and the world, rather than readily understandable, and always rational and ordered, become fragmented and obscure. Mary Karr comments on the anti-rational forces at work within Eliot’s poem when she writes that the piece serves as a “gold standard for difficulty in modern poetry, the measured point on the this-is-hard chart” (iv). Eliot’s poetic “atom bomb” goes off, and the new,

difficult world of modern poetry forces humankind into the wreckage of the reality once unquestionably governed by rationality, reason, and progress, and, by extension, comfort and ease. *The Waste Land's* difficulty, that is, makes difficult a reality accustomed to the comforts and luxuries made possible by the Industrial Age. It destroys ease as part of its atomic destructiveness Williams remarks on above. Such atomic destructiveness associated with Eliot's poem becomes more nuanced when understood according to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation outlined within the introduction. With this grotesque system in mind, Eliot's "atom bomb," it could be said, saves and liberates humankind because it helps destroy humankind, or at least the grotesque upper world reality ruled by reason and rationality.

As discussed in the introduction, the grotesque system must remain inextricably bound to liberation because such an understanding of the grotesque as a force of liberation separates it from the Schlegelian grotesque writers. These writers, the disciples of Friedrich Schlegel's conception of the grotesque, insist upon making the grotesque a mere arouser of fleeting emotions. The grotesque momentarily incites laughter and terror. Eliot, as hinted at above, aids in reversing this Schlegelian misconception of the grotesque due to the atomic-like devastation created by his poem. *The Waste Land* devastates the world driven by rationality, but in turn liberates individuals from such a reality. The poem's destructiveness liberates. Karr also speaks towards this liberating destructiveness of Eliot's poem when she writes, "I read it to hear a noise that tells me about certain states of mind so horrible I live much of my life trying to deny their existence though they swarm at the periphery of my eyes during late-night startles" (xii). Eliot's bomb blast jolts Karr awake, forcing her to acknowledge a world she normally

shuns and hides from because of the “horribleness” of this world. Karr, it could be said, awakens to the horrors created by an absolute faith in rationality and progress. Rather than inevitably making the world a better place, reason can cause unprecedented acts of savagery, such as the blood baths of World War I battles. Rationality can kill, and lead humankind back to barbarity. Eliot’s poem therefore acts as an anti-Schlegelian force of liberation. It frees individuals from the horrors of absolute reason and rationality. So behaving, *The Waste Land* allows Eliot to be understood as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque, since, as Karr helps reveal, he uses his poem as a force for liberation.

While Eliot in this way can be viewed as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer, he also adapts the grotesque system of liberation to temporal considerations. That is, Eliot temporally frees individuals by applying notions of time to the grotesque system. He makes the beginning Symbolic stage temporal by insisting that individuals remain permanently stable and secure within the illusion of an eternal present. Consequently, the Real stage that follows this eternally present Symbolic illusion dwells within what could be called, the temporal flux spectrum. Time present, rather than isolated within the Symbolic illusion, unites with time past, and creates, as Jean-Michel Rabaté writes, “an organic unity of literature” (210). Past time pulses through time present, generating, as Rabaté suggests, an enlivening, “organic” literature of temporal flux. With the Real stage in this way grotesquely destabilizing Symbolic present time with time past, the individual, caught up within this temporal grotesque battle, ultimately emerges into the so-called “Real,” true grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space. Within this final stage of the grotesque system, an individual remains temporally torn and divided between time present and time past, but, because of such temporal flux,

grotesquely free and liberated from the tyranny of the Symbolic illusion's eternally present time. Eliot describes this grotesquely liberated individual of the temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic in his 1924, "Introduction to Charlotte Eliot." In this work, Eliot writes in the following passage:

no interpretation of a rite could explain its origin. For the meaning of the series of acts is to the performers themselves an interpretation; the same ritual remaining practically unchanged may assume different meanings for different generations of performers. (VIII)

The Non-Symbolic Symbolic individual, as the passage above reveals, enters into a grotesquely liberated space where the Symbolic single interpretation, or meaning derived from a fixed, stable present time moment, no longer matters. Grotesquely liberating temporal flux undercuts such Symbolic present time stability, and the Non-Symbolic Symbolic individual in turn remains surrounded by trans-temporal interpretations. These diverse interpretations create "different meanings for different generations" that keep temporal flux alive. It pulses across the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, reaching across time to the "different generations" that produce the "different meanings" that grotesquely undermine the single present time Symbolic moment. In order to reveal the presence of Eliot's temporal grotesque system at work within *The Waste Land*, a series of textual markers, specific to the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic environments remarked on above, must be outlined.

Beginning with the present time Symbolic, textual markers for this first stage of the grotesque system include issues of characterization, setting, progressive mobility, anti-allusiveness, symbolism, and metamorphosis. Symbolic characterization involves characters that exhibit extreme docility, or a determination to remain within the security of the present time Symbolic illusion. These characters consequently possess negative

progressive mobility. They stay put, or refuse to actively progress beyond the comforting confines of the present time Symbolic. Such negatively mobile Symbolic characters remain passive and docile within Symbolic settings. These spaces present two possible environments. The first Symbolic setting mirrors the willing enslavement of Symbolic characters to the eternal present, and so displays a bleak, desolate, and barren environment. The title character of Eliot's poem, "Gerontion" represents a negatively mobile Symbolic character trapped within such a barren Symbolic setting. Eliot writes of Gerontion, "Here I am, an old man in a dry month, / Being read to by a boy, waiting for rain" (22, 1-2). Gerontion, as "an old man," sits immobile in a temporally parched, "dry month" Symbolic setting. In addition to Gerontion's "dry month," a Symbolic setting also presents overly pleasurable, numbing surroundings that mirror the docility and passive numbness of Symbolic characters. These Symbolic settings in turn inform Symbolic anti-allusiveness and metamorphosis. Symbolic characters, trapped within numbing or bleak Symbolic settings, cannot change form, or metamorphose beyond their human form. Like their enslavement to the present time Symbolic, these characters are trapped within an immutable form for the sake of uninterrupted Symbolic stability. Symbolic anti-allusiveness also helps ensure this Symbolic stability because the suppression of past time allusions keeps Symbolic characters focused on time present. Symbolic symbols stand as the final textual marker for Eliot's present time Symbolic, and involve symbols that symbolize such a Symbolic. These symbols therefore include objects that represent the temporally enslaved status of Symbolic characters within present time, Symbolic settings.

In addition to the textual markers for the present time Symbolic, a series of markers reveal the presence of Real temporal flux. These markers include issues

involving characterization, anti-symbolism, allusiveness, progressive mobility, setting, and metamorphosis. Starting with characterization, Real characters determinedly rebel against and purposefully cut down Symbolic claims to eternally present time. To succeed in their rebelliousness, Real characters use Real allusiveness and Real progressive mobility as weapons against the present time Symbolic. That is, Real characters rebel by using past time allusions, at times arranged in a jarring montage format, to grotesquely batter against the present time Symbolic, and positive progressive mobility to literally depart from Symbolic sources. This active mobility in turn upsets Symbolic permanent stability within time present. Real settings also help undermine present time Symbolic stability by presenting scenes of painful rebirth and rejuvenation that subvert Symbolic settings of numbness and barrenness. Real settings grow, and reattach to past time, like new roots digging deep into the soil. These Real settings of growth and rebirth in turn inform Real metamorphosis and Real anti-symbolism. Objects that grow within Real settings metamorphose beyond the trapped forms of the present time Symbolic. They change shape, and consequently undercut Symbolic permanent stability of forms within eternally present time. Finally, Real anti-symbolism involves symbols that resist symbolization, or incorporation and subjugation within the present time Symbolic. Such anti-symbols therefore represent objects that possess some or all of the Real markers discussed above. For example, the nightingale within *The Waste Land* serves as a Real anti-symbol because it represents both Real allusiveness and Real metamorphosis, and in turn helps grotesquely break down the present time Symbolic.

Following the Real temporal flux stage, the final, Non-Symbolic Symbolic phase of the grotesque system commences. The importance of this closing stage stems from its

ability to maintain the grotesque liberation by overwhelming Symbolic textual markers with Real textual markers. That is, the present time Symbolic remains grotesquely beaten down by Real temporal flux, and, because of this Real victory, individuals persist in their grotesque liberation from the Symbolic illusion. Eliot specifically presents *The Waste Land's* Non-Symbolic Symbolic within the closing stanza of the poem. In this stanza, Real textual markers overwhelm present time Symbolic attempts to lure the grotesquely liberated back into the stability and security of the Symbolic illusion. This Non-Symbolic Symbolic grotesque liberation resembles the temporal flux of Eliot's poem, *East Coker*. In the first part of this poem, Eliot writes, "In my beginning is my end. In succession / Houses rise and fall, crumble, are extended, / Are removed, destroyed, restored" (23, 1-3). The "beginning" and the "end" merge, or exist within grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Time past (the crumbling, falling houses) serves as the foundation for time present (the "restored" and "extended" houses). Similar to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, then, this succession of houses exists within temporal flux. In consequence, Eliot not only maintains the grotesque liberation, but also ensures his position as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque. He preserves the conception of the grotesque as a force of liberation, or as a force caught up within the continual building and re-building of Eliot's *East Coker* houses.

Before outlining the grotesque system within *The Waste Land*, Eliot's essay collection, *The Sacred Wood* helps further clarify his temporal grotesqueness. The title alone, "The Sacred Wood," in fact informs Eliot's grotesque liberation. Grotesquely liberated individuals, existing within the temporal flux of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, temporally redeem literature. They, in a sense, break literature away from its

entrapment within the present time Symbolic, and reconnect it to “The Sacred Wood” of temporal flux. This wood proves sacred because it upholds the sacredness of the grotesque liberation. Individuals and literature, previously forced to wallow within the present time Symbolic, regain their Real, true, and sacred position within temporal flux. As Eliot writes in his “Introduction” to *The Sacred Wood*, this sacred temporal flux ultimately allows grotesquely liberated individuals “to see the best work of our time and the best work of twenty-five hundred years ago with the same eyes” (62). This idea of, in a sense, “seeing” temporal flux in fact reveals Eliot’s connection to the philosophy of Henri Bergson. Bergson’s notion of *durée*, or of the temporal duration that undergirds reality, closely resembles Eliot’s temporal flux. Bergson describes *durée* when he writes, “It is our own person in its flowing through time, the self which endures” (*Creative* 162). *Durée* flows “through time,” just as Eliot’s grotesquely liberated individuals flux, or flow, between time present and past in order “to see the best work of our time and the best work of twenty-five hundred years ago with the same eyes.” It could be said, then, that Eliot’s grotesquely liberated temporally flux with Bergsonian *durée* (see also Bergson’s essay, *Laughter*, pages 160-166, and his 1889 work, *Time and Free Will*, for more information on *durée*). Therefore, when understood with Bergson’s ideas in mind, Eliot’s essay collection describes the various Symbolic forces that trap individuals and literature within time present, and which in turn prevent these people from seeing *durée*, or “the best work of our time and the best work of twenty-five hundred years ago with the same eyes,” while also outlining the Real forces that foster the grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, “Sacred Wood.” Eliot shows the path back to this “Sacred Wood” of the grotesque liberation specifically within the essay, “Tradition and the

Individual Talent.” The present time Symbolic Eliot discusses within his essay, “The Metaphysical Poets.”

“The Metaphysical Poets” suggests that the present time Symbolic results from what Eliot calls, the “dissociation of sensibility” (231). Eliot writes of this “dissociation” when he says, “In the seventeenth century a dissociation of sensibility set in, from which we have never really recovered” (231). While he especially blames the dual influences of Milton and Dryden for this “dissociation of sensibility,” Eliot nevertheless condemns all poets that sacrifice the intellect for the heart. These poets isolate literature within the emotive realm. Such “dissociation of sensibility” compares to the temporal dissociation between time present and past that informs Eliot’s grotesque system. That is, the present time Symbolic represents Eliot’s temporal dissociation, since it cuts time present from time past. This break in temporal flux in turn creates a substandard body of literature, “from which we have never really recovered.” Literature, just like Symbolic characters, wallows within the present time Symbolic environment, unable to reinvigorate literary creations with past time. Such a present time Symbolic state, it could be said, deliberately obscures and hides the Bergsonian *durée* remarked on above. The “flowing through time” of *durée* ceases, and the individual and literature exist only within the present time moment. However, while literature suffers from this temporal dissociation that fosters the development of a stifling present time Symbolic, Eliot believes salvation can still be achieved. Real temporal flux returns, or Bergsonian *durée* flows once again “through time,” and literature and Symbolic characters consequently free themselves from the present time Symbolic, due to “The Metaphysical Poets” of Eliot’s title.

Within his essay, Eliot explains the importance of “The Metaphysical Poets” within his temporal grotesque system in the passage that follows. Eliot writes that these “Metaphysical Poets” should:

... be interested in philosophy, or in any other subject. We can only say that it appears likely that poets in our civilization, as it exists at present, must be *difficult*. Our civilization comprehends great variety and complexity, and this variety and complexity, playing upon a refined sensibility, must produce various and complex results. The poet must become more and more comprehensive, more allusive, more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning. (232)

Eliot’s ideal “Metaphysical Poets” almost violently disrupt and break down the present time Symbolic illusion. They “force” and “dislocate if necessary” the Symbolic’s stability within time present to reconnect with Real temporal flux. They lash time present back to time past. These Real Metaphysical poets, as Eliot describes, especially employ Real allusiveness to accomplish this task. Eliot’s poem “must become more and more comprehensive, more allusive, [and] more indirect.” This comprehensiveness, allusiveness, and indirectness grotesquely breaks down the limiting present time boundaries of the temporal Symbolic. Present time becomes, as Eliot writes, more complex and varied, or opens up to time past. Literature and Symbolic characters in turn open up, free themselves from the present time Symbolic, and reconnect to Real temporal flux. As Eliot describes, though, this grotesque freedom from the present time Symbolic “must be *difficult*,” and literature and individuals must diligently sustain their grotesque liberation within temporal flux.

The grotesque liberation provided by Eliot’s “Metaphysical Poets” remains constantly threatened by the present time Symbolic of temporal dissociation. This Symbolic tempts individuals and literature to renounce the liberating intrusion of past

time into the present time Symbolic for the sake of stability. Temporal flux no longer disrupts, and creates an unstable environment torn between the present and past. To prevent this rejection of the grotesque liberation, or to refuse the “*difficult*” task of preserving temporal flux, individuals and literature must inhabit the Non-Symbolic Symbolic of Tradition. Within such a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, Tradition, or the past time literary tradition, continually intrudes into the present time Symbolic. Literature and individuals consequently remain grotesquely free. They use Tradition as a weapon against the present time Symbolic. However, like the “*difficult*” task of maintaining the grotesque liberation, Tradition itself must be diligently attended to for it to serve as a successful Real weapon. Antakyalioglu Zekiye writes of this difficulty of Tradition when he remarks that Tradition “cannot be inherited, it is obtained by great labor” (92). Real characters must undergo the “great labor” of learning the past time literary Tradition, and must then apply it to the present time Symbolic in order to sustain the grotesque liberation of temporal flux. This hard, devoted laboring for grotesquely liberating Tradition in fact helps explain Eliot’s resistance to contemporary forces that proclaim the necessary death and destruction of the past for the sake of humankind’s future.

Futurism serves as one such force openly hostile to past time Tradition. Futurists, led by the Italian, Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, condemn the past, and believe that all libraries and art should be destroyed. Such destruction paves the way for a future unfettered by the past, or for a future where people embrace, and strive to become, the loud, fast, and efficient machines that ride over past understandings of time and space. Eliot, it could be said, counters this destruction tied to Futurism with his own version of destruction, as pointed to by William Carlos Williams’ remarks regarding the “atom

bomb” quality of *The Waste Land* discussed above. Using past time and Tradition as weapons, Eliot fights off the forces, such as Marinetti’s Futurism, that prove hostile to his grotesque liberation of temporal flux. He fights destruction with destruction. The fact that Symbolic states, as outlined in the introduction, always pose a threat to the grotesquely liberated, even after a Symbolic’s grotesque undermining by Real forces, adds to and explains the significance of Eliot’s own violence and destruction. He destroys, or unleashes his poetic atom bomb, to keep at bay forces, like Futurism, that attempt to revive the values of the Industrial Age upper world reality, which push for permanent present time progress. Eliot takes such great pains to discredit and discontinue these values for the sake of aiding the “great labor” of a grotesquely liberated individual’s pursuit of past time Tradition. Eliot elaborates on the “great labor” of Tradition, and the necessity of preserving this Tradition from violent forces that foster the present time Symbolic, in another essay from *The Sacred Wood* entitled, “Tradition and the Individual Talent.”

If “The Metaphysical Poets” discusses the dissociation of time past from time present that creates the present time Symbolic, than “Tradition and the Individual Talent” describes how this break can be mended to ensure that temporal flux pulses through the present time Symbolic. This temporal flux in turn frees individuals and literature from the grasp of such a Symbolic, and allows them to return to “The Sacred Wood” of the temporal grotesque liberation. Eliot explains the grotesquely liberating influence of Tradition and temporal flux in the passage below:

The poet must be very conscious of the main current, which does not at all flow invariably through the most distinguished reputations. He must be quite aware of the obvious fact that art never improves, but that the material of art is never quite the same. He must be aware that the mind of Europe – the mind of his own

country – a mind which he learns in time to be much more important than his own private mind – is a mind which changes, and that this change is a development which abandons nothing *en route*. (102)

Eliot's poet serves as a Real character that uses Tradition, or "the mind of Europe," as a weapon against the present time Symbolic. This poet grotesquely beats down such a Symbolic bent upon stabilizing time within the eternal present with "a mind which changes, and that this change is a development which abandons nothing *en route*." Temporal flux "abandons nothing *en route*," or actively engages past time Tradition in its grotesque battle against the present time Symbolic in order to enter "The Sacred Wood" of the temporal grotesque liberation. Eliot's grotesquely liberating temporal flux in fact begs comparison to F.H. Bradley's notions concerning the systematic nature of Experience. This comparison proves further warranted because Eliot wrote his doctoral dissertation on Bradley, and, throughout his literary career, continually returned to Bradley's ideas. Briefly, these ideas reveal the intimate connection between Bradley's Experience and Eliot's Tradition of temporal flux. Bradley compares his Tradition-like Experience, that systematically fluxes like Eliot's temporal flux, to "a stream" that flows between the past, present, and future (see Bradley's *Principles of Logic*, 590-591). Bradleyan Experience, then, becomes much like Eliot's grotesquely liberating Tradition of temporal flux. Both insist on time present's connection to time past, or of a great "mind [or stream] of Europe" that "abandons nothing *en route*" (consult Brooker's cited article for a more detailed discussion of Eliot's indebtedness to Bradley). Eliot's progression from the present time Symbolic of "The Metaphysical Poets" to the Real grotesque liberation of "Tradition and the Individual Talent" also appears within *The Waste Land*, but on a much grander scale. In this poem, Eliot, following Bradley, truly

“abandons nothing *en route*,” and shows the entire temporal grotesque system at work, from the present time Symbolic of “The Burial of the Dead,” to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic of “What the Thunder Said.”

The epigraph to *The Waste Land* begins the poem’s overall path through the temporal grotesque system, and especially sets the groundwork for the present time Symbolic stage of this system detailed within the first two parts. For the epigraph, Eliot selects the following passage from the *Satyricon* of the 1st century CE Roman writer and statesman, Petronius Arbiter:

Nam Sibyllam quidem Cumis ego ipse oculis meis vidi in ampulla pendere, et cum illi pueri dicerent: Σύβυλλα τί θέλεις; respondebat illa: ἀποθανεῖν θέλω. (38)

Robert L. Schwarz, in his study, *Broken Images*, translates this epigraph in the following manner:

For, with my own eyes I saw the Cumean Sibyl suspended in a bottle, and when the boys asked her, “Sibyl, what do you want?” she replied, “I want to die.” (69)

For a poem dedicated to past time Tradition fueling an individual’s grotesque liberation into temporal flux, it proves especially fitting that Eliot begins by referencing a past time work. Already, that is, before the poem proper actually begins, Eliot, in the epigraph, attempts to rejoin the severed ties between the present time Symbolic, and Real past time Tradition. Eliot’s choice of the Cumean Sibyl for his epigraph also grounds *The Waste Land* in anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness because of the mythic history surrounding the Sibyl. Her appearance in Virgil’s *Aeneid* proves especially important in establishing this grotesqueness because Virgil relates her descent into the underground world of Hades with Aeneas. This underworld journey in turn connects to the myth of the golden bough, and, by extension, to James Frazer’s magnum opus, *The Golden Bough*, a work that

profoundly influenced Eliot, and other modern writers in the first decades of the twentieth century. The Sibyl tells Aeneas that, in order to enter the underground world of Hades, he must carry a golden bough. This bough therefore serves as a type of key that grants Aeneas entrance to the underworld, where he speaks with his dead father, Anchises, who foretells the future glory of Rome. The Sibyl's underworld journey with Aeneas in this way not only hearkens back to the grotesque underworld reality, which, as discussed in the introduction, serves as the grotesque counterweight to the exacting reason and rationality of the upper world, but also engages in temporal flux. Aeneas, with the Sibyl's help, sees across time, or engages with the grotesquely liberating temporal flux that defines Eliot's anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness.

Such a multi-faceted epigraph, with its associations with the grotesque underworld and Eliot's temporal grotesqueness, in turn explains Eliot's admiration for Frazer's *Golden Bough*, which also deeply layers myths with a diverse range of meanings and interpretations. Frazer, that is, like Eliot in his epigraph, becomes, as described above in "The Metaphysical Poets," "more and more comprehensive, more allusive, [and] more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning." Frazer, it could be said, forces his multi-layered myths of *The Golden Bough* into direct contact with Eliot, who indirectly appeals to them in his epigraph. Eliot's indirectness, made even more extreme by the un-translated Greek and Latin of the epigraph, which Harriet Davidson calls "intimidating" (121), then ultimately forces his poem into direct contact with past time Tradition and the grotesque underworld. An admittedly complex but important trans-temporal link therefore early exists in *The Waste Land*, and, because of its complex connections to Virgil's *Aeneid*, Frazer, and the history of the grotesque,

perhaps temporally “intimidates.” Eliot places his 1922-present time work alongside the past time Tradition stretching back to Petronius Arbiter in the 1st century CE, Virgil in the 1st century BCE, Fabullus’ underground reality of Nero’s Rome, and, at least closer to 1922, Frazer’s *Golden Bough* of the first decades of the twentieth century. Eliot in turn “intimidates” the reader with such a vast amount of time, and with such a vast amount of references to past time works. This temporal intimidation accounts for the fact that, while the epigraph establishes grotesquely liberating temporal flux within the poem, it also initiates the dissociation of time past from time present, and the subsequent development of the present time Symbolic. The complexity overwhelms, and, like the Sibyl, the intimidated reader escapes into the supposed safety of a present time Symbolic glass bottle.

The translated Greek and Latin of the epigraph, presented in the passage above, reveals the dissociation of time past from time present that Eliot’s epigraph initiates. The Cumean Sibyl, the first prophet-like figure of the poem, possesses, as discussed, the unique ability of foretelling time, or of extending time present into time future by referencing time past. In their study of *The Waste Land*, Jewel Brooker and Joseph Bentley suggest that the Sibyl’s position within temporal flux in fact gives her a “primitive mind” because, unlike the divided modern mind discussed in the introduction, her mind works “holistically” (34). The Sibyl, armed with her primitive, holistic mind, therefore exists as a Real character that grotesquely subverts the present time Symbolic, which remains divided from time past, by deeply embedding herself within the grotesquely liberating influences of temporal flux. And yet, despite the Sibyl’s connection to the past and future, the passage above reveals her wish to die. She wants to

be free from her Real role as a prophetess. She wants to renounce her position within temporal flux, and forsake her “primitive mind,” for the absolute a-temporality of death – time, at least for the Sibyl, who possesses immortality, but not eternal youth, stops in the grave. Brooker and Bentley remark on the Sibyl’s death wish when they write in the following passage:

She is still immortal and has memory and holds history in her imagination. But she has lost her mythic perspective and is imprisoned in a jar; like finite beings, she has been reduced to a single perspective and deprived of her ability to see systems and eras and situations from both inside and outside. (47)

The Sibyl, “imprisoned in a jar,” and “reduced to a single perspective and deprived of her ability to see systems and eras and situations,” or cut off from her position within temporal flux, helps create the present time Symbolic that Eliot outlines within the first two sections of his poem. In fact, it could be said that Eliot’s present time Symbolic represents the temporal after-effects of the Sibyl’s death. She breaks away from her prophetic connection to temporal flux, and, in consequence, people seeking the trans-temporal guidance of the Sibyl go un-helped. These people, in many ways, die alongside the Sibyl. Bereft of the Sibyl’s liberating position within temporal flux, these people wallow within the waste land of the present time Symbolic. They shrivel up in exile, much like the Sibyl in her bottle, cast out from the “Sacred Wood” of Eliot’s temporal grotesque liberation.

Understood in this way, or as creating the present time Symbolic, the epigraph sheds a nuanced light on Eliot’s title for the first part of his poem. “The Burial of the Dead” represents, on one level, the burial of Symbolic character devoid of grotesquely liberating temporal flux because of the Sibyl’s death. They inhabit the small, grave-like space of the present time Symbolic. On another level, “The Burial of the Dead”

represents the death and burial of Eliot's grotesquely liberated literature of Tradition and temporal flux. Without Real past time grotesquely confronting the present time Symbolic, literature remains disconnected from the temporal flux Eliot associates with ideal literary creations. Like the people bereft of the Sibyl, then, Eliot's ideal literature shrivels up and dies within the present time Symbolic. The largely hopeless, devastated Symbolic setting of *The Waste Land's* first part expands upon this present time Symbolic death introduced within the work's epigraph.

Eliot begins "The Burial of the Dead" with words that could be spoken by one of the countless Symbolic characters temporally dead and buried within the present time Symbolic. These opening words proclaim that:

April is the cruellest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain. (38, 1-4)

For Symbolic characters, "April is the cruellest month" because it brings temporal rebirth, or the promise of grotesquely liberating temporal flux, in a temporally devastated Symbolic landscape. Grotesquely liberating temporal flux emerges with April's new birth of life, but dies before it can free Symbolic characters from the present time Symbolic. Eliot, in his "Notes" that follow the poem, adds depth to this temporal cruelty of April in a Symbolic setting by referencing both Frazer's *The Golden Bough* and Jessie Weston's *From Ritual to Romance*. These works explain springtime rebirth as indicative of heroic trans-temporality. A hero, that is, engages in seasonal episodes of birth and death that cut across time, or that connect the individuals that revere these heroes to grotesquely liberating temporal flux. In return for their reverence, the hero lifts a curse from the land for their devout followers, and April brings forth new life. Eliot's present time Symbolic,

then, denies heroic trans-temporality, and keeps the curse of time past dissociated from time present on the land in order to maintain its illusion of absolute stability and security within present time. Past time Tradition must therefore be denied a foot-hold, or a place to grow and grotesquely disrupt the present time Symbolic illusion. The hero-less, cursed April land consequently breeds “Lilacs out of the dead land,” mixes “Memory and desire,” and stirs “Dull roots with spring rain” in vain. The “Lilacs,” born in “the dead land” of the poem’s barren Symbolic setting, seem destined to die. The enlivening combination of “Memory and desire,” which throws out a tenuous connection to past time memories, and the arousal of “Dull roots with spring rain” both inevitably wither and decay within the present time Symbolic dedicated to the burial of past time. These agents of growth and rejuvenation, especially the water (“rain”) that thrives in Real settings, seem to promise temporal rebirth, or the connection of time present to time past, only to die. In such an opening Symbolic environment, then, the cruelty Eliot associates with April fully emerges.

April teases and toys with Symbolic characters by presenting the hope of a new birth of temporal flux, or with the heroic lifting of a curse, within a temporally disconnected, “dead land.” Chris Ackerley also discusses this “cruelty” associated with April when he writes, “the season of spring, is ‘the cruellest month,’ because the quickening of new life is undesired” (26). More specifically, “new life is undesired” within the present time Symbolic because such rebirth threatens to temporally destabilize the Symbolic illusion. Symbolic characters, mirroring the rebirth of April, shed their positions within the present time Symbolic for the grotesquely liberating temporal flux between time present and time past. Such an outcome must be avoided to maintain

Symbolic stability, or April promises of rebirth must be stunted and killed within desolate, barren Symbolic settings. Eliot in fact reveals past time Tradition's disconnect from the present time Symbolic through his creative line breaks. The first three lines of the poem break between active, promissory words ("breeding," "mixing," and "stirring") and the rebirth created by these actions. "Breeding" creates the "Lilacs," "mixing" combines "Memory and desire," and "stirring" mixes together "Dull roots with spring rain." By separating the active words from their resulting creations, Eliot hints at the similar temporal disconnect between these promises of rebirth, and their actual fulfillment within the present time Symbolic. Just as the lines break, so, too, does the present time Symbolic break from April's promises of grotesquely liberating temporal flux. The sentence following these first four lines, and then Eliot's words within the second stanza, reveal more characteristics of the present time Symbolic.

In addition to its dashed promises of past time rebirth, the present time Symbolic thrives within the burial-like qualities of winter. Eliot explains the connection of winter to the present time Symbolic when he writes, "Winter kept us warm, covering / Earth in forgetful snow, feeding / A little life with dried tubers" (38, 5-7). Ironically, winter warms. Much like a blanket, it covers and hides Symbolic characters and "Earth in forgetful snow." The Symbolic's warming snows cover up past time Tradition. In consequence, Symbolic characters possess "A little life," or just enough life to maintain their existence within the present time Symbolic. The "dried tubers" serve as a fitting Symbolic symbol for these Symbolic characters condemned to "little [Symbolic] life." These "tubers," being dry and therefore brittle, cannot adequately perform their natural function of connecting the tuber plant with the soil to generate birth and growth. The

“tubers,” within such a “little life,” Symbolic setting, spawn deformed, stunted plants, more dead than fully alive. These plants remain disconnected from complete growth and life, much as the Symbolic characters of Eliot’s present time Symbolic exist dissociated from the grotesquely liberating influence of past time Tradition. Eliot’s continued use of the line break style found in the first four lines of the poem further cements this temporal relationship between the “dried tubers” and Symbolic characters. Both the tubers and Symbolic characters, that is, cannot connect to sources of growth and rebirth in much the same way that the lines break between active, promissory words, and their subsequent creations.

In the stanza following these introductory lines, Eliot continues describing the present time Symbolic’s disconnection from past time Tradition. The first six lines of this stanza read:

What are the roots that clutch, what branches grow
 Out of this stony rubbish? Son of man,
 You cannot say, or guess, for you know only
 A heap of broken images, where the sun beats,
 And the dead tree gives no shelter, the cricket no relief,
 And the dry stone no sound of water. Only
 There is shadow under this red rock,
 (Come in under the shadow of this red rock)... (38-39, 19-26)

In this passage, Eliot showcases, through the darker, more morbid imagery of a Symbolic setting, various aspects of the wintery, “little life” Symbolic discussed within the first stanza. The “dried tubers,” fed with “A little life” during the Symbolic winter, ultimately wither and die because their roots attempt the impossible. They seek growth out of “stony rubbish.” As discussed, this failure to growth and connect with the Earth Symbolically symbolizes the fate of Symbolic characters. These characters “cannot say, or guess, for you [they] know only / A heap of broken images.” Past time Tradition exists as a “A heap

of broken images,” or broken from the present time Symbolic. Eliot creatively reveals this temporal dissociation through his organization of the last four lines quoted above. These lines similarly shatter because of caesura-like internal divisions. Such fragmentation mirrors the “Son of man” of the poem’s present time Symbolic dissociated from past time Tradition. He cannot connect to his Biblical and Frazerian associations with timelessness and redeeming sacrifice. That is, Christ represents the Biblical “Son of man,” or that figure with the unique ability of combining timeless divinity with the time-bound mortal world. Christ, in a sense, embodies temporal connectivity. He serves as a type of temporal connector rod that joins the time-bound human world to the timeless divine. This temporal connectivity could in fact be regarded as the outcome of Christ’s sacrificial death. He dies in order to instill temporal connectivity, and, by so doing, saves individuals from the temporal waste land of the poem’s opening Symbolic setting. However, the “Son of man” cannot perform this temporal sacrifice. Eliot, in the passage above, explains that the “Son of man” rests “under this red rock.” The “red rock” provides shelter, but, like the defining temporal dissociation of the Symbolic landscape, the “Son of man” rests “under” the rock, or dissociated from direct contact with it. This “under” location of the “Son of man” proves important because Frazer associates the “red rock” with the rock of sacrifice, or the rock that catches the blood of the sacrificial lamb, such as from Christ, the so-called “Lamb of God.” In Eliot’s passage, though, the “Son of man” does not directly connect with the sacrificial “red rock.” He rests “under this red rock” when, to fulfill his function as the sacrifice that instills grotesquely liberating trans-temporality, he needs to rest on top of the rock, ready for his temporally redeeming sacrifice. The paltry, shabby shelter also provided by a “dead tree” helps further

emphasize the over-arching temporal dissociation and fragmentation of “The Burial of the Dead” that the “Son of man,” by remaining unable to perform his temporal sacrifice on the “red rock,” must endure in the present time Symbolic. The tree offers no protection from the temporal dryness and death of the present time Symbolic, and, like the flowers raised in cruel April, withers because it remains dissociated from temporal flux. Merely a brittle shell of its potential full growth and flowering if connected to past time Tradition, this tree shrivels up within a Symbolic setting “with no sound of water,” and with an impotent, sacrifice-deprived “Son of man.” Such a setting in fact evokes Eliot’s poem, “The Hollow Men,” where he writes, “This is the dead land / This is cactus land” (80, 40-41). The Symbolic setting of “The Burial of the Dead” remains similarly “dead,” or populated by “cactus” and “dead tree[s].” In both settings, that is, water does not exist. This life-giving element, infusing the tree and cactus with rejuvenating temporal flux, and nourishing “the dead land,” remains obsolete.

In addition to its presentation of the poem’s present time Symbolic, “The Burial of the Dead” merits further investigation because it introduces the first of many prophet-like figures within the work. By appearing in the epigraph, the Cumean Sibyl, technically the first such figure, exists outside of the poem proper. With the Sibyl therefore subtracted from the body of Eliot’s work, “Madame Sosostriis, famous clairvoyante” (39, 43) stands as the first seer of *The Waste Land*. Occupying such a position, Madame Sosostriis, much like the Cumean Sibyl, serves a vitally important function because she attempts to grotesquely batter down the present time Symbolic due to her position within Real temporal flux. In turn, Sosostriis could grotesquely liberate Symbolic characters from the present time Symbolic. Sosostriis’ potential to serve as a grotesque liberator

unfortunately withers away within the disjointed temporal environment of the present time Symbolic, and she becomes complicit in the enslavement of individuals to the Symbolic. She prognosticates, that is, for the perpetuation of the present time Symbolic, and therefore denies Symbolic characters the active, Real progressive mobility that pushes them away from the Symbolic in order to connect with grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Sosostris keeps Symbolic characters stuck in place, or mired within the present time Symbolic. Eliot reveals Sosostris' support for the present time Symbolic when he explains that she "had a bad cold" (39, 44). Sosostris' illness, or "bad cold," mirrors the temporally sick Symbolic of "The Burial of the Dead." Her health, like the "dead tree" discussed above, breaks down into illness, in much the same way that the present time Symbolic breaks from past time Tradition. It therefore follows that Sosostris' prophetic pronouncements, spewed out from her "bad cold," reiterate and reinforce the temporally broken and unhealthy present time Symbolic. Understood in this way, Sosostris' prophecies with her "wicked pack of cards" (39, 46) present sickly temporal visions, or visions of the present time Symbolic's absolute temporal disconnection from grotesquely liberating past time Tradition. The "wickedness" of Sosostris' "pack of cards" speaks towards this "wicked" dissociation of time present from time past that keeps Symbolic characters trapped in the present time Symbolic. These cards, it could be said, Symbolically symbolize Sosostris' sickly visions that support Symbolic stability within time present. Sosostris reveals this Symbolic symbolism of the cards when she pronounces, "Fear death by water" (39, 55). This warning benefits the present time Symbolic because the presence of water within the desiccated environment of "The Burial of the Dead" serves a temporally life-giving function. Such water, rather

than inflicting “death,” as Sosostriis implies, brings life to “the dead tree” that gives “no shelter,” and to the “dull roots” of the poem’s fourth line. Sosostriis’ card, then, symbolizes her support for the present time Symbolic. She condemns the temporally rejuvenating water that gives life to Symbolic characters by reconnecting them to past time Tradition. She must therefore make Symbolic characters “fear” water for the sake of denying the grotesque liberation that breaks apart the present time Symbolic illusion.

While “The Burial of the Dead” represents the poem’s present time Symbolic, the next part, “A Game of Chess,” showcases Real temporal flux beginning to grotesquely undermine the poem’s Symbolic illusion. In fact, attention to the title of this second part hints at its connection to the Real’s grotesque battle against the present time Symbolic. “A Game of Chess,” that is, suggests battling opponents. The game, involving two opposing sides, entails opponents thinking back to past moves and mistakes in order to claim victory. A chess champion, then, much like a healthy prophet, lashes time present to time past, or dwells within grotesquely liberating temporal flux. In addition to its temporal association, the title, “A Game of Chess,” also suggests an arbitrary sense of order and stability. The “Game,” with its established rules of conduct, imposes a type of upper world order on the unpredictability and uncertainty of human existence. Chess pieces must move in predictable ways, or obey imposed patterns of movement. This upper world-like dedication to order, though, ignores (or attempts to ignore for the sake of continued order) the arbitrariness of the chess game’s rules. Much like a Symbolic, the game presents the illusion that specific rules must be upheld for the permanent success of the game. A player wins, that is, only because they abide by the rules, and, by so doing, bolster the integrity of the rules in maintaining the game’s Symbolic, upper world of

order, predictability, and stability. This success, though, masks the fact that chess pieces could move according to different rules that, if accepted by the upper world Symbolic, could become the new rules of the game. Such arbitrariness reveals the source of Symbolic power that the chess champion, acting as a fighter for the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, must defeat in order to truly win the chess game. This anti-Schlegelian grotesque chess champion not only engages in the grotesquely liberating temporal flux remarked on above, but also reveals the Symbolic arbitrariness of the chess game. The game, for the anti-Schlegelian grotesque chess champion, becomes a game, or a Symbolic, upper world construct that upholds arbitrary rules for the sake of maintaining the illusion of order and stability. Beyond the title, which, as discussed, suggests a grotesque-like battle between opponents, and evokes a Symbolic environment governed by arbitrary rules, Eliot begins this second section of his poem with a description of the present time Symbolic forces within the grotesque “Game of Chess.”

In the opening lines of “A Game of Chess,” Eliot presents a claustrophobic Symbolic setting abounding in imagery of intoxication and numbness. This beginning passage reads as follows:

The Chair she sat in, like a burnished throne,
 Glowed on the marble, where the glass
 Held up by standards wrought with fruited vines
 From which a golden Cupidon peeped out
 (Another hid his eyes behind his wing)
 Doubled the flames of sevenbranched candelabra
 Reflecting light upon the table as
 The glitter of her jewels rose to meet it,
 From satin cases poured in rich profusion: (40, 78-86)

Sensual images invade the reader of these lines. Alluding to Cleopatra’s pleasure barge in Shakespeare’s *Anthony and Cleopatra*, “The Chair she sat in, like a burnished throne”

illuminates the eyes as it glows “on the marble.” Four lines later, this luminescence continues to spread when Eliot describes the especially bright, “Doubled” “flames of sevenbranched candelabra” that reflect “light upon the table.” The reflected light then merges with “The glitter of her jewels” to create the passage’s sensually explosive finale. The many sources of light (“The Chair,” “the flames of sevenbranched candelabra,” “The glitter of her jewels”) unleash the sensual vibrancy of the final line, “From satin cases poured in rich profusion.” The “satin cases” evoke touch, and then unite with hints of smell and taste when Eliot writes of these “cases poured in rich profusion.” This sensual envelopment numbs, or even overwhelms and buries the reader in relaxing imagery. Peter Weiss, in his explication of these lines, writes that such sensual envelopment creates objects that “become individually indistinguishable or wholly enmeshed” (46). Weiss also frequently refers to the “fusion” of these lines. This word, “fusion,” helps bring out the confinement of the passage. Sensual bombardment, it could be said, helps trap, or “fuse,” Symbolic characters to the present time Symbolic, thereby robbing them of the Real progressive mobility that actively removes them from this Symbolic setting. The fact that Eliot originally titled this second part of *The Waste Land*, “In the Cage,” also reinforces the confinement of the part remarked on above. The Symbolic characters “fuse” into “the Cage” of this part’s Symbolic setting. They cannot escape, much like the Sibyl of the epigraph, who remains trapped inside the cage of her bottle. Eliot creatively displays this sensual entrapment and caging within the present time Symbolic through his line structuring.

Within the passage above, Eliot consistently enjambes his lines. After the first line, which ends with a comma, Eliot commences a wild, almost maddening line structuring of

end-stops cast aside for the sake of lines fusing together. Only at the sensually explosive final line, “satin cases poured in rich profusion,” does this enjambment end with the appearance of a semicolon. However, even this punctuation choice continues the passage’s over-arching aura of entrapment. A semicolon, that is, does not serve a conclusive function. It acts, in many ways, as a joint that links dependent passages together. The presence of a semicolon, then, paints this final line as yet another link in a still unfolding Symbolic setting of sensual entrapment. It perpetuates far more than it concludes, and so joins together with the preceding, deeply enjambed lines in an entangled sensual mess evocative of the “fruited vines” that twist around the standards. Eliot solidifies this numbing sensual overload in the lines directly following the one’s quoted above. After the sensually explosive line, “From satin cases poured in rich profusion,” Eliot writes, “In vials of ivory and coloured glass / Unstoppered, lurked her strange synthetic perfumes, / Unguent, powdered, or liquid – troubled, confused / And drowned the sense in odors” (40-41, 87-90). These “strange synthetic perfumes” inundate and drown “the sense in odors.” They finish and uphold the sensual numbness that keeps Symbolic characters trapped in the present time Symbolic. So behaving, these “synthetic perfumes” resemble “the yellow fog” (“Love Song” 4, 15) of Eliot’s, “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock.” This “yellow fog,” like the “perfumes,” entraps and ensnares. It “Curled once about the house, and fell asleep” (4, 22). The “yellow fog” literally surrounds “the house,” and, as a fog, obscures and hides, or sprays out the “strange synthetic perfumes” that finalize the Symbolic’s first grotesque move against Real temporal flux within *The Waste Land*’s grotesque “Game of Chess.” The present time Symbolic in turn waits for the Real’s move.

Within “A Game of Chess,” Real past time commences its grotesque assault against the present time Symbolic in a quiet, subtle fashion. While Eliot does insert the *Anthony and Cleopatra* allusion into the passage above, this brief moment of connection between time present and past cannot hold due to the overwhelmingly sensual, Symbolic-sustaining lines that follow it. Real temporal flux in this way retreats from its first grotesque clash with the present time Symbolic. However, Real past time soon rallies for another grotesque confrontation at line 97, where Eliot introduces the myth of the nightingale. Eliot describes this myth in the following passage:

Above the antique mantel was displayed
As though a window gave upon the sylvan scene
The change of Philomel, by the barbarous king
So rudely forced; yet there the nightingale
Filled the desert with inviolable voice
And still she cried, and still the world pursues,
“Jug Jug” to dirty ears. (41, 97-103)

The myth of the nightingale proves important to Real past time because it brings together four Real textual markers. The nightingale serves as a Real anti-symbol because it subverts present time Symbolic stability due to its Real allusiveness, progressive mobility, and metamorphosis. By writing about “The change of Philomel,” Eliot alludes to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, the past time text he uses as the primary source for the nightingale myth. Therefore, this Real allusiveness reconnects time present to time past. Real progressive mobility and metamorphosis add to this Real temporal flux. The nightingale, as a bird, is actively mobile. It resists entrapment, and literally flies away from Symbolic attempts to cage it within present time. This Real progressive mobility of the nightingale relates to its Real metamorphosis. The nightingale stands as the end metamorphosis of Philomel, the rape victim of Tereus, “the barbarous king.” Philomel, it

could be said, metamorphoses, or changes form, to escape Tereus' attempt to silence her daily proclamations of his evil act. Tereus tries to contain Philomel within time present, a temporal space where his past act goes unremembered. However, Philomel metamorphoses beyond Tereus' present time Symbolic, and as the nightingale cries within Real temporal flux. She cries "Jug Jug" in order to keep alive her Real past time rape within the present time Symbolic. Eliot in fact similarly uses the mythic nightingale as a voice of time past within his poem, "Sweeney Among the Nightingales." In this piece, Sweeney becomes much like Tereus, and sexually works his way through a brothel. However, Sweeney's over-indulgence is not forgotten. Nightingales "singing near / The Convent of the Sacred Heart" (37, 35-36) proclaim Sweeney's actions. Like the nightingales of *The Waste Land*, that is, these nightingales unite time present with time past, or dwell within grotesquely liberating temporal flux.

With Philomel in this way established as a powerful Real force within the poem, Eliot dedicates the remainder of "A Game of Chess" to the present time Symbolic attempting to counter this grotesque charge by Real past time. He represents this growing grotesque conflict between the present time Symbolic and Real past time as a combative conversation where the phrase, "HURRY UP PLEASE ITS TIME" (42, 141) pops up five times. This repeated phrase points towards the status of the grotesque conflict within the poem. The present time Symbolic, by the end of "A Game of Chess," cannot adequately withstand the growing power of Real past time. In fact, the repetition of this phrase in many ways serves as a last ditch attempt to shore up Symbolic strength. Continually repeated, that is, the phrase uses repetition as a type of building block, where each repeated phrase adds another block to the grotesquely weakened present time

Symbolic fortress. The Symbolic illusion, though, buffeted by Real past time, still gradually crumbles, just as the poem itself begins to fragment, as displayed by the largely disjointed conversation. The topics discussed during this conversation, fragmented by the conversational cues of, for example, “she said,” and “I said,” also reveal the gradual crumbling of the present time Symbolic illusion. These topics, like the broken, disjointed lines, revolve around broken and fragmented objects and bodies, and include dental and pregnancy issues. Lil suffers from the emotional cruelty of her husband, Albert, who insists that Lil obtain both an abortion, and a new set of teeth. Albert wants Lil to “have them [her teeth] all out... and get a nice set” because he “can’t bear to look” at Lil (145-46). In addition to her decaying, and soon to be ripped out, teeth, Lil exists with a wasted body worn out by bearing five children. Another child she aborts with “them pills I took, to bring it off” (159). Although assured by “The chemist” that, after taking the pills, she “would be alright,” Lil admits, “I’ve never been the same” (161). Her body, rather than healthy and whole, and in this way symbolic of the absolute wholeness and completeness of the so-called “healthy” present time Symbolic, exists shattered by excessive pregnancies, an abortion, and the literal removal of her teeth. Lil physically breaks apart, just as the present time Symbolic, by the end of “A Game of Chess,” can no longer endure the anti-Schlegelian grotesque confrontation against Real past time, and similarly shatters and fragments. “ITS TIME,” then, at the conclusion of this section, for the grotesque battle to reach its climax, and for the already powerful Real forces to stage their decisive death blow against the present time Symbolic illusion.

If “A Game of Chess” ends with Real past time forces slowly overcoming the present time Symbolic fortress, than the next part, “The Fire Sermon,” presents the

grotesque battle moving towards its climax. Real past time and Symbolic present time grotesquely fight, blow-for-blow, for ultimate victory. This raging grotesque battle of “The Fire Sermon” begins with a great charge by Real past time forces. These Real forces, as displayed by the initial imagery of this part, and this section’s allusive title, fight with water, that most essential, but absent, element in a temporally desiccated present time Symbolic setting, in order to attain a state of temporal purification. Eliot’s title, “The Fire Sermon,” alludes to the Fire Sermon of the Buddha, who explains, to a thousand attentive priests, the danger, or raging fire, of false knowledge, specifically received through the senses. In light of the ongoing discussion of Eliot’s anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness in *The Waste Land*, this allusiveness proves important for several reasons. On one level, it grounds this entire part of the poem in Real allusiveness, since Eliot’s allusion also serves as his title. Such allusiveness not only draws attention to the growing dominance of Real past time throughout this section, but also adds to the strength of Real forces as they grotesquely battle against the false knowledge of the present time Symbolic that the Buddha bemoans in his sermon. That is, when understood according to Eliot’s temporal anti-Schlegelian grotesque system of liberation, the Buddha’s raging fires of false knowledge become the raging fires of false temporal knowledge upheld by the present time Symbolic. Both the Buddha’s fires and the Symbolic’s fires engulf individuals, and misguide and deceive them. In the case of the present time Symbolic, its fires deceive individuals with knowledge gleaned only from the present. To save these individuals from the false fires of the present time Symbolic, water must therefore be obtained. Not only does this element naturally extinguish fire, and in turn purify individuals from the Symbolic’s deceiving fires, but it also serves as a potent Real anti-

Symbol in the poem. It extinguishes the present time Symbolic fire, and, by so doing, symbolizes both its natural opposition to this false fire (or is literally anti-Symbolic), and the grotesquely liberating flux of water that courses between time present and time past. This Real anti-Symbolic water of grotesquely liberating temporal flux helps explain the abundance of this element in “The Fire Sermon,” where, as stated, Real forces reach their climax in their anti-Schlegelian grotesque assault against the present time Symbolic, and the fact that Eliot begins this section with a description of flowing water.

Eliot starts “The Fire Sermon” with the lines, “The river’s tent is broken: the last finger’s of leaf / Clutch and sink into the wet bank” (43, 174-175). Real anti-Symbolic water, flowing with past time, inundates and floods the temporal dryness of the Symbolic landscape trapped within the deadening illusion of eternally present time, or within the eternal present’s raging fire. “The river’s tent is broken,” or that tent-like structure, perhaps a dam, that bounds and presumably controls the flow of the river. “Broken,” such a structure unleashes the pent up water. This set-free, rushing Real water grotesquely crashes against the Symbolic illusion, flooding its present time landscape with time past, and extinguishing its deceiving fire. As “the last finger’s of leaf / [that] Clutch and sink into the wet bank” make clear, though, this Real temporal rejuvenation commences only once the present time Symbolic begins to break apart. “The last finger’s of leaf” remain alive, but, in a Symbolic setting dedicated to a death-in-life eternal present, these leaves are more directly associated with death and decay. They burn to ashes, in a sense, in the Symbolic fire. The unleashed Real water must therefore drown these “last finger’s of leaf,” or remnants of the present time Symbolic illusion. Eliot displays this grotesque inundation of the Symbolic by Real anti-Symbolic water, and the leaf’s impotence

against it, by the colon he inserts after “broken.” This punctuation mark serves as the textual equivalent of a ruptured dam. The dam breaks, opening up much like the separated dots of the colon, and the Real water rushes out, washing over “the last finger’s of leaf,” and surges towards its grotesque assault against the present time Symbolic, and its deceiving fires.

Within “The Fire Sermon,” Eliot presents the image of a person fishing and singing in the aftermath of this grotesque inundation of Real water across the temporally dead Symbolic landscape. This person, directly resembling the nightingale discussed above, serves as another Real character within the poem by singing an anti-Symbolic song of lament and past time suffering. Eliot describes this Real fisherman in the following passage:

Sweet Thames, run softly till I end my song,
 Sweet Thames, run softly, for I speak not loud or long.
 But at my back in a cold blast I hear
 The rattle of the bones, and chuckle spread from ear to ear.
 A rat crept softly through the vegetation
 Dragging its slimy belly on the bank
 While I was fishing in the dull canal
 On a winter evening round behind the gashouse
 Musing upon the king my brother’s wreck
 And on the king my father’s death before him. (44, 183-192)

Real past time surrounds this lone person “fishing in the dull canal.” Appropriately, then, the fisherman sings their song of the past to the “Sweet Thames,” or to a body of temporally rejuvenating Real water. The fact that the fisherman’s song also begins with an allusion adds to its power to rejuvenate. “Sweet Thames, run softly till I end my song” alludes to Edmund Spenser’s poem, “Prothalamion,” which serves as a song for a couple en route (going down the “Sweet Thames”) to their wedding. Real temporal flux between time present and time past therefore courses through the poem, just as the Thames flows

across the poetic landscape, and carries the lovers the fisherman alludes to in his song. This Real temporal flux represented by the “Sweet Thames” in turn highlights the grotesque’s function as a liberator. Real past time water grotesquely surges against, and ultimately destabilizes, the present time Symbolic illusion. This grotesque conflict liberates both individuals, such as the fisherman, and literature from their Symbolic wallowing within time present. They reconnect to temporal flux. However, while the grotesque in this way becomes a liberating force, and Eliot, by employing the grotesque as a liberator, cements his position as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer, the grotesque liberation exists in a fragile state. The present time Symbolic, although weakened by Real past time, still poses a threat. It could tempt grotesquely liberated characters, unstable, but free, due to temporal flux, to renounce their liberation for the secure, stable present time Symbolic illusion. The grotesque liberation must therefore be protected from Symbolic temptations. Eliot’s fisherman in the passage above represents such a grotesquely liberated character in need of protection from the still threatening present time Symbolic.

The lone fisherman displays this fragile state of the grotesque liberation by calling upon the Thames to continue breathing life into their past song. Such an appeal possesses great urgency, since the fisherman almost worries that the “Sweet Thames” flows by without sustaining the temporal flux of the grotesque liberation. The fisherman reveals this urgency through their wish for the Thames to “run softly till I end my song... run softly, for I speak not loud nor long.” Linger awhile, the person urges the Thames, to best ensure that Real past time continues to grotesquely undermine the present time Symbolic. The fisherman then discusses the negative consequences for the grotesque liberation if

this temporal flux ceases. The person sings to the Thames to keep at bay the “cold blast” of “The rattle of the bones, and chuckle spread from ear to ear.” The Symbolic winter of “The Burial of the Dead” re-freezes the “Sweet Thames,” and in turn locks temporal flux within time present. This Symbolic threat to the grotesque liberation lurks close behind the fisherman as the rat creeping “softly through the vegetation / Dragging its slimy belly on the bank.” Such a rat crawls towards the person “fishing in the dull canal,” ultimately desiring to suppress the fisherman’s “Musing” upon the past. Or, re-stated, the fisherman literally connects to the grotesquely liberating Thames of coursing temporal flux through the fishing-line cast into the water. The “slimy” rat slowly creeps forward to gnaw through and sever the connecting line, and consequently remove the fisherman from the grotesquely liberating Thames. The grotesque liberation, then, remains dangerously unprotected, and vulnerable to continued assaults by Symbolic forces that attempt to reinstitute the present time Symbolic. The remaining lines of “The Fire Sermon” display Real past time forces grotesquely pummeling down these still threatening Symbolic forces in order to sustain the grotesque liberation.

In the short stanza following the first, long stanza of “The Fire Sermon,” the Real myth of Philomel returns, and leads another grotesque charge against the present time Symbolic. Eliot writes of Philomel in the following bombardment of bird sounds: “Twit twit twit / Jug jug jug jug jug jug / So rudely forc’d. / Tereu” (44, 203-206). Philomel, the mythic nightingale, crashes against the Symbolic using her chirps of lament for her tragic past history. She wails of Real past time, much like the fisherman above sings to the “Sweet Thames.” This Real grotesque assault, which again injects past time into the present time Symbolic, reaches its climax with the appearance of Tiresias, the blind

Greek prophet. Tiresias, that is, delivers the grotesque death blow to the already wavering, gravely weakened Symbolic. He therefore serves as the most important Real character within the poem. Eliot himself speaks towards Tiresias' prominent place within the poem when he writes in his "Notes" to *The Waste Land*, "Tiresias, although a mere spectator and not indeed a 'character,' is yet the most important personage in the poem, uniting all the rest" (53). Tiresias, as a prophet, unites time present with time past, or exists within grotesquely liberating temporal flux. According to the myths surrounding him, Tiresias also unites in his single body both the female and male sexes. This hermaphroditic aspect of Tiresias further cements his overarching position as a unifier within the poem. Eliot describes Tiresias' embodiment of unification when he writes, "I Tiresias, though blind, throbbing between two lives, / Old man with wrinkled female breasts" (45, 218-219). Tiresias throbs between time present and time past, just as his physical body throbs between "two [sexual] lives." One specific event that Tiresias foresees due to his hermaphroditic position within temporal flux involves "The typist home at teatime" (45, 221) and "the young man carbuncular" (45, 231). This episode within the poem again evokes the Real myth of Philomel. The typist literally types out and communicates information in much the same way that Philomel communicates her rape through her nightly bird calls. The "young man carbuncular," or the young man with perhaps a case of acne, stands in as Tereus. While not at all as violent as Tereus, since he takes his sexual gratification and departs, this young man nevertheless rapes the typist's memory. So behaving, he serves as a Symbolic character that helps preserve the present time Symbolic. After the young man leaves, the typist exists in a Symbolic-like eternal present, with her past encounter with the man already slipping away into forgetful

oblivion. Eliot shows this Symbolic raping of memory when he writes, “She turns and looks a moment in the glass, / Hardly aware of her departed lover; / Her brain allows one half-formed thought to pass: ‘Well now that’s done: and I’m glad it’s over’” (46, 249-252). The typist’s memory of the event consists of “one half-formed thought.” Without Tiresias’ trans-temporal eye, since he, too, “foresuffered all / Enacted on this same divan or bed” (45, 243-244), the typist enters into a Symbolic present where she exists hardly aware of the past, or “Hardly aware of her departed lover.” Tiresias, in his position as a Real character, therefore helps secure the grotesque liberation by preserving the past time event involving the typist. He places it within temporal flux, and, by so doing, grotesquely undermines the young man’s present time Symbolic.

After the appearance of Tiresias, the present time Symbolic illusion rapidly breaks apart. For example, the remaining lines of “The Fire Sermon” exist in a Symbolically shattered, broken state, with Real past time encountering little resistance as it continues to grotesquely batter down the Symbolic. The final six lines of this part exemplify this Symbolic destruction, and read as follows:

la la
 To Carthage then I came
 Burning burning burning burning
 O Lord Thou pluckest me out
 O Lord Thou pluckest
 burning. (47, 306-311)

Real past time, aided and revealed by the jarring montage of these highly allusive lines, grotesquely shatters the present time Symbolic. The multiple allusions, arranged as a montage of sources that resist Symbolic insistence on stabilizing order and precise organization, reinstitute the grotesquely liberating temporal flux that results from this Symbolic shattering. Temporal flux, in a sense, flows through this shattered Symbolic

space, and, as discussed above, extinguishes its deceiving fires. In fact, Eliot's repetition of, "burning," showcases both the Symbolic's raging, deceiving fires, and the grotesquely liberating temporal flux that flows in, and puts out these fires. The present time Symbolic burns, fueled by the fires of passion and sensuality that the Buddha warns against in his "Fire Sermon." Saint Augustine voices a similar warning in his, *Confessions*, where, in the opening sentence of the third chapter, he writes, "To Carthage then I came, where there sang all around me in my ears a cauldron of unholy fires" (30). Augustine, like the Buddha, believes Carthage's "cauldron of unholy fires" sensually deceive the individual. People cannot escape the flames, and remain trapped in Carthage, just as individuals cannot escape the present time Symbolic without Real past time grotesquely assaulting the Symbolic, and freeing these people to temporal flux. Eliot's allusion to Augustine both reiterates the Buddha's fires of deception, and serves as a past time extinguisher of these present time Symbolic fires. Real past time grotesquely fights these Symbolic fires, and pulls individuals from the Pentecostal-like flames, as revealed by the lines, "O Lord Thou pluckest me out / O Lord Thou pluckest." These "plucked" out individuals emerge from the Symbolic fires, and enter grotesquely liberating temporal flux. They merge with time past, or with the anti-Symbolic Real water of temporal flux that inundates "The Fire Sermon." Throughout the final two parts of *The Waste Land*, Eliot continues to strengthen the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation of these individuals "plucked" out from the deceiving fires of the present time Symbolic illusion.

"Death by Water," the first of the final two parts of the poem, appears after the closing "burning" of the passage above. This placement allows the part to be understood as the first Real past time survivor plucked out of the Symbolic fires of "The Fire

Sermon.” “Death by Water,” that is, emerges from the Symbolic, “burning” fires, and describes the grotesquely liberated individuals of temporal flux. The following passage, presenting the entirety of this part, details the life and death of Phlebas, one such individual grotesquely freed into Real temporal flux. This part reads as follows:

Phlebas the Phoenician, a fortnight dead,
 Forgot the cry of gulls, and the deep sea swell
 And the profit and loss.

A current under sea
 Picked his bones in whispers. As he rose and fell
 He passed the stages of his age and youth
 Entering the whirlpool.

Gentile or Jew
 O you who turn the wheel and look to windward,
 Consider Phlebas, who was once handsome and tall as you. (48, 312-321)

The title of this fourth part, “Death by Water,” sets the tone for the lines above. A present time Symbolic, represented by a desiccated Symbolic setting, and by the deceiving fires of “The Fire Sermon,” cannot survive a grotesque inundation of Real water surging with past time. It drowns, its fires extinguished, and dies “by Water.” Understood by the title, then, the lines of this part detail the death of Phlebas as a Symbolic character, and his subsequent rebirth, or grotesque liberation, into Real temporal flux. Paul Claes writes of Phlebas’ Symbolic death and rebirth into the grotesque liberation when he writes, “Phlebas’ drowning is a ritual immersion like baptism and a purification in anticipation of final redemption” (130). Phlebas drowns in Real water, which baptizes and purifies him from his position within the present time Symbolic. This purification in turn creates his “final redemption” in the grotesque liberation. Such movement from baptism to redemption in fact mirrors a process of Real metamorphosis that begins with “the drowned Phoenician sailor” (39, 47) of Sosostris’ “wicked pack of cards.” Max Nanny helps explain this Real metamorphosis by writing that Eliot invented the Phoenician

sailor (36). The “drowned Phoenician sailor,” that is, does not appear in the traditional deck of Tarot cards Eliot referred to when composing the poem. Nanny’s insight proves important because it highlights the sailor’s ability to undermine Sosostris’ support for the present time Symbolic because of her warning against rejuvenating Real water (“Fear death by water”). The Phoenician sailor does not literally exist as a standard card in the deck. He therefore escapes from Sosostris’ Symbolic-sustaining pronouncements, and, in Part IV, drowns in grotesquely liberating, Real water. His Real metamorphosis from the unnamed “Phoenician sailor” to “Phlebas,” like the nightingale discussed above, grotesquely undercuts the present time Symbolic’s attempt to maintain permanent stability by maintaining fixed physical forms. Phlebas, in a sense, metamorphoses beyond Symbolic control.

The flowing quality of the line breaks between the stanzas of the fourth part helps further reveal Phlebas’ grotesque liberation that results from his Real metamorphosis and baptismal drowning within Real water. The first line of the second stanza begins where the last line of the preceding stanza concludes. These two lines connect, then, even though separated by stanzas, much as Phlebas, drowned within temporal flux, connects to time past and present. The imagery of the second stanza also displays Phlebas’ grotesque liberation. This second stanza takes place underwater, where the dead Phlebas is slowly picked apart by the Real seawater. Eliot describes Phlebas’ underwater location when he writes, “A current under sea / Picked his bones in whispers.” The Real undersea current literally devours Phlebas’ body, picking away his flesh. By so doing, the water rids Phlebas of his present time Symbolic body. The water tears away, it could be said, his Symbolic body in order to build back up Phlebas’ grotesquely liberated body on his old

bones. Eliot pinpoints this Real rebirth into the temporal flux of the grotesque liberation when he writes, “As he rose and fell / He passed the stages of his age and youth / Entering the whirlpool.” Phlebas embarks upon his new life undersea, or upon his grotesquely liberated life within the temporal flux of Real water. With his Symbolic body picked away, “He passed the stages of his age and youth.” Phlebas passes into “the whirlpool” of Real temporal flux between time past and time present. This “whirlpool” in turn serves as a Real anti-symbol. It symbolizes the “whirlpool” of temporal flux that grotesquely undermines the present time Symbolic in order to create the grotesque liberation. Phlebas, caught up within this “whirlpool,” engages with the “whispers” of Real past time. He whirls about in the temporal flux of his grotesque liberation.

Due to Phlebas’ grotesque liberation within the temporal whirlpool, he functions as a contradictory memento mori figure within the poem. He exemplifies the necessity of Symbolic death in order to create the Real past time rebirth into the whirlpool of the temporal grotesque liberation. Phlebas lives in the grotesque liberation because of his Symbolic death. His contradictory memento mori status also makes Phlebas a warning against Symbolic existence. Eliot presents Phlebas’ role as a Symbolic warning when he writes, “Gentile or Jew / O you who turn the wheel and look to windward, / Consider Phlebas, who was once handsome and tall as you.” Eliot warns Symbolic characters, or characters once like Phlebas, that present time Symbolic existence deals in false promises of security and stability. “Handsome and tall” Symbolic characters eventually wither and decay because of the present time Symbolic’s deadly disconnection from temporal flux. “Consider Phlebas,” then, and drown in Real water in order to depart from the hollow promises of the present time Symbolic. Myths associated with *The Waste Land*,

especially myths that emphasize salvation and redemption (cf. Jessie Weston's chapter, "The Freeing of the Waters," in *From Ritual to Romance*) value water for its ability to cleanse and purify, such as the grotesquely liberated individual from the present time Symbolic. Water lifts the curse of the present time Symbolic, and in turn floods the parched, present time "Waste Land" of the poem with grotesquely liberating temporal flux. As it does to Phlebas, water drowns the present time "Waste Land" in order to grotesquely save, redeem, and free it. In the final stanza of "Death by Water," Eliot continues to stress his command to "Consider Phlebas," and, by extension, the importance of water as a grotesquely liberating element. In fact, as if to hammer the importance of these points home, Eliot uses the beginning half of his final fifth part, "What the Thunder Said," as an extension of his warning against the desiccated dangers of the present time Symbolic.

In the opening stanzas of "What the Thunder Said," Eliot briefly resuscitates the desiccated Symbolic landscape previously struck down on the grotesque battlefield of "The Fire Sermon." Eliot brings back a Symbolic setting with "no water but only rock" (48, 331), and describes "dry sterile thunder without rain" (49, 342). The dry waste land mirrors the present time Symbolic's equally "dry [and] sterile" connection to temporal flux. Therefore, to avoid this Symbolic waste land, continue to "Consider Phlebas," and reconnect to the Real temporal flux of the grotesque liberation. While Eliot in this way briefly revives the present time Symbolic in order to warn Symbolic characters about the temporal "Waste Land" of Symbolic existence, he subsequently breaks apart the Symbolic as "What the Thunder Said" proceeds. Eliot describes this present time Symbolic destruction when he writes, "Only a cock stood on the rooftree / Co co rico co

co rico / In a flash of lightning. Then a damp gust / Bringing rain” (50, 392-395). This “cock,” performing its traditional function as a bird whose cry banishes evil spirits (cf. Brooker and Bentley 186), casts out the evil spirit of the present time Symbolic. The dramatic “flash of lightning” that coincides with the cock’s cry tears across the dry, evil spirit Symbolic landscape, and reveals in its brilliant light Real past time. This “flash” of Real past time ultimately manifests as “a damp gust / Bringing rain.” It breaks the Symbolic’s grip on time present, just as it literally breaks the line above in-half. The “damp gust” brings the Real rainwater that then falls to the next line, in much the same way that Real rain falls in the Symbolic desert to re-awaken and reinvigorate grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Time present shoots to time past when the “flash of lightning” strikes. Eliot reveals this lightning flash of the re-instituted grotesque liberation through Real allusiveness. He particularly alludes to the Hindu *Upanishads*, but also references Dante’s *Purgatorio* and the myth of the nightingale. In the final stanza of the poem Eliot brings these allusions together, creating the following passage:

I sat upon the shore
 Fishing, with the arid plain behind me
 Shall I at least set my lands in order?
 London Bridge is falling down falling down falling down
Poi s’ascose nel foco che gli affina
Quando fiam uti chelidon – O swallow swallow
Le Prince d’Aquitaine à la tour abolie
 These fragments I have shored against my ruins
 Why then Ile fit you. Hieronymo’s mad againe.
 Datta. Dayadhvam. Damyata.
 Shantih shantih shantih. (51, 424-434)

Here, in this closing stanza, Eliot proceeds to the final stage of the grotesque system, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. This stage, as discussed, serves the important function of sustaining the temporal grotesque liberation. Real characters and literature remain

connected to temporal flux, and in turn not only maintain the grotesque liberation, but also showcase Eliot's position as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque.

The final stanza quoted above reveals Eliot's anti-Schlegelian status by proclaiming "What the Thunder Said." That is, "the Thunder" proclaims the arrival of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic grotesque liberation. "The Thunder" naturally follows the "flash of lightning" that rips apart the temporarily revived Symbolic illusion, and booms out, or speaks about, temporal flux. Such a closing stanza, embedded within temporal flux, continues the grotesque liberation. Time present connects to the Real allusions of the passage above, and thereby grounds the Non-Symbolic Symbolic within grotesquely liberating temporal flux. One specific Real allusion that helps reveal this Non-Symbolic Symbolic guarantee of the grotesque liberation involves the returning Real fisherman. This Real character, previously stalked by the Symbolic rat within the unstable grotesque liberation of "The Fire Sermon," connects to the temporal flux of the coursing Real water he fishes in. He also sits "upon the shore," and therefore resides in the once barren Symbolic landscape. The fisherman's position, though, within the temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic distances him from this Symbolic setting because of Eliot's Real allusiveness. Past time allusions grotesquely beat down the present time Symbolic setting, and ensure that his line sinks within the water's Real temporal flux. R.V. Young discusses this liberating quality of Real allusiveness when he writes, "One may say that the allusions are the antidote to the illusions of a society trapped in its narrow span of time and estranged from the sources of its cultural vitality" (para. 13). At the end of *The Waste Land*, the last stanza's Real allusions act as the "antidote" to the present time Symbolic's "narrow span of time" by drowning the poem in the Real water of temporal

flux. The grotesque liberation results, and characters and literature return to the “cultural vitality” of Eliot’s temporal Non-Symbolic Symbolic.

Within the final stanza, the Real fisherman also displays the Non-Symbolic Symbolic’s sustained grotesque liberation in his questioning sentence, “Shall I at least set my lands in order?” By questioning, the fisherman further preserves his grotesque liberation by keeping it away from a final, set period that mirrors a set, fixed moment in time. His questioning sentence wanders and flows, or mimics grotesquely liberating temporal flux. This Non-Symbolic Symbolic temporal flux also explains why “London Bridge is falling down.” The bridge spans the Real water, and connects the desiccated Symbolic shorelines, rather than immersing Symbolic characters in the temporal flux of the water. It therefore denies the grotesque liberation by fostering a literal re-connection to the present time Symbolic. In order to prevent this outcome, then, the bridge must be destroyed. Eliot creatively shows this destruction of London Bridge in the remaining lines of the poem. The bridge falls down, as Eliot makes clear by his repetition of the phrase, “falling down,” and tumbles into the temporal flux of the Real water. In fact, it could be said that the bridge sinks into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic’s Real allusiveness. It drowns in the Real past time allusions that help ensure the grotesque liberation. Eliot further reveals the bridge’s “death by water” by the overall absence of punctuation in the four lines following the bridge’s destruction. In these lines, Real past time allusions, arranged like the closing stanza of “The Fire Sermon” discussed above in a Symbolic-shattering montage, bombard one another, with Eliot pulling from, among other sources, Dante, Latin poetry, and the nightingale myth. The absence of punctuation, especially the pausing qualities of a period or comma, adds to this Real montage of allusions by

preventing separation between the lines and references. The lines allusively melt together, and move between time present and time past in order to help submerge the bridge in grotesquely liberating temporal flux. Anchor-like, that is, these Real allusions hold the bridge down within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic grotesque liberation.

Eliot's "Notes," which follow this final stanza, serve much the same function as the Real allusions that hold down London Bridge in temporal flux. The myriad references of these pages represent the Real past time Tradition that undergirds the grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Therefore, by placing the "Notes" within the poem, Eliot anchors *The Waste Land* in temporal flux. He in fact remarks upon this anchor-like quality of the "Notes" after the abundance of Real allusions without punctuation. Eliot writes, "These fragments I have shored against my ruins." The fragments of Real allusions, when coupled with the other Real textual markers, save *The Waste Land* from the present time Symbolic. These "shored" up Real markers that help preserve the grotesque liberation shed light on Eliot's concluding line, "Shantih shantih shantih." Roughly translated as the "peace which passes understanding," and associated with the closing prayers of the Hindu *Upanishads*, "Shantih" speaks towards the Non-Symbolic Symbolic's grotesque liberation, which, in a sense, "passes beyond" the present time Symbolic. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic becomes "Shantih," or that closing prayer for the success of the temporal grotesque liberation that upholds Eliot's status as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque, and the freedom of individuals and literature from "The Waste Land" of the present time Symbolic. Eliot, it could be said, uses "Shantih" to at last re-enter "The Sacred Wood" of grotesquely liberating temporal flux. This long awaited re-entry Eliot also describes within the final stanza of his poem, *Little Gidding*.

He writes, “We shall not cease from exploration / And the end of all our exploring / Will be to arrive where we started / And know the place for the first time. / Through the unknown, remembered gate” (58, 239-243). The grotesquely liberated, anti-Schlegelian text returns through the “remembered gate” that leads back into “The Sacred Wood” of temporal flux. Time present here merges with time past, or at last journeys back to the temporal connectivity “where we started.” This return to “The Sacred Wood” of grotesquely liberating temporal flux due to Eliot’s closing “Shantih shantih shantih” also relates to Joseph Frank’s notion that *The Waste Land* cannot be read. In “Spatial Form in Modern Literature,” Frank argues that Eliot’s poem must be re-read, or that the final lines must be in the reader’s mind before the first lines can be understood. This necessary re-reading creates a type of flux between the beginning and ending of the poem that mirrors the temporal flux of the grotesque liberation. Frank’s continual re-reading, that is, compares to the grotesque liberation, which, as discussed above, “shall not cease” from freeing individuals and literature from the grasp of the present time Symbolic.

Chapter 2

“Oh build your ship of death.” A Voyage through D.H. Lawrence’s Contradictory

Grotesque System of Liberation

Oh build your ship of death. Oh build it!
for you will need it.

For the voyage of oblivion awaits you.

- D. H. Lawrence, “The Ship of Death”

Aldous Huxley’s correspondence between a wide variety of friends and acquaintances serves as a nice portal through which D.H. Lawrence’s contradiction-based adaptation of the grotesque system of liberation gradually comes into view. Huxley’s letters present personal, unedited glimpses of Lawrence as both a man and artist, and show how, by using the contradiction of incomplete-completeness, Lawrence makes the grotesque not a Schlegel-derived arouser of fleeting emotions, but instead a force of liberation from illusory sources of stability and security. Lawrence, as viewed through Huxley’s letters, therefore separates himself from the narrow, emotive Schlegelian conception of the grotesque, and specifically harnesses the power of grotesque contradiction. He becomes a grotesque writer, determined to liberate enslaved individuals through contradiction from illusory states of perfection. One of Huxley’s letters, written in late December, 1915, reveals Lawrence’s contradiction-based grotesqueness by presenting an encounter a young Huxley had with an equally young Lawrence. Writing to Lady Ottoline Morrell, the owner of Garsington Manor, an artistic retreat in the English countryside, Huxley begins by explaining that, on a recent Friday, he left Lawrence feeling “very much impressed by him” (20). Lawrence seemed to exude “something almost alarming about his sincerity and seriousness, something that makes one feel

oneself to be the most shameful dilettante, persifleur, waster and all the rest” (21). Throughout their correspondence, Huxley often praised Lawrence’s startling combination of “sincerity and seriousness.” One gets the feeling, when reading these letters, that Huxley stood much in awe not so much at Lawrence’s intellect, but more at his overwhelming ability to live life completely and deeply, or to claim all of life’s experiences in one orgiastic embrace. Jake Poller describes Huxley’s often complex relationship with Lawrence when he writes, “Huxley’s estimation of Lawrence as a writer was initially less favorable than his impression of the man” (76). In comparison to Lawrence’s intensity of living, Huxley, with his far more restrained approach to life, certainly appeared, as he writes, “the most shameful dilettante, persifleur, waster and all the rest.” Huxley seemed to waste life experiences, while Lawrence ravenously devoured them.

However, while Huxley praises Lawrence’s sincere and serious approach to complete living, he nevertheless critiques such a lifestyle. Huxley makes such a critique clear when he writes to Lady Ottoline, “It all comes back again to the question we were talking about the other day – the enrichment of emotion by intellect. And so too with Lawrence: I’m inclined to think that he would find a life unenriched by the subtler amenities of intellect rather sterile” (21). Lawrence, for all his claims to deep living, to unabashedly welcoming all aspects of life, cannot make good on such a lifestyle if, as Huxley points out, he rates bodily pleasures more highly than the pleasures to be gained from the intellect. Such a lifestyle confined to the body indeed proves “rather sterile” if left “unenriched by the subtler amenities of intellect.” Lawrence, then, according to Huxley, needs to drink deep from both the mind and the body. To neglect one for the

other makes Lawrence's quest for complete living incomplete. He claims complete living and all-encompassing experience, that is, at the cost of the mind, and so remains forever unable to reconcile his urge for body-driven completeness with the world of pleasures opened up by the mind. In this early letter, cracks already begin to appear in Lawrence's lust-for-life ethos that bring to light his lifelong attachment to the grotesque contradiction of complete living only by neglecting certain aspects of life, such as "the subtler amenities of intellect." He lives completely in his incompleteness, and in turn behaves grotesquely by denying, through such a contradictory attitude, the validity of supposedly absolute, impenetrable claims to completeness. Lawrence's early affinity for contradiction therefore frees him from such tyrannical sources of assumed perfection. The grotesque contradiction becomes a liberator, and consequently pushes Lawrence even further away from the Schlegelian conception of the grotesque as a mere arouser of fleeting emotions.

Huxley continues to remark upon Lawrence's grotesque contradictoriness in another letter written after Lawrence died of tuberculosis in France on March 2, 1930. Huxley was in fact beside Lawrence when he died, and, in a letter from late March, he describes how Lawrence's inner fire that attempted to consume all of life's experiences at last went out. Huxley writes, "We were with poor Lawrence when he died – a very painful thing to see an indomitable spirit finally broken and put out" (225). This death-bed scene kicked off Huxley's life-long commitment to both helping preserve Lawrence's artistic accomplishments (he edited Lawrence's letters, publishing them in 1932), and trying to make sense of his dead friend's unresolved, contradictory approach to life. Huxley perhaps most directly comments upon Lawrence's ever-present grotesque

contradictoriness in another letter written eighteen years after Lawrence's death. Addressed to the English poet and writer, Richard Aldington, this letter from mid-August 1948 presents Huxley's belief "that the strangest and most significant thing about Lawrence was the intrinsic contradictions of his attitude" (398). Huxley goes on to point out that such contradictions are "illustrated very clearly in *The Plumed Serpent*, where he alternately invites everyone to plunge into the ocean of blood and darkness and expresses his horror of the Mexicans who live in that ocean." Poetically, in his early collection, *Look! We Have Come Through!* (1917) Lawrence also displays, as Huxley says, his "intrinsic contradictions" in the poem, "Both Sides of the Medal." In this piece, Lawrence equates love with hate, and writes, "Ha, since you love me / to ecstasy / it follows you hate me to ecstasy" (191, 3-5). Like *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence again insists on contradiction, believing that love entails a form of passionate hatred. The lover, contradictorily, loves because they hate so intensely. This poem therefore continues to use contradiction grotesquely, or displays Lawrence's refusal to accept absolutes. Love breaks down into hatred, just as, in *The Plumed Serpent*, he celebrates "the ocean of blood" by expressing his "horror" of it. Objects, following the grotesque as a force of liberation, become most complete, then, when incomplete, or freed by contradiction from illusory states of perfect wholeness and completion. This contradictory incomplete-completeness, as Huxley hints at in his letter, preoccupies Lawrence throughout his writing career. Lawrence proclaims completeness through incompleteness.

Within his letter to Aldington, Huxley finally sums up his opinion about Lawrence's contradictoriness when he writes, "The contradiction is never resolved by him." This final statement reaffirms Lawrence's position within the anti-Schlegelian

camp of grotesque writers because it points towards the defining issue of permanence that divides critics and writers of the grotesque. For the Schlegelians, the grotesque, as discussed, involves the emotions of terror and comedy that both dissipate with the removal of the grotesque stimulus. These emotions dissolved, that is, and the grotesque dissolves in turn, making impermanence reign within this Schlegelian side of the grotesque. However, Lawrence's "never resolved" grotesque contradictoriness, which tears down supposed states of absolute perfection, undercuts such Schlegelian impermanence. In the hands of Lawrence, the grotesque is "never resolved," meaning that grotesque impermanence becomes permanent, and objects, continually battered against by the contradiction of incomplete-completeness, remain perpetually liberated from illusory states of absolute, unflawed perfection. The Lawrencian grotesque contradiction in this way becomes a perpetual, "never resolved" liberator, rather than a mere Schlegelian arouser of fleeting emotions. To best demonstrate Lawrence's anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque as a contradiction-led liberator recourse must now be taken to the Lacanian influenced grotesque system already described in depth within the introduction. Or, more specifically, each stage of this system, from the Symbolic, to the Real, to the closing, Non-Symbolic Symbolic, must be understood through the lens of Lawrence's grotesque contradictoriness.

The opening Symbolic stage of the grotesque system, in accordance with Lacanian notions of the term, maintains the illusion of continued, permanent stability and security. Individuals in turn remain perfectly content, and, because of this enduring, Symbolic-induced contentment, unlikely to see through the Symbolic illusion. These purblind Symbolic individuals in a sense possess what Lawrence, in his essay, "Art and

Morality,” calls “snapshot vision” (165). They see only the safe “snapshot,” or an image that presents the illusion of “the universal vision” (166). Lawrence further adapts this understanding of the Lacanian Symbolic to his grotesque contradictoriness by couching the “snapshot” Symbolic illusion within what could be called, deliberately anti-contradictory meaning. Individuals and objects retain the Symbolic illusion of perfection, or of being permanently uninterrupted by ideas and suggestions that attempt to subvert and contradict claims to complete, absolute meaning and existence. Such deliberately anti-contradictory individuals, content within the Symbolic illusion, resemble, as Lawrence writes within his poem, “Cry of the Masses,” from his 1930 collection, *Nettles*, “Corpse-anatomies with ready-made sensations! / Corpse-anatomies, that can work” (511, 13-14). Symbolic, anti-contradictory individuals, for Lawrence, exist more dead than alive because they give up the necessary suffering produced by the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness, and consequently become the “Corpse-anatomies” of the Symbolic illusion. They purposefully remain dead to the grotesque contradiction in order to receive the security derived from the illusion of their permanent completeness within “the universal vision” discussed above. These individuals, then, as Thomas Carlyle writes, have “grown mechanical in head and in heart” (“Signs” 60). Being “Corpse-anatomies,” that is, these individuals die because of their servitude to the machines they ultimately come to resemble. In *Women in Love*, for example, the electricity that powers the mines of the novel seems to course “turgid and voluptuously rich” (65) through Gerald Crich, while Clifford in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* views mine-workers as “objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life” (22). Clifford’s view of the mine-workers resembles Ruskin’s “mere segments of men” (“The

Nature” 196) discussed in the introduction, where machines de-humanize by eradicating grotesquely liberating contradiction for the sake of scientific, mechanistic precision.

Numbers (and “segmented” individuals) always add up, and in turn suppress claims that contradict the stability of the rationally predictable, Symbolic bottom line. Within a text, Lawrence specifically displays such an anti-contradictory, corpse-riddled Symbolic illusion through a series of textual markers. These markers include grotesque considerations of setting, character, progressive mobility, relative spatiality, and symbolism.

Symbolic settings, the first of these textual markers of Lawrence’s anti-contradictory Symbolic, present environments that appear bleak and barren, and so mirror the equally bereft, deathly condition of the Symbolic “Corpse-anatomies” willingly enslaved to Symbolic claims of perfect, un-contradicted security and stability. Such enslaved Symbolic characters, these individuals that populate Lawrence’s anti-contradictory Symbolic, in turn exhibit an overall lack of so-called “progressive mobility,” or that drive to literally progress and move away from the barrenness and bleakness of Symbolic settings. These Symbolic characters are stuck in place, mired by and held down within the very Symbolic, anti-contradictory stability they help to maintain. Symbolic characters, then, willingly participate in their Symbolic enslavement, and indeed welcome their subjugation because of the supposed security anti-contradiction provides. These characters in fact resemble the individuals that refuse to put down the umbrella that Lawrence describes in his “Review of *Chariot of the Sun* by Harry Crosby.” The umbrella serves as a Symbolic-like barrier against the chaos of the outside world (see *Phoenix*, pgs. 255-62). The trapped, willingly enslaved status of such

individuals lacking in progressive mobility points towards Symbolic notions of relative spatiality. Since Symbolic characters resist the progressive mobility that moves them away from the comfort of their deliberately anti-contradictory Symbolic sources, they necessarily remain within a limited, narrow span of space relative to the Symbolic center, or that defining organizational point for the entire anti-contradictory Symbolic edifice. Symbolic characters consequently possess negative relative spatiality because, by remaining close to the Symbolic center, they remain the most enslaved and directly attached to it. Their small span of space sits firmly within the confines of the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Such trapped Symbolic characters recur throughout Lawrence's works. In novels such as *Women in Love* (see page 193, where workers "are sent like fuel to feed the factory smoke") and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (page 182, the workers are "distorted, one shoulder higher than the other") Symbolic characters cannot escape, and, so confined, "feed" the machines they work, and exist "distorted" and malformed because of their close proximity, or negative relative spatiality, to the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Finally, Symbolic symbols, which symbolize Symbolic claims to uncontradicted, absolute existence, abound within Lawrence's texts, and represent objects or individuals that exude stability, solidity, and an overall precision and clarity of function. These Symbolic symbols, that is, symbolize their unwavering support for continued Symbolic stability through their literal, physical rigidity and fixity in place. Within "The Ship of Death," the all-nourishing, maternal, and solid, imposing tree that opens the poem exemplifies such a Symbolic symbol. While these specific textual markers reveal the presence of Lawrence's anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion, they

remain constantly under threat by the forces that fight for the Real grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness.

In accordance with the theories of Jacques Lacan discussed in the introduction, these Real forces function with the sole purpose of destabilizing and ultimately undermining the validity of the Symbolic illusion of absolute perfection and completeness. The Real rips down the Symbolic's illusory façade. Understood through Lawrence's grotesque contradictoriness, the Real functions as such a source of Symbolic destabilization by proclaiming that individuals and objects, rather than absolutely complete within the Symbolic illusion, in fact become most free and most complete in their incompleteness. Or, the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness sets Symbolic characters free from the illusion of anti-contradictory existence. Lawrence, in such works as *Women in Love* and "Fantasia of the Unconscious," compares the unconscious to this Real contradictoriness. In the unconscious, that is, "one is outside the pale of all that is accepted, and nothing known applies" (*Women* 146). Anti-contradictory Symbolic ordering of the "known" upper world reality dissipates in the Real contradictory unconscious. Real individuals therefore exist incomplete and "outside the pale" of a Symbolic, but nevertheless complete because free from precise Symbolic cataloguing. Holly Laird helps further explain this freedom achieved by the grotesque confrontation between the Symbolic and Real when she writes about Lawrence, "even the elegiac experience of wasting away was articulated and theorized as a process of struggle or, in Lawrence's vocabulary, of 'opposition' between antagonistic people, selves, principles. Correlatively, conflict became a vehicle for dissolution" ("Records of Pain" 133). Lawrence's commitment to conflict, or to the "process of struggle" between the

contradictory Real and the anti-contradictory Symbolic, serves as the “vehicle for dissolution.” The Symbolic illusion dissolves, revealing the so-called “Real,” true state of humanity that exists most grotesquely free from false claims to anti-contradictory life when most incomplete and broken. Textually, Lawrence showcases the Real grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness through characterization, progressive mobility, “vers libre,” setting, anti-symbolism, second person voice, relative spatiality, and metonymy.

Characterization, the first of these Real textual markers, involves characters that deliberately subvert Symbolic stability, or act as Real agents of Symbolic destabilization by engaging in pursuits that highlight the incomplete-complete grotesque contradiction. These characters embody the grotesque contradiction, and therefore exude the progressive mobility remarked upon above. They rebel by progressing away, and literally departing from Symbolic sources, and, by so doing, use their active mobility to undermine Symbolic claims to absolute, un-contradictory stability and security. These rebellious Real characters exude what Elise Brault-Dreux refers to as Lawrence’s deliberate “naïveté,” or “a sense of emotional immediacy and a direct contact with the world and with emotions” (23). Naïve Real characters, that is, depart from Symbolic sources in order to confront the “emotional immediacy” of the grotesque liberation’s incomplete-completeness. Lawrence’s “naïveté” also relates to Real “vers libre.” This textual marker requires a literal understanding of “vers libre,” or “free verse.” Lawrence, that is, frees verse from what he calls in his essay, “Chaos in Poetry,” “sophistication” (“Chaos” 116), or from overly sophisticated poetic meters (such as strict, painfully regular iambic pentameter) and forms (such as quatrains and couplets). Virginia Woolf

writes that these sophisticated structures and forms create a “railway line of a sentence” (*Letters* 135). They therefore restrict structural experimentation by keeping writing “on track,” or on the rigid, unbending “railway line[s]” of traditional forms. Lawrence, though, “wring[s] the neck of sophistication” (116). He ventures off the traditional “railway line” of form and structure by grotesquely “wring[ing] the neck” of anti-contradictory Symbolic “sophistication” with deliberately “naïve” lines that resist metrical order, and stanzas that stray from standard forms. This “new naiveté” of “vers libre” ultimately creates “the new spirit of poetry, the new spirit of life” (116). It creates “the new spirit” of Lawrence’s contradictory grotesque liberation, where seemingly infallible poetic forms and meters submit to the destabilizing, contradictory, and naïve forces of “vers libre.” A Symbolic, in this way undermined by Real progressive mobility and “vers libre,” becomes increasingly grotesquely incomplete as Real naïve characters depart for Real settings. These settings present environments marked by incomplete, decaying objects that, although broken and shattered, in fact exist most complete and whole. When coupled with the progressive mobility described above, such Real settings involve issues of relative spatiality, meaning that Real characters, using their subversive mobility, necessarily travel large spans of space relative to the Symbolic center. They depart and move away from organizing Symbolic points, and so typically engage in journeys or voyages that cover large areas of space.

In addition, Real anti-symbols, or symbols that resist incorporation and subjugation within the Symbolic fortress, help destabilize Symbolic stability by specifically representing the so-called ineffableness of objects and individuals. Lawrence helps explain this Real anti-symbolic ineffableness when he writes in his essay, “On

Being a Man,” “My body is like a jungle in which dwells an unseen me, like a black panther in the night, whose two eyes glare green through my dreams, and, if a shadow falls, through my waking day” (213). Real anti-symbols attempt to represent such “a black panther in the night,” or capture a beast that, by continually escaping and hiding, displays the ineffableness of anti-symbols. The “black panther” always, in a sense, slips away, remaining ineffable and unknowable to the Symbolic forces that want to contain it. The eponymous “Ship of Death” of Lawrence’s poem serves as such an ineffable Real anti-symbol, since, in line with its progressive mobility, it continually sails off and escapes from the confining, anti-contradictory Symbolic. Lawrence’s use of Real second person voice also helps destabilize a Symbolic because it breaks apart its illusory completeness through the incorporation of the outside reader into the text. “You,” that is, intrudes into the supposedly self-contained, absolutely whole Symbolic. Finally, Real metonymy employs its part-to-whole relationship to show that the part in fact possesses the whole, just as the grotesque contradiction professes that the fragment, or part, nevertheless remains most complete and whole, and, when viewed according to the grotesque system, most free from the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion. These various markers of the Real grotesque contradiction ultimately help bolster and support the final, Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system, where liberation from the anti-contradictory Symbolic reigns supreme.

Within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, the importance of preserving the liberation of individuals into the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness stems from the fact that these grotesquely liberated individuals prefer the comfort and security derived from the deliberately anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion to the

suffering and torment of the grotesque liberation. Lawrence elaborates upon why these individuals, in a sense, prefer their enslavement to the anti-contradictory Symbolic when he writes in his 1923 essay, "The Future of the Novel," "when you've been jammed for a long time in a tight corner, you get really used to its stuffiness and its tightness, till you find it absolutely strikingly cosy" (155). Individuals "jammed" into the "tight corner" of the Symbolic illusion get "used to its stuffiness and its tightness," and so ultimately come to prefer its "cosy" confinement to the suffering of the grotesque liberation, where these individuals must remain broken and distant from the lost, anti-contradictory illusion. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic specifically ensures that individuals persist in their grotesque incomplete-completeness, and resist the urge to return to the "strikingly cosy" Symbolic illusion, by placing the Real and Symbolic textual markers outlined above side-by-side. The grotesque battle between Symbolic anti-contradiction and Real contradiction therefore permanently rages within a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, but with the Real always emerging victorious, and the grotesque liberation in turn assured. The Real contradiction accomplishes this victory by literally appearing more frequently within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic than the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Real textual markers dominate, and the sheer number of these Real markers permanently overwhelms the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion. In consequence, while the Symbolic drive towards illusory stability within anti-contradiction exists within a Non-Symbolic Symbolic, this drive remains forever impotent in the face of the overpowering Real forces. Individuals within such a Non-Symbolic Symbolic environment must therefore accept their suffering-based, grotesque liberation into the contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Lawrence describes this perpetual suffering of the contradictory grotesque liberation within a Non-

Symbolic Symbolic in his late, 1930 essay, “Nobody Loves Me.” In this piece he writes, “One may be at war with society, and still keep one’s deep peace with mankind. It is not pleasant to be at war with society, but sometimes it is the only way of preserving one’s peace of soul, which is peace with the living, struggling, real mankind. And this latter one cannot afford to lose” (313). Like the grotesque conflict between the anti-contradictory Symbolic and contradictory Real, Lawrence insists such a battle, or being “at war with society,” proves important because it allows one to be at “peace with the living, struggling, real mankind.” David Gordon similarly discusses this “real mankind” of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic grotesque liberation. He connects Lawrence indelibly to the natural world, even comparing Lawrence to Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s ideas regarding the innate goodness and purity of this world, when he writes that the “heart – or the blood – speaks truly, and must do so, because there is no original flaw in nature” (239). The grotesque conflict therefore connects individuals to the Rousseau-like natural world of the “struggling, real” contradictory grotesque liberation, that vital outcome of the grotesque system “one cannot afford to lose” precisely because “one cannot afford” to return to the “cosy” confines of the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion.

To reveal Lawrence’s use of the grotesque contradiction, and to in turn establish his position within the anti-Schlegelian camp of grotesque critics, his actual writing must be analyzed according to the textual markers outlined above for the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages of the grotesque system. Close attention will be paid to Lawrence’s 1925 essay, “Why the Novel Matters,” and his 1932 poem, “The Ship of Death” to accomplish this task of revealing Lawrence’s grotesque contradictoriness. “The Ship of Death” especially applies to Lawrence’s grotesqueness because, as Bethan Jones

discusses, the eponymous “Ship” derives from Lawrence’s visit to underground Etruscan tombs in April of 1927 (67). These tombs contained, as Lawrence explains in his, *Sketches of Etruscan Places and Other Italian Essays*, “bronze ships, of which the Etruscans put thousands in the tombs” (21). In relation to the history of the grotesque outlined within the introduction, the fact that Lawrence descends into the underground to view these ships proves important. The grotesque begins in such an underground space as paintings on the walls of Nero’s “Golden Palace.” Therefore, “The Ship of Death” derives from ships of the underground, or from the birthplace of the grotesque. While this poem also displays Lawrence’s contradictory grotesqueness by sailing through each stage of the grotesque system, the underground inspiration for the “Ship of Death” indelibly connects it to the grotesque tradition. In addition to the underground location of the Etruscan “Ship of Death,” the fact that Lawrence praises the unconventional, rebellious nature of Etruscan art further connects the Etruscan “Ship” to the grotesque underworld reality. In *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, Lawrence celebrates the Etruscan vases that, unlike Greek and Roman art, which cannot escape from “elegance and convention” (32), “open out like strange flowers, black flowers with all the softness and the rebellion of life against convention.” These “strange [Etruscan] flowers” add to the underground grotesqueness of the “Ship of Death.” The flowers, that is, rebel against, or grow away from, the confining conventions of the upper world reality, much like Lawrence’s “Ship” escapes from this reality by voyaging into the grotesque underworld.

Before specifically outlining “The Ship of Death’s” voyage through the contradictory grotesque system, “Why the Novel Matters” helps further clarify Lawrence’s overall grotesqueness. This essay in fact applies to Lawrence’s contradictory

grotesque system of liberation because of its title. “The Novel Matters,” that is, because it becomes indicative of the grotesque liberation that results from the contradictory Real grotesquely battling down the Symbolic quest for stability and security in anti-contradiction. This connection of the essay’s title to the eventual grotesque liberation stems from the fact that a novel ultimately functions as a Real anti-symbol that makes grotesquely liberating contradiction possible. Lawrence argues that the novel, acting as an anti-symbol, subverts Symbolic claims to absolute, anti-contradictory stability by representing the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. John Worthen, in his study of Lawrence’s novels, remarks upon Lawrence’s presentation of “community even while preaching isolation” (184). The anti-symbolic novel, following Worthen’s words, displays individual characters connected to a “community” of shared life experiences because of their incomplete, “isolated” connections to them. Due to this grotesque incomplete-completeness, “the Novel Matters” because, as Lawrence writes in his 1928 novel, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, it leads “our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead” (101). Or, more specifically, “the Novel Matters” because its grotesque incomplete-completeness leads “our sympathy away” from the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion, that “thing” “gone dead” due to its false assurances of absolute completeness and security.

Lawrence further clarifies the importance of the novel as an anti-symbol representative of the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness when he explains the artistic methods used to create the grotesquely liberated novel. He describes these artistic practices in the passage below:

My hand is alive, it flickers with a life of its own. It meets all the strange universe in touch, and learns a vast number of things, and knows a vast number of things.

My hand, as it writes these words, slips gaily along, jumps like a grasshopper to dot an *i*, feels the table rather cold, gets a little bored if I write too long, has its own rudiments of thought, and is just as much *me* as is my brain, my mind, or my soul. Why should I imagine that there is a *me* which is more *me* than my hand is? Since my hand is absolutely alive, me alive. (290)

Lawrence here imagines his hand as a Real metonymic weapon of contradiction within its grotesque battle against the Symbolic illusion of complete, un-contradicted stability. This Real metonymic hand “flickers with a life of its own,” and seems impelled, because of this inner life force, to engage “all the strange universe in touch.” Lawrence reaches out, pulling that life external to himself closer to his own, pulsing life. Metonymically, then, he takes a lone, individual part of himself (his hand), and, using its Real power to grotesquely destabilize the Symbolic illusion of perfect completeness and wholeness, interacts with, or seems to contain, the entire “strange universe.” Through Real metonymy, Lawrence therefore dwells within the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness, since the separate and isolated Real hand successfully unites with the larger world. Division, or Real destabilizing isolation and incompleteness, batters down the Symbolic illusion of all-expansive completeness, and links Lawrence to the grotesque liberation. He exists incompletely-complete, and learns from this grotesque freedom from the Symbolic illusion “a vast number of things, and knows a vast number of things.” Lawrence more specifically learns that the lone, metonymic hand must produce its larger connection to the outside world by writing of this contradiction of incomplete-completeness in the grotesquely liberated novel, where, as discussed above, the “me alive” of the producing Real hand reaches out and grabs the “vast number of things” that inhabit the greater world removed from the Symbolic illusion.

Lawrence continues to expand upon the “me alive” Real hand, and the grotesquely liberated world of contradiction it creates as a novel, when he writes, “If you’re a novelist, you know that paradise is in the palm of your hand, and on the end of your nose, because both are alive” (291). The novelist here becomes a Real character because they subvert the Symbolic illusion with the knowledge that “paradise is in the palm of your hand, and on the end of your nose.” These Real metonymic parts contain the greater whole of Lawrence’s “paradise,” or that contradictorily incomplete-complete world of the novel created by the Real novelist. The grotesque novel depicts the world of contradiction, where individuals suffer for the grotesque freedom from the anti-contradictory Symbolic. The contradiction of Lawrence’s “paradise” in fact entailing a hellish state of suffering adds to the grotesque contradiction. Real characters must suffer in “paradise” in order to remain grotesquely free in their incomplete-completeness.

Lawrence expands upon the grotesquely contradictory novel when he writes, “The novel is the one bright book of life. Books are not life. They are only tremulations on the ether. But the novel as a tremulation can make the whole man alive tremble” (292). Due to its use of the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness, the novel breathes as “the one bright book of life.” It enlightens, that is, or makes “the whole man alive tremble” even though it insists upon grotesque incompleteness. In his essay, “Art and Morality,” Lawrence also remarks on “the whole man alive trembl[ing]” in their grotesquely liberating incomplete-completeness when he writes, “And nothing is true, or good, or right, except in its own living relatedness to its own circumambient universe; to the things that are in the stream with it” (167). “The whole man alive,” to remain “true” to the contradictory grotesque liberation, must live as a separate part in the “circumambient

universe,” or as a pebble in Lawrence’s “stream.” This “whole man,” that is, exists most complete when incompletely attached to the “circumambient universe.” Such an individual in turn inhabits the Lawrencian novel, since, as discussed above, it houses the individual grotesquely free to remain complete in their incompleteness, or torn between the Symbolic quest for anti-contradictory stability, and the Real insistence upon the destabilizing power of the grotesque contradiction.

With Lawrence in this way establishing the importance of the novel as an anti-symbol representative of the grotesque contradiction, the remainder of his essay attempts to further preserve the grotesque liberation by dwelling upon incomplete-completeness. Lawrence more specifically sustains the grotesque contradiction by proclaiming the absolute completeness of individuals due to their absolute incompleteness. He perhaps best displays this grotesque contradictoriness by reserving mock scorn and ridicule for the philosopher, the scientist, and the saint. Lawrence writes that the “saint wishes to offer himself up as spiritual food for the multitude. Even Francis of Assisi turns himself into a sort of angelcake, of which anyone may take a slice. But an angel-cake is rather less than man alive” (292). He continues with this theme of dissection, where the saint provides “a slice” to each devout follower, in his discussion of the philosopher and scientist. The following passage presents Lawrence’s ideas concerning these two professions:

The philosopher, on the other hand, because he can think, decides that nothing but thoughts matter. It is as if a rabbit, because he can make little pills, should decide that nothing but little pills matter. As for the scientist, he has absolutely no use for me so long as I am man alive. To the scientist, I am dead. He puts under the microscope a bit of dead me, and calls it me. He takes me to pieces, and says first one piece, and then another piece, is me. (292)

In their respective quests for truth and knowledge, the Real characters of the saint, the scientist, and the philosopher adhere to the grotesque contradiction. These professions, much like Lawrence's Real novelist, use Real, metonymic parts to grotesquely battle against the Symbolic illusion of absolute, anti-contradictory completeness. The saint, as Lawrence somewhat gruesomely describes, slices away parts of their "spiritual food." Handed out as if a piece of "angel-cake" on plates, the saint rips apart the Symbolic illusion of their perfect individual completeness, and instead professes that only their incompleteness, or Real parts, grotesquely liberate "the multitude" into the grotesque contradiction. Similarly, the philosopher breaks down the illusion of their all-complete Symbolic by removing their mind from the rest of their body. These philosophers decapitate themselves because, for them, "nothing but thoughts matters." By isolating these important thoughts from the supposedly flawless, whole Symbolic body, the philosopher inhabits the grotesque contradiction by asserting that their decapitated, incomplete body in fact exists the most complete and whole. These decapitated philosophers consequently mirror Anne Fernihough's study involving Lawrence's antagonistic attitude towards the aesthetic. Fernihough writes that Lawrence denigrates aesthetic judgments because they foster "the severance, in Western cultures, of mind and body, and the subsequent privileging of the mind" (1-2). The philosophers, then, of Lawrence's essay, as Fernihough shows, behave aesthetically by insisting that "nothing but thoughts matter." In addition to these aesthetic philosophers, Lawrence castigates the scientist because such a profession dedicates itself to this ongoing theme of dissection and decapitation. Scientists literally pull the body apart, and proclaim, through such dissection, that "first one piece, and then another piece, is me." Therefore, the scientist

perpetually rips apart the Symbolic illusion of the whole body, and reveals through this grotesque dissection, the dismembered, incomplete, grotesquely liberated individual. Such a ripped apart body, following the grotesque contradiction, remains the most free because it distances itself from the Symbolic illusion of perfect completeness with every body part the scientist slices away.

Lawrence must mock all of these professions because such a tone stands as a necessary component within his contradiction-based grotesque system. He, above all, stresses the contradiction that incompleteness in fact makes an individual whole, and that the Real professions of the saint, scientist, and philosopher help dissect the Symbolic illusion in order to free individuals into this contradiction. Valerie Popp further emphasizes this Lawrentian theme of dissection when she writes, “the ideal Lawrentian body is a snapped, combusted, wrung, broken, scarred record of human boldness” (42). Dissection occurs, and the resulting “broken, scarred” individual represents “the ideal Lawrentian body” of the grotesque contradiction. This body remains broken and incomplete, but, because of such fragmentation, necessarily more free. In his piece, “Introduction to these Paintings,” Lawrence compares this ideal incomplete-completeness to Paul Cézanne’s apple still-life paintings. Lawrence explains that, “Cézanne’s great effort was as it were to shove the apple away from him, and let it live of itself” (567-68). Cézanne’s apples resemble the dissected body of “Why the Novel Matters.” Both, that is, “live of [themselves],” or exist in a grotesquely liberated state of incomplete-completeness (Lawrence returns to apples in the opening stanzas of “The Ship of Death,” discussed below). However, Lawrence cannot overtly praise the dissecting professions of “Why the Novel Matters” because such praise would in fact contradict his over-arching

grotesque contradiction. By praising, he would lump together these professions, and so create a Symbolic-like whole. Therefore, to prevent this outcome, he must break all of these dissecting professions down through mock ridicule. Or, to extend Lawrence's contradictoriness, he must mock and belittle them in order to praise them as exemplars of the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Lawrence in turn proves his claim within the essay, "I don't want to grow in any one direction any more. And, if I can help it, I don't want to stimulate anybody else into some particular direction. A particular direction ends in a *cul-de-sac*. We're in a *cul-de-sac* at present" (293). Lawrence, by using mock scorn, keeps his grotesquely liberating professions separate, and prevents this deadly "cul-de-sac," or "cosy" Symbolic space where the illusion of completeness reigns. In his essay, "Study of Thomas Hardy," Lawrence expresses the importance of preventing this Symbolic "cul-de-sac" when he writes, "Whenever art or any expression becomes perfect, it becomes a lie" (87). Individuals and art must in turn preserve their grotesque freedom to exist imperfect within the contradiction of incomplete-completeness, and scatter to protect the truth of their grotesque liberation from the single whole, the single path, and the single, dead-ending Symbolic "cul-de-sac."

While Lawrence in this way presents his contradictory grotesque within "Why the Novel Matters" by specifically employing the Real metonymic textual marker, he nevertheless fails to progress through the entirety of his contradictory grotesque system. He merely shows his contradiction at work, and fails to place this contradiction within the grotesque system, and analyze how it functions within each stage. Lawrence's poem, "The Ship of Death" solves this problem of breadth, or of walking through the Symbolic, Real, and Non-Symbolic Symbolic stages, by showcasing the entire contradictory

grotesque system. That is, Lawrence's "Ship of Death" moves through the three stages of the contradictory grotesque system. The poem begins with a Symbolic stage that insists upon upholding the quickly dying illusion of perfect, un-contradicted bodily completeness and wholeness. This opening, anti-contradictory Symbolic stage then comes under fire in its grotesque battle against Real death, or that thoroughly destabilizing force that literally kills the body, piece-by-piece breaking it down into the grave. This grotesque conflict ultimately liberates an individual into the overarching contradiction of the poem. Bodily death, for Lawrence, gives life because it reveals the Symbolic illusion of completeness, and therefore frees the individual into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic defined by being incomplete and detached from life, but nevertheless supremely free. As stated, the eponymous "ship" of the poem sails to this Non-Symbolic Symbolic home of the grotesque contradiction throughout the piece, until finally reaching its grotesquely liberated destination within the closing stanzas. Lawrence's poem, unlike "Why the Novel Matters," in this way moves through the respective stages of the contradictory grotesque system.

The overall organization of "The Ship of Death" also reveals the movement of the poem through the grotesque system. Lawrence divides the poem into ten sections of varying lengths. This organizational attribute of the piece proves important because it clearly and directly displays Lawrence's grotesque contradiction. Contradictorily, that is, he asserts wholeness by division, completeness by incompleteness. The poem's division, then, into separate sections structurally mirrors the eventual Non-Symbolic Symbolic space reached at the conclusion of the piece, where an individual stands grotesquely freed by division. In addition to the structure of Lawrence's poem, the opening part's use of

Real anti-symbolism displays the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. This opening Real anti-symbol involves Lawrence's first stanza use of falling fruit. He describes these Real, anti-symbolic fruit in the following stanza:

Now it is autumn and the falling fruit
and the long journey towards oblivion.
The apples falling like great drops of dew
to bruise themselves an exit from themselves. (355, 1-4)

Lawrence here in fact presents both the Symbolic symbol of a tree, and the Real anti-symbol of the falling fruit. A tree serves as a Symbolic symbol because it stands deeply rooted into the earth, fixed in place as a progressively immobile, complete, whole, living and breathing organism. Thomas Carlyle, in his "Signs of the Times," adds additional depth to the Symbolic nature of the tree when he writes that the Industrial Age machine has, "stuck its roots down into man's most intimate, primary sources of conviction" (74). The tree therefore becomes machine-like and invasive. It sticks its "roots down into" individuals, and, by so doing, keeps them progressively immobile, and firmly attached to the Symbolic tree. This tree, when understood through Carlyle, also adds to its anti-contradictory status because of its comparison to a machine, which dispels contradiction through its dedication to precision, efficiency, and predictability. The Symbolic machine equates and factors away the possibility of contradiction upsetting the smooth production of Symbolic order and stability. However, while the tree appears to exist Symbolically stable and whole, it nevertheless cannot maintain its supposed completeness because of the seasonal falling of fruit.

During autumn, the Symbolic tree literally becomes incomplete. Autumn therefore becomes a Real setting for Symbolic destabilization, since it tears the fruit from its Symbolic source, and thereby grotesquely riddles the Symbolic tree with the liberating

scars of incompleteness. The falling fruit in turn successfully performs its function as a Real anti-symbol. It symbolizes Symbolic destruction, or the gaps formed within the Symbolic illusion because of the fruit falling away from the tree. Lawrence adds additional depth to this Real, anti-symbolic status of the falling fruit when he writes, “The apples falling like great drops of dew.” Such a fruit choice interestingly connects the anti-symbolic fruit to the Forbidden Fruit of the Biblical Eden. Just like the anti-symbolic apples of Lawrence’s poem, the apples of Eden led to a situation of incompleteness. Adam and Eve fell away from a direct, complete communion with God. This Biblical baggage within the poem therefore re-asserts the grotesque contradiction of incompleteness. Adam and Eve, like the grotesquely liberated individual, broke free from a source of completeness, and consequently entered into an incomplete, broken, post-Eden environment similar to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system. Throughout his works, Lawrence in fact emphasizes this grotesquely liberating ejection from Eden, especially in his discussion of Nathaniel Hawthorne in his 1923, *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Hawthorne, for Lawrence, becomes the “master of serpent subtlety” (141), and consequently serves as an instigator of the grotesque conflict. He influences Adam and Eve to eat the apples that, in “The Ship of Death,” help grotesquely dissolve Lawrence’s anti-contradictory Symbolic.

The falling, anti-symbolic apples of the first stanza also introduce Lawrence’s creative line structuring that continues throughout his poem. He structures his lines to mimic the falling away of the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion during its grotesque battle against the contradictory forces of the Real. In the following passage, Lawrence

shows this connection between the tattered Symbolic illusion and his equally tattered, broken lines:

The apples falling like great drops of dew
to bruise themselves an exit from themselves.

And it is time to go, to bid farewell
to one's own self, and find an exit
from the fallen self. (355, 3-7)

The Real, anti-symbolic fruit, falling from the Symbolic tree, “bruise themselves” when they hit the ground. This bruising, or tarnishing of the once pristine fruit, points towards the similar bruising of the Symbolic illusion of perfection. The fruit falls away from the tree, bruising both itself and the tree with grotesque incompleteness. Lawrence reveals this bruising of the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion created by the anti-symbolic falling fruit in the second stanza, where he dwells upon finding “an exit,” or departure point, from the grotesquely bruised Symbolic. After the fruit falls, “it is time to go, to bid farewell / to one's own self, and find an exit / from the fallen self.” This “fallen self” departs from, or “bid[s] farewell” to, the once seemingly pristine Symbolic illusion, and, highlighting its Real progressive mobility, ventures off into a necessarily incomplete existence removed from the Symbolic tree. Such Real progressive mobility on the part of the anti-symbolic fruit in fact leads to the grotesque liberation of incomplete-completeness. The fruit sits broken from the Symbolic tree but, because of this separation, more free and liberated in its incomplete state. Lawrence structurally displays this fallen and bruised life of the contradictory grotesque liberation in the second stanza when he employs Real “vers libre.” That is, the departure from “one's own self” following the “apples falling like great drops of dew” literally departs, or frees itself, from the first stanza. This “self” breaks from the beginning, foundational stanza just as

the anti-symbolic falling fruit breaks from the Symbolic tree. Such freedom for “one’s own self” in turn frees the poem from a rigid adherence to traditional poetic forms and meters. For example, the brokenness of the second stanza’s lines, riddled with caesura-like breaks, and containing one sentence broken into three lines by enjambment, represents Real “vers libre” literally breaking free from the Symbolic-like constraints of traditionally end-stopped lines contained within standard quatrains. The lines of the second stanza exist broken by Real “vers libre,” bruised by their fall from the beginning source, or stanza, of the poem, much as the anti-symbolic fruit lands grotesquely liberated into the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Lawrence’s verse becomes most free and complete when broken away and removed from traditional poetic meters and forms.

After these opening two stanzas, the first of the poem’s ten divided parts, Lawrence commences his use of Real second person voice. Such employment of “you,” which subsequently echoes throughout the remainder of the poem, serves an important function within Lawrence’s contradictory grotesque system because second person voice adds to Symbolic destabilization by incorporating the outside reader, or “you,” into the poem. The second person “you” comes from without, from the outside reader, and disrupts the supposedly all-perfect, absolutely self-contained Symbolic illusion. This understanding of second person voice as a Real source of Symbolic destabilization in fact opens up a new way of viewing the use of “you” within a text. Matt DelConte argues for the standard view of second person voice when he writes that the presence of “you,” “manifests in narrative technique the notion that someone or something outside of yourself dictates your thoughts and actions” (205). Second person voice, as understood

by DelConte, becomes largely Symbolic-like, or serves as a controlling, organizing power that “dictates your thoughts and actions.” “You” must obey higher, Symbolic powers. However, this conception of second person voice proves narrow and limiting, since it casts this “narrative technique” in a largely negative light. When understood according to the contradictory grotesque system, though, second person voice actually serves as a liberator, rather than a controller and dictator. As discussed, it riddles a text with the outside, “you” voice, and thereby helps grotesquely break down the supposedly all-encompassing, all-perfect Symbolic illusion. Lawrence first introduces Real second person voice in the first stanza of the second part of his poem.

In this stanza, Lawrence writes, “Have you built your ship of death, O have you? / O build your ship of death, for you will need it” (355, 8-9). This use of Real second person voice draws the outside reader, the “you” reading, into the very structure of the poem. Occupying such a position, the outside “you” adds to the Real forces battling against the Symbolic illusion. “You,” in a sense, fights alongside the anti-symbolic “falling fruit” in order to hasten the “exit / from the fallen self” that fosters the creation of the grotesque liberation into incomplete-completeness. Lawrence in fact emphasizes this gradual growth in the strength of the Real by again evoking the anti-symbolic “falling fruit” of the first stanza after his introduction of the second person “you.” In the second stanza of part two, Lawrence writes, “The grim frost is at hand, when the apples will fall / thick, almost thundrous, on the hardened earth” (355, 10-11). “The grim frost” of the Real autumn setting continues to grotesquely encroach upon the Symbolic tree, slowly dismantling the tree’s Symbolic illusion of perfection and absolute completeness with every anti-symbolic apple that falls “thick, almost thundrous, on the hardened earth.”

These apples that fall away from the Symbolic tree gain strength from the Real outside “you,” and, with this increased Real force, grotesquely attack the Symbolic tree more strongly and persistently. The Symbolic tree, in turn, loses more fruit, and the grotesque liberation swells, increasing with every anti-symbolic apple that falls towards the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Due to the reinforcement the outside “you” provides for the Real forces of the grotesque conflict, second person voice also acts as fuel for the eponymous “ship of death” that carries the grotesquely liberated into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system.

The Real outside “you” acts as fuel for the ship of death because it helps destabilize the supposedly self-contained Symbolic illusion, and consequently increases the number of individuals ready to use their Real progressive mobility to voyage to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic of permanent incomplete-completeness. The ship of death must, in a sense, be built to accommodate the gradually increasing number of grotesquely liberated individuals freed from the Symbolic tree of the poem. Due to this responsibility towards the grotesquely liberated, the ship of death serves as the most potent and important Real anti-symbol within Lawrence’s poem. It symbolizes, that is, the grotesque liberation as a journey of active progressive mobility, or the voyage away from the Symbolic illusion of absolute wholeness and perfection. Similar to the Real “you,” the Symbolic cannot literally contain the ship, or hold it permanently within its negative progressive mobility. Lawrence draws attention to the importance of the Real anti-symbolic ship through his refrain, “Have you built your ship of death... O build your ship of death.” This refrain echoes throughout the remainder of the poem, and its continual repetition emphasizes the necessity of the anti-symbolic ship within the ongoing

grotesque system. It must be built to prevent the Symbolic illusion from recapturing the newly liberated individuals of the grotesque.

These individuals remain weak, and suffer in their newfound grotesque incompleteness. Given such a volatile state of liberation, the lost Symbolic illusion holds a particular allure. It promises the end of suffering and incompleteness. It offers peace in the illusion of absolute perfection and wholeness. Therefore, the Symbolic stands as a dangerous temptation for the recently liberated. Lawrence describes this danger assigned to the lost Symbolic illusion when he explains how it can never die. He writes in the three short stanzas below:

Can a man his own quietus make
with a bare bodkin?

With daggers, bodkins, bullets, man can make
a bruise or break of exit for his life;
but is that a quietus, O tell me, is it quietus?

Surely not so! for how could murder, even self-murder
ever a quietus make? (355-356, 17-23)

This passage reveals the importance of building the ship of death because the Symbolic illusion, although slowly crumbling due to its grotesque battle against swelling Real forces, can never completely fall away. As Lawrence writes, the Symbolic tree cannot die, or be finally ripped apart “with daggers, bodkins, [or] bullets.” The Symbolic persists, and emerges from the grotesque battle scarred, and its illusion in tatters, but still nevertheless capable of being rebuilt. Such possible reconstruction threatens the newly liberated status of the grotesquely freed individual. In light of this indestructible Symbolic, the ship of death, serving its function as a progressively mobile, Real anti-symbol, must be built as a safeguard. It keeps the grotesquely liberated safe by literally

conveying these individuals away from the temptations of the perfectly complete and whole Symbolic illusion.

Lawrence begins the important journey towards the Non-Symbolic Symbolic by highlighting the grotesquely liberated state of the individual. This renewed emphasis upon the grotesquely liberated, Real character reveals the tenuous state of grotesque freedom given the fact that the anti-contradictory Symbolic still tempts Real characters with its comforting offers of illusory perfection and completeness. Lawrence describes the fragility of the grotesque liberation in the following passage:

Already our bodies are fallen, bruised, badly bruised,
already our souls are oozing through the exit
of the cruel bruise.

Already the dark and endless ocean of the end
is washing in through the breaches of our wounds,
already the flood is upon us. (356, 32-37)

These stanzas present the “fallen, bruised, badly bruised” Real character recently grotesquely liberated from the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion. This individual in turn embodies the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness, or exists broken, ragged, and tattered, but, because of these liberating “wounds,” free from the Symbolic illusion of completeness. The Real character, as if ripped to shreds during the grotesque battle, falls nearly dead onto the ground of the incomplete-complete grotesque liberation. In order to protect such a weak, broken Real character from the temptation of returning to the comforts of anti-contradictory, Symbolic existence, “the dark and endless ocean of the end” must pour through the “breaches of our wounds.” This “endless ocean,” a Real setting for the newly liberated, helps secure a Real character’s grotesque liberation by drowning the individual in the grotesque contradiction. The ocean surges in “through the

breaches of our wounds,” and drowns the Real character into the life and liberation, or the permanent incomplete-completeness, of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space. Such liberating drowning into the grotesque contradiction in fact recurs within several poems from Lawrence’s late collection, *Pansies* of 1929. For example, the first poem of the collection, “Our day is over,” contains the line, “darkness rushes between our stones, / we shall drown” (“Our day,” 370, 6-7). Drowning, for Lawrence, frees and liberates because it inundates and forces Real characters down into the depths of grotesque contradiction. Within such a space, the anti-contradictory Symbolic remains distant, and therefore unable to lure back the freshly liberated Real characters drowned within the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness.

Following the successful drowning of Real characters, Lawrence at last begins the actual journey on the ship of death that carries the grotesquely liberated to the poem’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic space. This journey onboard the ship of death reveals Real progressive mobility and relative spatiality within the poem. Real characters literally progress and journey away from the anti-contradictory Symbolic, and in consequence increase the strength of their grotesque liberation with their increase in distance and space from the Symbolic center. Lawrence especially stresses this Real mobility and relative spatiality of the journey by again calling upon the Real character to “build your ship of death, your little ark, / and furnish it with food, with little cakes, and wine / for the dark flight down oblivion” (356, 38-40). The Real character must “build your ship of death” in order to remain grotesquely free. Lawrence supports this freedom imparted by the ship of death through his description of the vessel as a “little ark.” This “little ark” evokes the Biblical ark, which, like Lawrence’s ship, similarly serves a redemptive function by

saving and preserving humankind during the Biblical Flood. In much the same way, Lawrence's ship of death saves and preserves the grotesquely liberated from the anti-contradictory Symbolic. The ship saves the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. In the passage above, Lawrence also helps secure the grotesque liberation by again bringing in Real second person voice. Lawrence calls upon Real characters to "build your ship of death." This use of second person voice adds to the contradictory Real forces grotesquely battling against the anti-contradictory Symbolic, and, along with Real progressive mobility and relative spatiality, helps protect Real characters on their voyage to their permanent grotesque liberation. Such an accumulation of Real forces of Symbolic destabilization serves as the nourishment for these Real characters that Lawrence describes. That is, the grotesquely liberated individual takes strength from these forces that help preserve the grotesque contradiction, just as the "little cakes and wine" provide bodily nourishment. Both help sustain Real characters as they board the ship of death and set out on "the dark flight down oblivion," or on that journey to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic.

Real characters, drowning within the Real setting of the ocean while safe aboard the ship of death, inhabit the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. Their presence within such a liberating contradiction receives added support from the endlessness of their voyage. Lawrence writes that the journey of the ship of death seems never to end, or consists of "oblivion." The ship, that is, continually moves the grotesquely liberated away from the Symbolic quest for a journey that stands complete and whole by having an obvious beginning and end. The ship, then, must be lost in "oblivion" before it can find the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Lawrence expands upon this

necessary “oblivion” and apparent endlessness of the journey to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic in the following passage:

There is no port, there is nowhere to go,
 only the deepening blackness darkening still
 blacker upon the soundless, ungurbling flood,
 darkness at one with darkness, up and down
 and sideways utterly dark, so there is no direction any
 more
 and the little ship is there. (357, 67-73)

Real characters travel without any apparent direction, or with “no port” and “nowhere to go.” However, this lost status reaffirms the grotesque contradiction because these characters must be lost, or wander about on an incomplete voyage on “the soundless, ungurbling flood,” in order to successfully complete their liberation from the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Lawrence structurally presents this aimless wandering in the fifth and sixth lines of the passage above. Mimicking the direction-less journey, Lawrence stretches the fifth line onto the sixth line with the single word, “more.” The fifth line, so placed, aimlessly wanders onto the sixth line, just as the ship of death aimlessly floats upon the absolutely dark sea. This structuring also displays Lawrence’s use of Real “vers libre.” His so-called “wandering lines” similarly wander free from Symbolic-like dedication to traditional meters and stanza forms. Lawrence, as discussed, “wring[s] the neck” of standard, “sophisticating” poetic traditions by constructing a deliberately un-metrical “free verse” that breaks away from typical stanza constructions, such as the quatrain.

The absolute darkness of the sea in the passage above also helps further reinforce the ship’s lost, aimlessly wandering state. The “darkness at one with darkness” makes navigation impossible. The darkness envelops, covering the ship in blackness. So

consumed, the ship cannot find an end point, or Symbolic-like port that marks a supposedly whole and complete journey. Lawrence also employs darkness in many of his other works, such as in his novel, *The Rainbow*, where darkness, as in “The Ship of Death,” counters “the light of science and knowledge” (437) that helps sustain the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Darkness also evokes the underground reality of the grotesque, where, as outlined in the Introduction, it frees objects and individuals from the piercing “light of science and knowledge” of the above ground, anti-contradictory reality.

Lawrence continues to describe this grotesquely liberating darkness that defers both upper world light, and the complete voyage in the short eighth part of the poem, where he writes, “The upper darkness is heavy as the lower, / between them the little ship / is gone. / It is the end, it is oblivion” (358, 80-83). The ship of death now vanishes, disappearing into “The upper darkness... [and] the lower.” The ship “is gone.” Such disappearance into oblivion appears in several of Lawrence’s other poems, including “Hark in the dusk!” from his collection, *Pansies*. In this poem, like in “The Ship of Death,” “the flood strikes the belly, and we are gone” (369, 8). “Oblivion” again envelops, and, by so doing, allows Real characters to disappear from the anti-contradictory Symbolic, or to enter the grotesquely liberating darkness of the underworld reality, where Lawrence’s grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness reigns.

With the ship of death lost in oblivion, or removed from the threat of the anti-contradictory Symbolic because of Real progressive mobility, the liberating grotesque contradiction reigns supreme. The ship is incomplete, or broken from the Symbolic illusion, but, because of this incompleteness, most complete because most free from the illusion of permanent anti-contradiction. This success of the grotesque contradiction, as

Lawrence explains, creates the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage. “Oblivion,” that is, leads to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Lawrence describes this Non-Symbolic Symbolic birth from oblivion when he writes, “out of eternity a thread / separates itself on the blackness, / a horizontal thread / that fumes a little with pallor upon the dark” (358, 84-87). In these lines, the contradictory light of incomplete-completeness (as opposed to the all-invasive, anti-contradictory light of the upper world reality) generated from the success of the grotesque contradiction breaks across the absolute darkness of the sea. This illumination helps guide the ship of death as the “horizontal thread / that fumes a little with pallor upon the dark.” The thread pulls the ship towards the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, where the ship docks and deposits the grotesquely liberated individual. Lawrence describes the state of such an incomplete-complete individual, newly arrived at the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, when he writes in the passage below:

Is it illusion? or does the pallor fume
A little higher?
Ah wait, wait, for there's the dawn,
the cruel dawn of coming back to life
out of oblivion. (358, 88-92)

With the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion pushed into the distance, the grotesquely liberated individual must exist within the “cruel dawn” of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. The individual must come “back to life / out of oblivion,” or is forced out of the darkness and into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic light. This individual exists incomplete within the glow of the light of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Such luminescence proves “cruel” because it displays the permanent state of incompleteness the grotesquely liberated individual must maintain in order to preserve their complete freedom from the Symbolic illusion. The individual suffers, forced to remain incomplete for the sake of their

grotesque liberation. This “cruel,” suffering aspect of the grotesque liberation in fact undermines a common critical understanding of pain and death within “The Ship of Death.” Critics, especially Holly Laird in her study, *Self and Sequence: The Poetry of D.H. Lawrence*, typically associate sadness and pain with this poem. Laird voices this opinion when she writes, “the experience of death is laced with needs unsatisfied, and we are forced to think of Lawrence in pain” (235). When understood through the grotesque liberation, though, this sadness of death, “with needs unsatisfied” and “Lawrence in pain,” becomes the driving force for the grotesque liberation. Death becomes joyful and hopeful. It grotesquely liberates individuals from the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion, and frees them into the grotesque contradiction of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space.

Lawrence’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic must also make the grotesque liberation permanent in order to secure his standing as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer. The following passage showcases Lawrence’s success in accomplishing this permanent grotesque liberation:

Wait, wait, the little ship
drifting, beneath the deathly ashy grey
of a flood-dawn.

Wait, wait! even so, a flush of yellow
and strangely, O chilled wan soul, a flush of rose.

A flush of rose, and the whole thing starts again. (358, 93-98)

Lawrence insists through the repetition of “wait” that the individual await their permanently sustained grotesque liberation. The ship of death continues to drift in the “flood-dawn” of their grotesque liberation, which casts “yellow” and “rose” lighting upon the painfully incomplete individual. Such lighting, though, could disappear, and the little

ship could potentially drift back to the anti-contradictory Symbolic illusion. To prevent this outcome, which destroys the grotesque liberation, Lawrence writes, “and the whole thing starts again.” A permanent cycle of grotesque liberation begins. The journey, that is, away from the Symbolic illusion remains permanent, with the ship of death continually sailing the grotesquely liberated into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space. In turn, the grotesque liberation stands secure. It therefore makes sense that this passage also exemplifies Lawrence’s use of “vers libre” as a force of liberation. The absolute lack of standard stanza lengths and meters (the stanzas in fact all vary in length) structurally mirrors the grotesque liberation. The verse is free, or representative of Real “vers libre,” just as Symbolic characters are free from the anti-contradictory Symbolic. In addition, the endless quality of this grotesque liberation reveals how, as Christopher Stokes writes, “Lawrence’s impulse for consummation is dialectically linked to destruction, apocalypse, and negation” (124). The end, the conclusion and “consummation” of the grotesque journey produces another journey, or proves endless, because termination creates “destruction, apocalypse, and negation.” Ross Murfin brings attention to Lawrence’s use of the word, “lustres,” to describe these endless journeys. Lawrence thought “of himself as a kind of phoenix, dying and being reborn at regular intervals” (Murfin vii). An end point remains continually deferred, with each “lustre” creating a new, reborn phoenix, and, in turn, a grotesquely liberated individual within a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space cannot destroy their freedom. It persists, continually being reborn, and keeps the individual most free and complete in their grotesque incompleteness. These phoenix-like “lustres” further reveal Lawrence’s critical indebtedness to Oswald Spengler’s, *The Decline of the West* (1918-22), since Spengler also understands reality as an endless

progression of birth-flowering-decay. Such Spenglerian “lustres” therefore relate to Lawrence’s contradictory Non-Symbolic Symbolic discussed above (consult Vol. I, pgs. 31-32 of *The Decline* for more insight into Spengler’s critical relationship to Lawrence).

In the final tenth part of the poem, Lawrence presents two Real anti-symbols that both represent the grotesque liberation of Real characters within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Lawrence describes the first of these Real anti-symbols when he writes that the grotesquely liberated individual represents “a worn sea-shell, / [that] emerges strange and lovely” (358, 99-100) from the ship of death. This “worn sea-shell” anti-symbolizes the equally worn and tattered state of the grotesquely liberated individual that successfully batters down and undermines the anti-contradictory Symbolic. Waves smash against this individual, wearing down their resistance to the still menacing Symbolic. However, the individual, although worn down like “a sea-shell,” perseveres, and weathers the storm aboard the ship of death. This ultimate victory over the Symbolic makes the individual “strange and lovely” in their grotesque liberation. Such a person, that is, proves “strangely lovely,” since their continual suffering, or incomplete-completeness, sustains their grotesque liberation. Strangely, the person suffers for their freedom. This “strange and lovely” sea-shell/individual that suffers and struggles for their grotesque liberation resembles a passage in *Women in Love* where Lawrence writes, “There is no new movement now, without the breaking through of the old body, deliberately, in knowledge, in the struggle to get out” (186). The individual must “struggle to get out” of the anti-contradictory Symbolic in order to gain the “knowledge” of the grotesque liberation. Their “old [Symbolic] body” withers, and the incomplete-complete body of the grotesque liberation takes its place. Lawrence also adds to this anti-symbolic,

struggling “sea-shell” the Real anti-symbol of a house. He describes this anti-symbolic house when he writes, “the little ship wings home, faltering and lapsing / on the pink flood, / and the frail soul steps out, into the house again / filling the heart with peace” (358, 101-104). This house serves as an especially important anti-symbol because it represents the Non-Symbolic Symbolic itself, and so stands as a specific, tangible place of continual grotesque resistance to the anti-contradictory Symbolic. The house, it could be said, provides a sanctuary for the grotesquely liberated, or for those “frail soul[s]” that leave the ship of death, and “step out, into the house.” Such a house literally adds a wall between the grotesquely liberated, and the anti-contradictory Symbolic. The anti-symbolic house in turn helps secure and protect the grotesquely liberated within the poem’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic space.

After presenting the two Real anti-symbols of the “worn sea-shell” and Non-Symbolic Symbolic house, Lawrence ends “The Ship of Death” by returning to Real second person voice. He proclaims in the passage below:

Oh build your ship of death. Oh build it!
for you will need it.
For the voyage of oblivion awaits you. (359, 107-109)

The outside “you” again enters the poem, adding to the Real anti-symbols, progressive mobility, and relative spatiality that successfully overwhelm the anti-contradictory Symbolic at the end of the poem. The “frail soul[s]” of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic maintain their grotesque liberation. The “ship of death” continues to sail, and continues to deposit the grotesquely liberated at the doorstep of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic house. The ship therefore exists, as Lawrence writes in “Morality and the Novel,” “in-between everything” (171). It travels and wanders on the sea between the anti-contradictory

Symbolic, and the Non-Symbolic Symbolic house. This “in-betweenness” and wandering (which appears throughout Lawrence’s work, e.g., Cyril in *The White Peacock* is “always wandering” (220), Gudrun in *Women in Love* is “profoundly restless” (211), as is Connie in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (28)) preserves Lawrence’s grotesquely liberating contradiction of incomplete-completeness. The ship, by remaining “in-between everything,” completes a journey, or deposits the grotesquely liberated into the Non-Symbolic Symbolic house, by again breaking away from its completed voyage. Completeness leads to incompleteness and vice versa as the ship sails and wanders in its “in-betweenness.” Anne Fernihough remarks on this grotesquely liberating contradictoriness when she writes, “The sense of a separate *thing* is as important for Lawrence as the sense of fusion” (170). Contradictorily, that is, “separate *thing[s]*” fuse when left in their grotesquely liberated state of incomplete-completeness. They remain separate, but most completely free from anti-contradictory Symbolic sources. In addition, Lawrence, as the passage above reveals, encourages individuals to use their Real progressive mobility, and participate in the endlessly repeated voyage that secures their grotesque liberation. “The voyage of oblivion awaits” these individuals, and they “will need” both it and the ship of death for their successful liberation into the grotesque contradiction of incomplete-completeness. This journey also succeeds because it secures Lawrence’s position as a writer of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition. He makes the grotesque a force of liberation, rather than a fleeting emotive arouser. Individuals free themselves from illusory states of stability and become, as Lawrence writes in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, the “cheap stuff” (62) of the grotesque liberation. However, these “cheap,” grotesquely liberated individuals derive “a certain grisly satisfaction” from their

new grotesque freedom. They remain satisfied that their “grisly” grotesque division keeps them free from the tyranny of illusory sources of perfect stability and completeness. They revel in their incomplete-complete, “in-between” voyage on “The Ship of Death.”

Chapter 3

Eating Civilization: Aldous Huxley's Scientific Grotesque System of Liberation within

Brave New World

“Did you eat something that didn't agree with?” asked Bernard.

The Savage nodded. “I ate civilization.”

“What?”

“It poisoned me; I was defiled. And then,” he added, in a lower tone, “I ate my own wickedness.”

- *Brave New World*, Chapter 18

Within his preface to his 1932 novel, *Brave New World*, Aldous Huxley at one point clearly states his primary thematic focus. He explains that, “The theme of *Brave New World* is not the advancement of science as such; it is the advancement of science as it affects human individuals” (8). The importance of this quotation stems from its presentation of what could be called the ramifications of scientific progress. Huxley remains less concerned with “science as such,” and more so preoccupied with the human condition. That is, what, Huxley asks, specifically happens to “human individuals” within a society where science assumes an all-encompassing, all-invasive role? John Grigsby helps point towards the answer to this question, while also supporting Huxley's concern for the individual, when he writes that, “Huxley's primary thematic concern in his fiction is with the ramifications of humanness” (para. 9). Huxley, then, with Grigsby's help, focuses his attention upon the very definition “of humanness” within *Brave New World*, or upon how exactly individuals are affected and influenced by scientific developments. This attention to the individual only goes so far, though, in that Huxley never clearly explains the exact result of these “ramifications” and after-effects of scientific progress

on “humanness.” What exactly happens to individuals within an overly scientific society? Or, better yet, how can the effect of science on individuals be measured and calculated in order to best understand the consequences that result? The answers to these questions reside within an understanding of Huxley’s scientific adaptation of the Lacanian-derived grotesque system of liberation.

Within *Brave New World*, Huxley displays this grotesqueness by applying scientific progress specifically to the Symbolic stage of the grotesque system. As outlined at length in the introduction, a Symbolic, following Lacanian theories, creates false, illusory states of perfection and absolute stability for the sake of permanent individual contentedness. Huxley claims that scientific and technological advancements best secure such Symbolic quests for absolute security and stability. These advancements provide the means and materials for the illusion of perfection sought by a Lacanian Symbolic. This scientific Brave New World Symbolic in turn creates what Thomas Carlyle, in his, “Signs of the Times,” calls “the Age of Machinery” (59). Machinery, “in every inward and outward sense of that word” (59), absolutely stabilizes Huxley’s “outward” scientific Symbolic by “inward[ly]” making human beings as mechanically predictable as the machines they serve. Therefore, the grotesque battle that ensues when the Real collides with the Symbolic fortress revolves around, as Huxley writes above, “the advancement of science.” The Lacanian Real, living up to its definition, wants to break apart the science-backed Symbolic illusion, or Carlyle’s “Age of Machinery,” in order to free individuals into the so-called “Real” knowledge of division, insecurity, and imperfection. Individuals now exist liberated by the grotesque battle between the Real and the scientific Symbolic. By functioning as a force of liberation, Huxley’s scientific grotesque allies itself with the

camp of critics and authors opposed to the so-called false critics of the grotesque that develop from Friedrich Schlegel. These Schlegelian critics incorrectly view the grotesque as an arouser of the fleeting emotions of terror and comedy. As Wolfgang Kayser, one of the most prominent, Schlegelian critics of the grotesque, writes, this Schlegelian grotesqueness creates a situation “which is both ridiculous and terrifying” (53). Once these emotions disappear, though, with the removal of the grotesque stimulus, the grotesque itself dissipates. Huxley saves the grotesque from such a Schlegelian conception of the term by presenting the grotesque not as a mere arouser of fleeting emotions, but instead as a force of liberation for individuals falsely enslaved to the science-backed Symbolic illusion. In fact, Huxley’s status as a liberator runs throughout the critical discourse surrounding him. Writers ranging from Kenneth Clark, who remarks upon Huxley’s “liberating books” (Huxley, *A Memorial* 17), to Stephen Spender (see Woodcock 1) consistently regard Huxley as a liberator of the illusion enslaved. However, when specifically analyzed as a grotesque liberator, Huxley’s “liberating books,” and his position within the anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque, stand on shaky ground until assured by the final, Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system.

The grotesque liberation of an individual from a scientific Symbolic exists in a fragile state because the individual must be compelled to suffer for their freedom by unrelentingly persisting in their divided, torn state. This grotesque-induced suffering proves especially difficult because the scientific Symbolic illusion, although battered and broken down by the Real, still stands as a threat. It can lure grotesquely liberated, suffering individuals back to the Symbolic illusion by promising to replace the pain of liberation with the numbing pleasures made possible by scientific and technological

advancements. To prevent this outcome, and to consequently maintain Huxley's position within the anti-Schlegelian camp of grotesque writers, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic must commence. Within this stage of the grotesque system, the grotesque battle between the scientific Symbolic and the Real permanently rages in order to ensure the grotesque liberation. The scientific Symbolic therefore stands incapable of gaining a foot-hold, or firm, stable place to re-assert its comforting illusion of scientific-bred pleasures that draw individual's back into the Symbolic fortress. Denied re-entry into the scientific Symbolic, the individual must remain grotesquely liberated, or permanently divided and torn between the lost Symbolic illusion, and the Symbolically destabilizing forces of the Real. In consequence, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic preserves Huxley's status as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque. He uses the grotesque as a force of liberation specifically from a Symbolic illusion upheld by the security and stability created by scientific and technological advancements. To best display Huxley's anti-Schlegelian, scientific grotesque system of liberation, a series of textual markers, unique to each of the stage's discussed above, must be presented.

Issues relating to characterization, monologic voice, relative spatiality, setting, progressive mobility, symbolism, and repetition mark the presence of Huxley's scientific Symbolic within a text. Beginning with characterization, Symbolic characters display docility and malleability, meaning that they are easily controlled and taught what to believe and think by the governing scientific Symbolic. Such a Symbolic best ensures this docility of Symbolic characters by relying upon monologic voice, or a voice that dictates and commands, and subsumes within itself supreme authority over Symbolic existence. Symbolic characters, commanding by Huxley's *Brave New World* monologic voice, in

turn become, as Huxley writes in his 1948 novel, *Ape and Essence*, “wretched slaves of wheels and ledgers” (90). As this quote helps reveal, Symbolic characters become so malleable and docile for the sake of Symbolic permanent stability that they in fact come to resemble the very machines they serve to maintain order. These “wretched slaves” in turn possess Benthamite utilitarianism of absolute utility, or use, in service of the scientific Symbolic. The Brave New World molds these characters in shapes that best serve the Brave New World. Gina Macdonald describes some of these useful shapes for Symbolic characters when she explains, “In this future world there can be no individuals, only variations of a pattern” (para. 5). Symbolic characters indeed exist as “variations of a pattern,” or, more specifically, as characters that present the endlessly repeated pattern of absolute docility and conformity to the driving, monologic ideas of Symbolic, scientific stability. In line with Macdonald’s endless “variations of a pattern,” these Symbolic characters exhibit this conformity because of the Symbolic insistence upon precisely cataloging and defining existence. The scientific Symbolic makes characters as predictable as the “wheels and ledgers” they toil over to best secure permanent stability. This docility and necessary conformity of character directly informs issues of Symbolic agency/progressive mobility.

Docile, malleable, monologically governed Symbolic characters resist actions that subvert Symbolic stability, and largely remain unmoved and unmoving, and in turn mimic the precise machines they maintain for continued order. Huxley remarks on this machine-like quality of Symbolic characters in his essay, “The New Romanticism,” when he writes that these characters can be “transformed by proper training into a perfect machine” (215). The lack of active character agency due to this “proper training” of

Symbolic characters into “perfect machine[s]” creates deliberately negative progressive mobility, meaning that characters literally cannot progress, or move away, from Symbolic sources. They mobilize and conglomerate around fixed, Symbolic points, determined to stay put, or remain screwed down as machines, for the sake of absolute security.

Symbolic settings also deal with issues of progressive mobility, but more so couch this lack of character agency within notions of relative spatiality. By presenting scenes of efficiency and numbness, Symbolic settings influence Symbolic characters to remain negatively mobile. Why depart from Symbolic sources when they provide all wants and needs, and keep individuals perfectly content for the sake of undiminished stability and security? Symbolic negative mobility informs relative spatiality because Symbolic characters necessarily exist within small, confining spaces relative to Symbolic centers and settings. These characters willingly renounce expansive spaces for the comforting confinement provided by the all-controlling scientific Symbolic. In order to influence Symbolic characters to accept confining, Symbolic relative spatiality, Huxley employs the power of Symbolic repetition. Endlessly repeated phrases that voice the necessity of upholding Symbolic stability behave as a Symbolic social conditioning mechanism. That is, Symbolically prescribed phrases, when repeated enough, bolster permanent stability and order by conditioning Symbolic characters to resist ideas and activities that threaten their perfect contentedness within the scientific Symbolic illusion. Huxley specifically calls such Symbolic repetition, “hypnopaedia,” while Martin Heidegger calls it, “*Regelkreis*,” or a type of electronic, closed circuit that helps enslave Symbolic characters to the Brave New World. Symbolic repetition flows out from the Brave New World, further conditions docile Symbolic characters, before returning to the Symbolic source.

Heidegger's *Regelkreis*, with its scientific/electronic connotations, therefore adds to the understanding of Symbolic repetition. Both repetition and *Regelkreis* use scientific ideas (of conditioning and a closed, electronic circuit) to explain the scientific underpinnings of the Brave New World Symbolic (consult Heidegger, *Distanz*, pages 11-22 for more information on *Regelkreis*). Finally, Symbolic symbols represent objects that stand in for the scientific Symbolic. These symbols therefore symbolize the enslavement and confinement of Symbolic characters to the Symbolic illusion, and include, among other symbols within *Brave New World*, the safe Mustapha Mond, one of the novel's World Controllers, houses within his office to lock away Symbolically destabilizing materials. While these various textual markers indicate the presence of Huxley's scientific Symbolic, they remain under constant threat by Real elements of destabilization.

As outlined above, the Real stage of the grotesque system attempts to tear down the scientific Symbolic illusion through the use of deliberately anti-scientific and anti-rational devices. Such Real devices, within a text, include issues of polysemous anti-symbolism, progressive mobility, characterization, ineffableness, relative spatiality, and setting. Starting with characterization, Real characters, unlike their Symbolic counterparts, resist the scientific Symbolic through committed, rebellious acts driven by passion, deep feeling, and an overall appreciation for, as Huxley writes within, *Literature and Science*, the "subtler and more penetrating forms of expression" (10). Huxley goes on to call such subtle "expression," "the ineffable" (10). Real characters, then, resist the absolute precision sought by Symbolic illusions by engaging in actions that remain "ineffable," or unable to be fully understood and controlled by Symbolic structures. These Real characters slip away, sliding through the fingers of a Symbolic because of

their determined ineffableness, and in turn resemble “a kind of hydra” (Huxley, “Spinoza’s,” 73). Like this mythic creature, Real characters continually annoy and pester Symbolic structures. If a Real hydra head falters (or is chopped off), another springs up, ready to continue the grotesque conflict against a Symbolic. These Real, hydra-like characters also highlight notions of Real progressive mobility and relative spatiality. Symbolically ineffable Real characters necessarily exhibit positive progressive mobility, or actively depart from Symbolic centers as part of their Symbolic undermining. This Real progressive mobility consequently becomes, as Huxley writes in his essay, “Foreheads Villainous Low,” “rather immoral” (208), since, in a Symbolic, “Happiness is a product of noise, company, motion, and the possession of objects” (208). Progressively mobile, Real characters are therefore Symbolically “immoral” because they willingly repudiate these products that help secure Symbolic “Happiness” and permanent stability. By departing from Symbolic centers through their Real progressive mobility, such characters also reveal their expansive relative spatiality.

Real characters, utilizing their Real progressive mobility, typically exist within wide, expansive spaces relative to the confinement and entrapment associated with Symbolic centers. This Real, expansive spatiality implies that Real settings must similarly inhabit spaces both free and distant from Symbolic sources. Real settings consequently showcase the natural world, rather than the artificial, scientifically engineered Symbolic illusion. Finally, polysemous anti-symbolism indicates the presence of the Real within a text. Real anti-symbols symbolize objects that stand in direct opposition to the scientific Symbolic, and so specifically represent deliberately anti-scientific, ineffable objects. This ineffableness assigned to Real anti-symbols adds the

polysemous aspect because, by representing objects beyond the control of the scientific Symbolic, Real anti-symbols move between many signs indicative of Real destabilization. The fluidity of signs mirrors the fluid ineffableness of anti-symbols that slip past the controlling scientific Symbolic. Within *Brave New World*, John the Savage represents such a polysemous anti-symbol. His Real rebellion against the scientific Symbolic takes many forms. It ranges from his unbridled passion for art and poetry, to his literal departure from the scientific Symbolic. He cannot be contained, that is, within a single sign of the Real rebelliousness he represents as an anti-symbol. This Real polysemous anti-symbolism, when coupled with the other Real textual markers remarked upon above, contributes to the eventual grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space.

The Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system serves the important function of preserving the liberation that results from the grotesque conflict between the scientific Symbolic and the anti-scientific Real. It keeps the grotesquely liberated individual torn and incomplete, or prevented from setting down the heavy burden of their grotesque freedom for the lost scientific comforts of the Symbolic illusion. Textually, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic performs such an important task by employing the Real elements of Symbolic destabilization already outlined. These elements, within a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, predominate, or literally appear more frequently than the Symbolic markers they grotesquely battle down. The Real forces overwhelm the scientific Symbolic. In consequence of this Real superiority of numbers within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage, the Symbolic cannot successfully influence grotesquely liberated individuals to rejoin the Symbolic illusion. It, quite simply, does not appear

enough within a specific part of a text to pose any actual threat to the grotesquely liberated. Huxley helps further explain this Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system within his epigraph to *Brave New World*.

Huxley's epigraph comes from the Russian philosopher, Nicolas Berdiaeff. In relation to Huxley's grotesque system, and especially his Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage, the last sentence of the epigraph is the most important part, and reads as follows:

Et peut-être un siècle nouveau commence-t-il, un siècle où les intellectuels et la classe cultivée reverent aux moyens d'éviter les utopies et de retourner à une société non utopique, moins "parfaite" et plus libre. (1)

Guinevera Nance, writing in her work, *Aldous Huxley* translates this passage in the following manner:

And perhaps a new age will begin, an age in which the intellectuals and the cultivated class will dream of how to avoid utopia and to return to a non-utopian society, less perfect and more free. (91)

This final sentence occupies an important position within the ongoing discussion of Huxley's scientific grotesque system because it in many ways foreshadows the novel's movement through each stage of the system. That is, the "new age" Berdiaeff envisions is the "new age" of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage reached by the end of the novel. After the grotesque battle, with the Real forces of anti-scientific instability raging against the Symbolic illusion of scientific perfection, Berdiaeff's "utopia," or that seemingly perfect, scientific Brave New World, no longer possesses absolute authority over individuals. In consequence of this Symbolic destruction, "a non-utopian society" emerges, or one that, like the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space, exists "less perfect and more free." The Non-Symbolic Symbolic proves "less perfect" because the grotesque battle rips apart the scientific Symbolic illusion of perfection. Due to this Symbolic

destruction, individuals emerge “more free,” or liberated by the anti-scientific Real into the so-called “more Real” state of grotesque freedom. Grotesquely liberated individuals remain torn between the lost scientific Symbolic illusion, and the Real forces of anti-scientific instability. How to achieve this “more free,” Non-Symbolic Symbolic state Huxley broaches within his epigraph requires an understanding of how his novel employs the textual markers elaborated upon above as indicators of his scientific-based grotesque system.

Commencing this journey through Huxley’s grotesque system, his preface to *Brave New World* presents the governing, scientific ideas that support the opening, Symbolic stage of this system. These foundational Symbolic ideas revolve around Huxley’s discussion of what he calls, the “really revolutionary revolution” (8). Further qualifying how exactly this revolution creates the scientific Symbolic illusion, Huxley writes that such a revolution involves “a deep, personal revolution in human minds and bodies” (12). Huxley’s revolutionary revolution differs from past revolutions because it focuses upon “human minds and bodies” as the intended areas of revolutionary activity. In other, more superficial revolutions, “mere politics and economics” (9) take precedence over matters of the mind and body. According to Huxley, these superficial revolutions only scratch the surface because they coerce people to accept new economic or political practices doomed, at some point, to end again in revolution, or in that dreaded, anti-scientific and anti-rational Real instability that the scientific Symbolic stands determined to prevent. A cycle of revolutions consequently commences. Social upheaval leads to some revised social state of somewhat dubious permanence, until another social revolution springs up and destroys the previously stable social order. Robert Baker

specifically calls this revolutionary flux “historicism,” and speaks of its constant social upheavals as “dynamic-evolutionary change” (*Dark* 6). For Huxley, though, this “dynamic-evolutionary change” of Baker’s “historicism” serves as an exercise in unnecessary futility.

All of the painstaking, typically bloody achievements of a revolution cease to matter, or, perhaps worse yet, morph into perverted ideas or movements. Due to such concerns, Huxley begs the question: “How does society evolve if permanently caught and trapped within an apparently inescapable cycle of stability-revolution?” His answer to this question informs the primary preoccupation of the scientific Symbolic, or its quest to create and make permanent the Symbolic illusion of perfect stability and security in order to avoid futile revolutionary flux. Huxley makes this preoccupation clear when he writes in the preface, “It is in order to achieve stability that they [the Brave New World] carry out, by scientific means, the ultimate, personal, really revolutionary revolution” (9). Social evolution occurs, in that the stability-revolution model breaks apart, and the Symbolic illusion emerges victorious, when a social order “achieve[s] stability” specifically through the use of “scientific means.” These “scientific means” in turn solve what past, “superficial” revolutions could never fully accomplish. Instead of coercing people, typically by the threat of bodily harm that most revolutions entail, to accept new social and political forms, “the ultimate, personal, really revolutionary revolution” subjugates both the body and the mind in its quest for permanent, scientific-based stability. This combination of bodily and mental subjugation in fact leads to the “really revolutionary” component of this “ultimate, personal” revolution in the first place. That is, the “really revolutionary revolution” derives from the fact that, instead of the

temporary stability of past revolutions, permanent scientific Symbolic stability is achieved and maintained at all costs. Bulent Diken summarizes this outcome of Huxley's revolution when he writes, "It [the Brave New World] is what is left in a society when you take away the possibility of revolt, revolution and critique, a world in which radical change is rendered not only impossible but also undesirable" (153). Absolute Symbolic stability results in this society because "revolt, revolution and critique" have been scientifically purged from the minds of Symbolic characters. These characters simply fall in line with the Brave New World's governing ideas, believing the entire time that their enslavement to the scientific Symbolic in fact becomes the greatest source of their continued freedom and perfect contentedness.

To convince the so-called "subjugated masses" of Symbolic characters to love their servitude, and to in turn ardently strive to uphold the scientific Symbolic illusion, stands as the great task of those people specifically assigned to uphold Symbolic stage, permanent stability. Robert Combs remarks upon this interesting aspect of Huxley's work, where Symbolic characters love their servitude, when he writes that Huxley "tended to think... that people were willing to be complicit in their own enslavement without needing to be threatened" (161). The World Controllers of the Brave New World make Symbolic characters "complicit in their own enslavement" to the Symbolic illusion. As highlighted above, Huxley says that these Controllers achieve this complicit enslavement of the masses to the Symbolic illusion through "scientific means." He implies that the body and mind best accept the Symbolic illusion through science, or through the large scale use of various scientific techniques and procedures to maintain the illusion of permanent stability. Huxley in fact specifically explains how these "scientific

means” that create and uphold the scientific Symbolic stage of the grotesque system involve “a greatly improved technique of suggestion – through infant conditioning and, later, with the aid of drugs, such as scopolamine” (12). Huxley then outlines “a fully developed science of human differences, enabling government managers to assign any given individual to his or her proper place in the social and economic hierarchy” (12). The final two requirements for the creation of the really revolutionary, scientific Symbolic include “a substitute for alcohol and the other narcotics,” and “a foolproof system of eugenics, designed to standardize the human product and so to facilitate the task of the managers” (12). The importance of these four necessary requirements for the creation of Huxley’s scientific Symbolic stems from the use of science to specifically control the mind.

According to Huxley, in those past, superficial revolutions, Real forces of destabilizing instability, especially Real characters driven by uncontrollable, rebellious passions, forever grotesquely destroyed the Symbolic quest for permanent stability because the body took precedence over the mind. People accepted a revolution, and lived within the Symbolic illusion, largely due to the ever-present threat of bodily harm and danger. However, as discussed, this revolution supported by bodily subjugation perpetually failed, and, rather than creating stability, led to constant instability and chaos. Only a Brave New World manager willing to implement the “scientific means” outlined above successfully halts this futile revolutionary flux by establishing the scientific Symbolic illusion. For Huxley, the Marquis de Sade, given his life of unapologetic perversity, represents such a figure that strives to create a permanent Symbolic state. In fact, according to Huxley, de Sade serves as “the apostle of the truly revolutionary

revolution” (9). He disregarded the political and economic superficialities that inevitably broke down into destabilizing chaos in favor of mental and bodily acts of purgation. Huxley explains these so-called “Sadistic purgative acts” when he writes, “individual men, women and children, whose bodies were henceforward to become the common sexual property of all and whose minds were to be purged of all the natural decencies, all the laboriously acquired inhibitions of traditional civilization” (9). Huxley then continues with the contradictory remark, “Between Sadism and the really revolutionary revolution there is, of course, no necessary or inevitable connection” (9). In point of fact, when viewed in light of the scientific Symbolic, the purgative acts of Sadism and the revolutionary revolution of permanent stability prove largely identical. They possess a type of sine qua non relationship, where one cannot exist without the other. Sadism purges “individual men, women and children” of the Real forces of destabilization “laboriously acquired” by the persistent revolutionary upheavals “of traditional civilization.” In his 1921 novel, *Crome Yellow*, Huxley names the people that perform these Sadistic purgative acts, “the Madmen” (243). These individuals, like de Sade, prepare the way for the scientific Symbolic, or act as “the tool of some superior intelligence” (244) that insists upon the mental and bodily subjugation of docile, dumbly accepting Symbolic characters in order to create and maintain permanent stability. Such Symbolic characters, the victims of “the Madmen,” become the blank slates upon which the “scientific means” of the revolutionary revolution create Huxley’s scientific Symbolic.

Within *Brave New World*, Huxley displays these “scientific means” that make possible the scientific Symbolic illusion of the grotesque system through a technique of

mind manipulation he calls, “hypnopœdia.” This scientific procedure conditions Symbolic characters to accept and uphold the scientific Symbolic illusion due to the Symbolic repetition of certain phrases. Machines, behaving like the closed circuit of Heidegger’s *Regelkreis* discussed above, continually repeat particular sayings to sleeping infants in order to subconsciously imprint information. When a Real act of anti-scientific destabilization arises, and consequently threatens the stability of the scientific Symbolic, Symbolic characters, perfectly conditioned by hypnopœdia, remain calm and stable by mindlessly repeating a subconsciously acquired phrase. By so doing, Symbolic repetition fulfills its function of helping preserve Symbolic stability. Symbolic characters, speaking hypnopœdic phrases, derive comfort from there assurances of stability, and consequently resist Symbolically destabilizing activities. Huxley exemplifies this use of hypnopœdia as a scientific tool that helps maintain Symbolic stability in the hypnopœdic lesson that follows:

Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they’re so frightfully clever. I’m really awfully glad I’m a Beta, because I don’t work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I *don’t* want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They’re too stupid to be able... (35)

According to the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning, the person in charge of these hypnopœdic lessons, this social conditioning exercise in Elementary Class Consciousness repeats “forty or fifty times more before they [the children] wake; then again on Saturday. A hundred and twenty times three times a week for thirty months. After which they go on to a more advanced lesson” (35). The reasoning behind each child’s so-called “progress” to “a more advanced lesson” develops from the logic that Symbolic repetition serves as a necessary defense mechanism for Huxley’s scientific Symbolic. A perfectly

conditioned Symbolic character having, as Huxley writes in his essay, “Hypnopœdia,” “swallowed whole” (312) the specific material from a lesson, simply repeats these subconsciously acquired phrases prescribed by the all-encompassing, Symbolic monologic voice whenever momentarily destabilized by Real, anti-scientific forces that question the validity, for instance, of the Brave New World social structure governed by Alphas. This Symbolic character simply repeats the above lesson verbatim, and thereby reaffirms their belief in the absolute perfection of the scientific Symbolic illusion. In consequence, anti-scientific Real forces dissipate, and the scientific Symbolic, here preserved by the “scientific means” of hypnopœdia, or that “greatly improved technique of suggestion,” reigns supreme.

Huxley further explains the ability of hypnopœdia to preserve the scientific Symbolic illusion when he specifically defines the term within the novel. He places the definition within the mouth of the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning, who explains that, “there must be words, but words without reason. In brief, hypnopœdia” (36). According to these remarks, Symbolic characters must receive, during a hypnopœdic exercise, “words without reason,” or words that do not reasonably explain why particular aspects of the scientific Symbolic must necessarily exist. For instance, in the passage above on class consciousness, the lesson only continually asserts that Alphas deserve to rule because of their cleverness and good work ethic. However, the passage never adequately explains why and how these Alphas are so clever in the first. The lesson only goes so far, just as the Symbolic character hearing hypnopœdic words only goes so far. Both stop short at the pernicious questioning that could gradually chip away at the validity of the scientific Symbolic illusion. Hypnopœdia therefore presents words without

developed reasoning behind them, or words that only voice ideas in support of permanent stability and security. Scientifically conditioned Symbolic characters, for the sake of maintaining the scientific Symbolic illusion, must not hear that clever Alphas rule by keeping the lower ranks weak and mindless. Such knowledge would threaten permanent stability by perhaps inciting these lower, subjugated ranks to rebel, and possibly topple the Symbolic illusion so painstakingly crafted by the “scientific means” of Huxley’s revolutionary revolution. As Jerome Meckier suggests, these Symbolic characters must become “facsimiles” (182), a word which sheds light on the Symbolic stability made possible by such “scientific means” as hypnopœdia. Symbolic characters must become mindless copies of a Symbolically prescribed hypnopœdic lesson. These characters safety “print off,” in a sense, from the scientific Symbolic machine of stability, and, in turn existing as machine-like “facsimiles,” readily receive the hypnopœdic commands of fellow machines. They feed off Brave New World machines. D.H. Lawrence, a close friend of Huxley’s, in fact remarks on this human-machine relationship when he writes, “We don’t *want* to hear their actual voices: only transmitted through a machine” (“Men Must” 590). “Facsimiled” Symbolic characters “don’t *want* to hear” human voices because, being machine-like, they prefer hypnopœdic transmissions sent “through a machine.” They hear the machine, obey the machine, and ultimately serve and sustain the machine that drives the scientific Symbolic.

Following the D.H.C.’s definition of hypnopœdia, a prominent Symbolic symbol appears that also speaks towards Symbolic notions of progressive mobility and relative spatiality. The D.H.C. describes this Symbolic symbol when he speaks about, “drops of liquid sealingwax, drops that adhere, incrust, incorporate themselves with what they fall

on, till finally the rock is all one scarlet blob” (36). The mind of each Symbolic character, symbolized as an un-thinking, un-critical “rock,” becomes even farther removed from potential Real sources of anti-scientific destabilization by being covered with “drops of liquid sealingwax, drops that adhere, incrust, incorporate themselves with what they fall on.” These hypnopædic “drops,” falling upon the sleeping minds of Symbolic characters, serve as another protective wall that insulates the scientific Symbolic from Real forces of instability. The drops “adhere, incrust, [and] incorporate themselves” onto the mind of each Symbolic character until, by gradually accumulating, the potentially subversive thoughts that could help batter down the scientific Symbolic illusion remain covered and hidden beneath “the scarlet blob” of hypnopædia. The continually repeated phrases and lessons of each hypnopædic lesson choke off and block all sources of anti-scientific Real destabilization, leaving the mind in a type of permanent paralysis of Symbolic negative progressive mobility. Such a perfectly controlled and scientifically conditioned mind, lacking in all thoughts of progressing away from the scientific Symbolic illusion because of hypnopædic suggestions to remain permanently stable and unmoved by Real anti-scientific impulses, consequently exists perfectly content hearing only “words without reason.” The scientific Symbolic stage of the grotesque system therefore stands especially strong and formidable within Huxley’s novel, since science, by controlling how people think through the “scientific means” of hypnopædia, necessarily controls the Symbolic’s ability to successfully ensure its firm grasp on permanent security and stability. That is, Symbolic characters cannot rebel if their minds remain a permanent “scarlet blob” of hypnopædic suggestions. Anti-scientific Real acts of rebellion are literally un-thinkable. It in turn becomes a hard and arduous task to convince perfectly conditioned Symbolic

characters to realize that, by employing the liberating influences of the grotesque system, they exist as the carefully conditioned slaves laboring to uphold the scientific Symbolic illusion.

Within *Brave New World*, the difficult task of grotesquely battering down the scientific Symbolic illusion with Real forces of anti-scientific destabilization falls upon the shoulders of John the Savage, the ideal Real character in the book. John stands especially capable of succeeding in this arduous task because he remains a permanent outsider even when physically within the scientific Symbolic. Before being taken to London, John lives on what Huxley refers to as the New Mexican Savage Reservation, and, in this way kept free from the Brave New World, he never underwent the scientific lessons of hypnopædia. John's life on the Savage Reservation in fact connects him to the modern celebration of primitivism discussed in the introduction. John remains uncorrupted and unspoiled by the so-called "civilization" of the scientific Symbolic. As Clive Bell explains, John in turn exists with Real sight, since he can "see emotionally," as opposed to the "civilized... [people that] use their eyes only to collect information" (*Art* 81). John's primitivism allows him to see, in a sense, the Real underworld. He "see[s] emotionally," or sees those scientifically ungovernable emotions (discussed below) that ultimately help him grotesquely batter down the scientific Symbolic. John's primitivism, by connecting him to the Real underworld, also connects him directly to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict. Bernard McElroy makes this connection between primitivism and grotesqueness clear when he writes, "The grotesque does not address the rationalist in us or the scientist in us, but the vestigial primitive in us, the child in us, the potential psychotic in us" (5). John, it could be said, therefore literally embodies the anti-

Schlegelian grotesque. He does not embody, that is, “the rationalist” or “the scientist.” He instead exudes a “vestigial” primitiveness that grotesquely combats these upper world pursuits. John’s mind, like his grotesquely liberating primitiveness, exists free from the hypnopædic “scarlet blob” of the Brave New World. In reference to the book’s epigraph, John possesses a “less perfect and more free” mind, or a mind that adamantly refuses to blindly believe in the perfect stability and security of the scientific Symbolic illusion. John’s mind is “more free” because he cannot be enslaved to the Brave New World, or because he refuses the numbing Symbolic enticements of “the rationalist” and “the scientist.” His task as a Real character therefore involves making Symbolic characters similarly “less perfect and more free,” or able to “see emotionally” as “vestigial primitive[s],” by utilizing the liberating power of the grotesque system.

John goes about performing this grotesque liberation by rallying the anti-scientific Real forces around the banner of passion, deep-feeling, and a genuine love for those activities suppressed by the scientific Symbolic. Such rebellious activities therefore engage Real ineffableness previously discussed in relation to Huxley’s, *Literature and Science*, and especially include John’s love of the ineffableness of Shakespeare and poetry. These Real ineffable pursuits teach Symbolic characters about the passions and deep feelings that remain Symbolically uncontrollable and ineffable to the precision-minded scientific Symbolic. Shakespeare and poetry encourage Symbolic characters to feel deeply, and to in turn become troubled and disturbed by ineffable philosophical considerations concerning the truth of life and existence. Riled up by this Real ineffableness, Symbolic characters will ideally rip off their protective “sealing wax,” and insist that the scientific Symbolic dive deeper into their “words without reason,” or

answer why and how the Symbolic illusion remains permanently stable in the first place. This insistence upon deeper meaning becomes even more dangerous to the scientific Symbolic because it entails allusiveness. That is, previously content Symbolic characters, egged on by John's Real ineffableness, ultimately reach back to certain texts, such as Shakespeare, and use their rebellious ideas against the scientific Symbolic. Allusions become Real weapons that provide outside, textual support against the Symbolic's claim to possessing absolute knowledge. These various Real forces gathered around John most directly clash against the scientific Symbolic, and thereby attempt to grotesquely free the greatest number of Symbolic characters, within the seventeenth chapter of *Brave New World*.

This chapter details John's grotesque confrontation with Mustapha Mond, one of the World Controllers of the Brave New World. John's grotesque confrontation against one of the leaders of the scientific Symbolic becomes especially pronounced because it takes place within the confinement of Mond's office. This confinement in fact adds a sense of destiny to the confrontation. John and Mond cannot hide or run away, or retreat from the grotesque battle at hand. The grotesque conflict comes to a climax, and each character must either triumph, or depart defeated. Here, then, in Mond's office, the fate of the grotesque within the novel is determined. The almost cocoon-like space of Mond's office also interestingly hints at "the scarlet blob" discussed above in relation to hypnopœdia. It exists seemingly secure in its confinement, or serves as a protected Symbolic setting where Mond can safely work to maintain the permanent stability of the scientific Symbolic. However, in this chapter, John grotesquely fights his way to one of the leaders of the scientific Symbolic, ripping apart with his Real, active progressive

mobility the many protective layers of “the scarlet blob” in order to discover, and by discovering destroy, the forces that maintain the scientific Symbolic. This grotesque battle that ultimately leads John to a Brave New World leader also imparts a *sanctum sanctorum* quality to Mond’s office. John penetrates this sacred space of the scientific Symbolic, or that space that serves as an organizing source for all of the “scientific means” that help uphold the Symbolic illusion. He in turn becomes a Real, anti-scientific intruder that demands answers from Mond, who, in this context, becomes equated with a quasi-God, or supreme power, that creates the scientific Symbolic. The etymology of “Mond” helps secure his connection to a type of God because “Mond” begs ties to the Latin-Romance branch of languages where such a word evokes “world,” or even “universe.” In this way etymologically linked to a divine-like figure in control of his respective scientific Symbolic universe, Mond’s grotesque confrontation with John assumes almost Biblical overtones. He must battle down John’s Real uprising in order to maintain both the scientific Symbolic world he helps create through “scientific means,” and the enslaved status of Symbolic characters. Peter Firchow remarks upon Mond’s Biblical-like quest to keep Symbolic characters docile when he describes Mond as “a ‘good’ shepherd who does everything for his charges as long as they remain sheep” (102). Mond fiercely protects his blindly accepting, Symbolic flock from Real characters like John, who refuses to become a sheep within Mond’s scientific Symbolic universe. He deliberately disobeys the “good shepherd” for the sake of the grotesque liberation.

With Mond in this way established as a divine-like figure, and John as a rebellious, Real character fighting against the “good shepherd” of the scientific Symbolic, it proves especially fitting that most of chapter seventeen deals with a discussion of

religion, or, more specifically, with the role of God in the Brave New World. Mond and John's respective reactions to the opening of such a subject display their combative positions within the ensuing grotesque conflict. Mond begins by asking John, "you know all about God, I suppose" (207), to which John replies with the incomplete sentence, "Well..." (207). In line with his position as a Brave New World power that upholds the supposedly complete and stable scientific Symbolic illusion, Mond, in this quotation, occupies a similarly complete position. He assumes that John already knows "all about God," or already possesses complete knowledge and understanding regarding such a being. Mond thinks in terms of absolutes. However, John reveals his dedication to Symbolically destabilizing incompleteness, or to the great, liberating gift of the grotesque battle to become "less perfect and more free," through his incomplete sentence, "Well..." a sentence that disappears into memory and Real ineffableness. John, that is, literally voices his incomplete, Real stance, a stance that grotesquely battles against the Brave New World's ever-persistent quest to codify and subsequently uphold the supposed completeness of objects, such as the perfect completeness and stability of the scientific Symbolic illusion. John's specific, incomplete memory following his ineffable "Well..." also demonstrates his commitment to grotesquely freeing Symbolic characters from the scientific Symbolic.

Following his ineffable "Well..." John remembers, "something about solitude... about the precipice, the plunge into shadowy darkness, about death. He would have liked to speak; but there were no words" (207). John's memories about God revolve around remove and absence, or with Real, active progressive mobility that undermines the permanent stability of an illusory Symbolic. Huxley, in his essay, "The Essence of

Religion” from his 1927 collection of essays entitled, *Proper Studies*, praises such a Real, progressively mobile approach to religion, or to the religion in praise of solitude and distance from all-organizing Symbolic centers. Huxley warns, though, that “By its very superiority the religion of solitude is condemned to be the religion of the few” (178). John, although free and distant from Symbolic centers due to his Real progressive mobility, worships alone. He at first removes himself from other people, remembering, as he does, “about solitude.” Then, the more morbid image of endless falling supplants this initial removal into solitude. John remembers, “the precipice, the plunge into shadowy darkness, about death.” This “plunge,” or fall “into shadowy darkness,” represents the Real anti-symbol of endlessly falling away from the scientific Symbolic illusion. John, that is, similarly falls away from the Symbolic illusion’s permanent presence, or attempts to literally remove himself from Mond, and all that he scientifically upholds within the Brave New World of London. It could in turn be argued that John falls “into [the] shadowy darkness” of the grotesque underworld reality. Such a subterranean place provides John with the grotesquely liberating “solitude” of irrationality. Upper world science and reason disappear, and, like the Underground Man in Fyodor Dostoevsky’s novel, *Notes from Underground* (1864), John possesses the freedom to question the validity of logic and rationality.

Dostoevsky’s Underground Man specifically questions the supposedly unquestionable mathematical certainty that $2 \times 2 = 4$. For the Underground Man, the unquestioned certainty of this equation is tyrannical, and, to counter this upper world tyranny, he prefers the irrational beauty of the anti-equation, $2 \times 2 = 5$ (consult Part I, “Underground,” pgs. 3-41). Such reference not only to this anti-equation, but also to

Dostoevsky's novel as a whole, proves worthwhile for several reasons. As discussed in the introduction, Dostoevsky's *Underground Man*, because of his name, connects to the grotesque. His name evokes the underground reality of the grotesque. This under world place celebrates his irrational anti-equation, since it grotesquely pits him against the upper world's dedication to reason and rationality. Dostoevsky's *Underground Man* also serves as an ideal embodiment of John, and in turn sheds additional light on John's conversation with Mond, and on his eventual departure from London for the English countryside. John, that is, while talking to Mond, identifies with the *Underground Man*. He seeks the "solitude" of the underground reality, or that grotesquely liberated place away from Brave New World London where he can celebrate not only the irrational beauty of anti-equations, but also the bodily discomforts that undermine the comfort-obsessed scientific Symbolic. During his conversation with Mond, John declares his determination to celebrate the irrational underworld when he says, "But I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness, I want sin" (215). John wants to live like Dostoevsky's *Underground Man*. He wants "God," "poetry," "real danger," and "sin" in an upper world reality where the pursuit of these wants stands as an irrational act. In order to live in the underground "solitude" of these irrational wants, John must therefore escape from the rational upper world for the Real setting of the English countryside. This place, located far away from the all-encroaching and all-invasive scientific Symbolic illusion, allows John to employ his Real progressive mobility, and fall into the grotesque underworld. However, before John can become like Dostoevsky's *Underground Man*, Mond grotesquely battles back, and attempts to prevent John from escaping from the scientific Symbolic.

In chapter seventeen, Mond specifically attempts to literally hide and lock away Real sources of anti-scientific destabilization. He hopes to prevent Symbolic characters from being influenced by John's liberating ideas, and following him into the irrational grotesque underground of the English countryside. Huxley describes Mond's attempt to lock away Real forces of destabilization when he writes, "meanwhile, [Mond] had crossed to the other side of the room and was unlocking a large safe set into the wall between the bookshelves. The heavy door swung open" (207). Mond's safe holds various banned books, or, more specifically, books of a religious nature that Mond keeps hidden because "they're old; they're about God hundreds of years ago. Not about God now" (208). These banned, locked away books become potent Real anti-symbols within the novel because they literally contain ideas that threaten the scientific Symbolic, which, in this context, is symbolized by Mond's safe. It locks up Real anti-symbols in an attempt to maintain Symbolic negative mobility, or that Symbolic force that keeps characters immobile and inactive, and therefore trapped within the scientific Symbolic, much like the books within the Symbolic safe. Mond's literal containment of scientifically subversive material resembles Michel Foucault's Ship of Fools argument in his 1961 work, *Madness and Civilization*. Foucault suggests that, in an overly scientific and rational reality, or in the scientific Symbolic of *Brave New World*, the Ship of Fools must dock at the insane asylum. The so-called "fools" of Foucault's ship, once free to rove the countryside, become inmates, or live "Retained and maintained" (31), much like the banned books locked away in Mond's safe. The fools, Foucault laments, "now take part in the measure of reason and in the labor of truth" (32). The scientific Symbolic/insane asylum appropriates them for the sake of maintaining stability and order. So contained,

Mond, who, when understood through Foucault's ideas, becomes a type of insane asylum or hospital manager, rests assured that these foolish books cannot influence Symbolic characters to grotesquely break apart the stability and absolute rationality of the scientific Symbolic. The potential destabilizing power of John's distant God of "hundreds of years ago" remains, in a sense, safely etherized in Mond's hospital safe. This "Retained and maintained," hospitalized God, who John connects to a progressively mobile escape into solitude, "now takes part in the measure of reason and in the labor of truth." In the Brave New World Symbolic, a trapped, institutionalized God works for Mond. Given the success of this divine containment, and the continued stability that results, Mond also tries to trap John in the insane asylum of the Brave New World.

Mond attempts to trap John in a Symbolic safe in order to diffuse John's Real progressive mobility that influences Symbolic characters to depart from the scientific Symbolic for the solitude of a Real setting of grotesque liberation. Mond goes about performing this forced confinement by preventing John from leaving London. John must stay, or must remain trapped within the scientific Symbolic insane asylum, with his Real ineffableness and progressive mobility unable to influence the perfectly conditioned masses. Due to Mond's forced imprisonment, John sadly becomes a type of amusing performer for the Brave New World, or even a curiosity item meant merely to distract Symbolic characters from the grotesque liberation. His status as an amusing performer fulfils John's "part in the measure of reason and in the labor of truth." He serves as a distraction for the other inmates in Mond's Brave New World insane asylum. Martin Heidegger explains that these distraction-obsessed Symbolic characters make John into a source of entertainment in order to feed their *Neugier* (or lust for novelty) created by the

scientific Symbolic. These individuals search for distractions in order to remain blind to their Symbolic enslavement. They, as Heidegger writes, seek “a satisfaction... a repose that no being [the Symbolic]... can offer” (“On the Essence” 136). As understood through Heidegger, then, Symbolic characters use distractions to compensate for the absence of the grotesque conflict, which creates the “repose” and “satisfaction” of the grotesque liberation, in the scientific Symbolic. Therefore, they seek out John as the force of the Real in the novel, at the same time that they treat him as an amusing diversion. Keith Neilson also writes about John’s position as an entertaining diversion, and discusses his refusal to ultimately accept this position, and to in turn leave Symbolic characters “un-satisfied” and unable to find “repose,” when he remarks, “At first, John is feted as an interesting freak, but, given his ‘primitive’ moralism, a clash is inevitable” (3). A renewed grotesque battle is the “inevitable” clash Neilson describes. John, while “an interesting freak,” possesses such an abundance of Real sources of Symbolic destabilization that his status as a mere curiosity item is certainly temporary. He simply needs to break out of Mond’s Symbolic safe and insane asylum, and, again employing his Real progressive mobility, depart from the scientific Symbolic for the grotesque liberation provided by the novel’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic. However, before John can commence the novel’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system he must physically purge himself of the scientific Symbolic.

John performs this purging of the scientific Symbolic in order to achieve his grotesque liberation by forcing himself to become violently ill. Huxley describes John’s self-inflicted purgation when he writes of how John drinks “some mustard and warm water” (216). This mixture causes John to violently vomit, or to expel from his body what

he considers the pollutants of the Brave New World that forced him to become an entertaining distraction for the masses enslaved to the scientific Symbolic illusion. John speaks towards this expulsion of his position as an amusing prop when he explains that he “ate civilization” (216), that it “poisoned me; I was defiled... I ate my own wickedness” (216). This passage proves especially intriguing because it suggests that John, in a sense, vomits out the Brave New World Symbolic illusion. He expels this polluted “civilization” that “poisoned” him by attempting to lock him away within the scientific Symbolic. John must therefore eat his Symbolic position, or eat his “own wickedness,” in order to successfully expel it. He in this way vomits himself out the Symbolic safe, and returns to his Real forces of anti-scientific destabilization committed to continuing the grotesque battle against the scientific Symbolic. John’s conviction that “civilization” poisons individuals in fact connects him to ideas put forth in the introduction concerning the degrading influence of a scientific Symbolic reality. Writers from Carlyle and Ruskin, to Heidegger and Spengler in the twentieth century, agree with John’s belief in the poisonousness of a machine-driven world. Such a reality poisons humankind by enslaving it to machines. These degraded, machine-enslaved individuals in turn become, as Ruskin writes, “mere segments of men – broken into small fragments and crumbs of life” (196). John’s self-purgation therefore represents his attempt to rebuild his humanity following his degradation in the Brave New World scientific Symbolic. He throws up the poisons of civilization, and, like the Rebel figure of Ernst Jünger’s, *Der Waldgang* (1951), who acts on Heidegger’s and Spengler’s warnings about a degrading scientific reality, escapes into the natural, anti-scientific world (Bourdieu 28-9).

By purging himself of the Brave New World's Symbolic illusion, and escaping into the English countryside like Jünger's Rebel, John initiates the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system. This most important stage of the grotesque system maintains John's grotesque liberation from the scientific Symbolic by permanently maintaining the grotesque battle. With the conflict continually raging, John remains permanently divided between the scientific Symbolic and the anti-scientific Real, but, because of this division, grotesquely liberated and free. Huxley consequently secures his position as an anti-Schlegelian grotesque writer. The grotesque becomes a force of liberation, rather than a fleeting emotive arouser. John's escape from London using his active, Real progressive mobility helps ensure this position of the grotesque as a liberator because his Non-Symbolic Symbolic within the English countryside literally exists physically removed from the scientific Symbolic. Given Real relative spatiality, this distance from the Symbolic center necessarily makes John more free. He is less susceptible to Symbolic attempts to reinsert and re-imprison him within the scientific illusion. John's literal distance from London protects his grotesque liberation from it. Within the English countryside Non-Symbolic Symbolic, John specifically lives within an abandoned air lighthouse, which serves as a Real anti-symbol representative of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic's necessary attachment to the scientific Symbolic in order to successfully undermine it for the sake of permanent grotesque liberation. Huxley reveals John's necessary attachment of the air lighthouse to the Brave New World when he explains the lighthouse's location.

John's Non-Symbolic Symbolic lighthouse sits just off the main air routes of the Brave New World. The building, as Huxley writes, is one of "four abandoned air-

lighthouses [that] marked the course of the old Portsmouth-to-London road” (218). Therefore, since John lives along one of the scientific Symbolic’s old and unused roads, he still remains attached to the Brave New World within his air lighthouse. The road anchors him to the Symbolic he escapes from by fleeing into the countryside. The importance of the lighthouse’s attachment to the scientific Symbolic increases when Huxley associates danger to the location. He explains that the air lighthouse no longer functions because the distance between two air routes “was too small for careless drivers” (218). These “careless” drivers collided, causing “accidents. Serious ones” (218). The air lighthouse in this way represents a place of death, or, more specifically, a place where the Brave New World’s influence once led to “serious” bodily harm. The lighthouse’s past history also marks it as a place of collision. Two opposing forces met at the lighthouse in a catastrophic and deadly collision. This danger and death connected to the lighthouse relates to John because he grotesquely collides with the Brave New World even as he desperately tries to distance himself from all that it represents. However, because of his continual grotesque confrontation with the scientific Symbolic, John remains vigilant against Brave New World encroachments in order to preserve his grotesque liberation. He must keep his guard up, and grotesquely surge against the Brave New World whenever it attempts to subdue him, and force him back into the Symbolic illusion. This importance of John remaining attached to the Brave New World in order to best grotesquely fight against it also adds refreshing depth to critics that largely dismiss John’s lighthouse setting as a complete severing of ties with London. Robert Baker voices such a sentiment when he writes that, at the lighthouse, John “attempts to establish his own utopia of one, a state of isolated individualism” (*Brave* 134). As understood

through the grotesque liberation, though, John, rather than establishing a “utopia of one,” never truly escapes from the Brave New World. He must remain connected instead of existing in a “state of isolated individualism” in order to best uphold and preserve his grotesque liberation at the lighthouse.

The air lighthouse continues to help maintain John’s grotesque liberation due to the importance of the structure, even though, like John, it no longer actively functions within the Brave New World Symbolic illusion. The lighthouse, that is, lingers in disuse, but still nevertheless stands capable of again directing planes across the sky. John similarly breaks free from the scientific Symbolic, and yet still grotesquely battles against the Brave New World with his Real, anti-scientific forces. The near pristine condition of the lighthouse reveals John’s similarly pristine condition within the ongoing grotesque battle. After taking up residence in the lighthouse, John remarks upon this pristine condition of the structure when he describes its “excellent condition” (218). He also believes the place to be “too comfortable... almost too civilizedly luxurious” (218). The lighthouse, rather than slowly decaying from neglect and disuse, in fact exists in a relatively nice state of preservation. It even harbors the Brave New World comforts and luxuries that John tries to distance himself from by escaping into the English countryside. With these “civilizedly luxurious” lighthouse comforts inescapable, though, John can best defend himself from them. He sees them and lives amongst them in order to, in a sense, remember the Symbolic dangers that still threaten his grotesque liberation. Huxley speaks towards this lurking Symbolic danger in his essay, “The Essence of Religion.” He writes, “The people for whom it does not cater [a communal religion] are those possessed by that rare, dangerous, and uneasy quality, the passion for liberty” (187). John also poses a

threat to the scientific Symbolic because, as discussed, his “passion for liberty” ignites his Real progressive mobility, and he flees the Brave New World. This departure from the Symbolic proves “dangerous” because it sets an example. Other Symbolic characters, seeing John flee, could follow his lead, and, by escaping, further undermine the scientific Symbolic. To prevent this outcome, John must in turn be threatened by the Symbolic, or surrounded by the Brave New World luxuries that continually tempt him to let down his guard, and renounce his grotesque liberation for the comforts and pleasures of the scientific Symbolic.

John holds off the encroaching Symbolic, though, and preserves his grotesque liberation by most specifically adopting a deliberately brutal, ascetic approach to life. When he first arrives at the lighthouse, John rallies his anti-scientific Real forces around the belief that passionate and violent acts of bodily deprivation and suffering best grotesquely undermine Symbolic pleasures and luxuries. That is, since the scientific Symbolic largely maintains permanent stability through “scientific means” that foster mental and bodily numbness, John’s Non-Symbolic Symbolic must fight against these Symbolic forces by intentionally killing numbness with pain and suffering. John makes this primary goal of his Non-Symbolic Symbolic clear when he thinks to himself, “All he deserved to live in was some filthy sty, some blind hole in the ground” (219). Such a place, or a “filthy sty,” does not contain the Brave New World comforts that surround John in the lighthouse. In his “blind hole in the ground,” John can only see filth and grime, and willingly lives with the bodily discomforts that result, in order to further grotesquely undermine the numbing scientific Symbolic illusion. Stripped of Symbolic

comforts, John preserves his grotesque liberation because he forces himself to physically suffer for his freedom from the Brave New World. He revels in the dirt and mud.

For a brief period of time, John successfully upholds his Non-Symbolic Symbolic of suffering-based grotesque liberation. The scientific Symbolic illusion remains present, especially through the comforts of the air lighthouse, and the lighthouse's literal attachment to London by the air routes, but John grotesquely beats down these Symbolic encroachments with Real, destabilizing acts of physical duress and suffering. One such Real act that helps break down the Symbolic illusion involves John's dedication to patient, determined acts of manual labor. He especially concentrates his efforts on making a bow and arrows from the trees growing by the lighthouse. Such work, as Huxley describes, "gave him intense pleasure. After those weeks of idleness in London, with nothing to do, whenever he wanted anything, but to press a switch or turn a handle, it was pure delight to be doing something that demanded skill and patience" (221). John even begins happily singing while he works. During such brief moments of "pure delight," John uses manual labor to destabilize the scientific Symbolic illusion built upon the idea that Symbolic characters free from overly tedious labor never threaten permanent stability. As John notes, in London individuals merely "press a switch or turn a handle," and any potentially troubling exertion ceases. John's dedication to tedious manual labor therefore imparts both the "pure delight" of grotesquely upsetting the scientific Symbolic illusion, and the further satisfaction that such patient work helps preserve his grotesque liberation from numbing Symbolic pleasures. Christopher Hitchens remarks upon John's "pure delight" when he writes, "There is no escape from anxiety and struggle, and Huxley assists us in attaining this valuable glimpse of the obvious" (xxi). Symbolic

characters escape and cushion themselves from “the obvious” grotesqueness of human existence that John comes to appreciate and embody in the English countryside. He dives into manual labor, or focuses on using his time surrounded by “anxiety and struggle” that further remove him from the absolute numbness and mindlessness of labor within the scientific Symbolic.

However, John’s production of a bow and arrows stands as a relatively minor act of Symbolic destabilization. The work succeeds in helping preserve his grotesque liberation, but small acts of manual labor soon cannot fully withstand increasingly powerful Brave New World encroachments. In fact, John eventually must use his bow and arrows as a weapon against the scientific Symbolic. These bow and arrows in turn become perhaps the most obvious Real anti-symbols within the novel, since they literally attempt to destroy and kill the Brave New World. John even fires an arrow into the side of a Brave New World helicopter that comes to observe his increasingly violent and erratic behavior. Such behavior John turns to when his manual labor can no longer grotesquely battle down the Symbolic illusion. He especially resorts to a whip of knotted coils whenever confronted by the Brave New World. Brandishing this whip, John violently and gruesomely beats himself. These beatings force John to intensely suffer, and, through such suffering, push aside the still threatening Brave New World comforts. Interestingly, then, John makes his physical body the sight of the grotesque conflict. The grotesque battle takes place on his skin, on his back as he lashes the whip against the scientific Symbolic that tempts him to give up the grotesquely liberating suffering of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic space.

John's increasingly violent behavior, while it helps preserve his grotesque liberation, nevertheless pushes John closer to the Brave New World because of the attention it creates. Symbolic characters, intrigued by John's displays of physical violence, flock to his air lighthouse in the countryside. These Brave New World crowds shed a nuanced light upon John's lighthouse setting. That is, such a building, on one level, guides and beckons, or acts as a director of traffic across the skies. John himself follows the anti-symbolic light of this structure when he flees London. Once John resorts to increasingly violent measures, though, the lighthouse also directs Symbolic characters to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. The lighthouse therefore serves as both an anti-symbol and a Symbolic symbol. As an anti-symbol, its light guides individuals away from the scientific Symbolic, while as a Symbolic symbol, the building guides Symbolic characters to the English countryside in order to undermine John's grotesque liberation. These crowds arriving from the scientific Symbolic in fact further threaten John's grotesque liberation because they again treat him as an entertaining diversion and side show. John's violent behavior entertains Symbolic characters. He consequently beats down the scientific Symbolic at the same time that he becomes an amusing distraction for Symbolic characters. In this way caught in a catch-22 situation, John must beat himself even more severely in order to maintain his grotesque liberation from the scientific Symbolic that laughs at his pain. While John succeeds in sustaining his liberation for a time, the rising violence of his outbursts finally destroys him, and he briefly renounces his suffering for an orgy of Symbolic delights.

John's orgy momentarily makes him a Symbolic character. He numbs himself with pleasure, and, by so doing, rejects the grotesque liberation. However, the orgy ends,

and John, when he awakens from his pleasure-induced sleep, also awakens to his personal horror at renouncing the grotesque liberation. In order to again purge himself from the scientific Symbolic, and regain his lost liberation, John commits the most drastic act of personal sacrifice. He rushes into his lighthouse, again anti-symbolically guided by such a structure, and hangs himself from the rafters. John's extreme determination to regain his grotesque liberation in turn reveals, as Huxley writes in his essay, "Swift," his willingness "to continue the pursuit of horrors and disgustfulness long after the majority of their fellows have begun to shrink from a pleasure which has become an intolerable pain" (95). John indeed shrinks from the pleasure of the orgy, "which has become an intolerable pain," and pursues his past dedication to grotesquely liberating "horrors and disgustfulness." Unfortunately for John, this re-dedication to the freeing "horrors" of the grotesque liberation leads to his death. And yet, rather than pathetically dying, John ends his life on a triumphant note. He dies to live, or kills himself in order to at last and finally remain permanently grotesquely liberated from the Brave New World Symbolic illusion.

Huxley presents this scene of triumphant suicide when he describes a group of Symbolic characters searching for John after the orgy. These characters literally grotesquely intrude into John's Non-Symbolic Symbolic lighthouse. They enter through the door and search for him. The Symbolic characters "see the bottom of the staircase that led up to the higher floors. Just under the crown of the arch dangled a pair of feet" (230-231). The importance of this scene to the grotesque stems from John's suspension in the air. He hangs suspended between the floor and the ceiling, and so swings about in an unstable, unpredictable manner. John, it could be said, hangs in Real instability. He uses his anti-scientific, passionate intensity to hang himself, and, by so doing, recaptures his

temporarily lost grotesque liberation. John's suicide therefore destabilizes and undermines the scientific Symbolic in the most extreme way possible. Since he hangs dead, the Brave New World Symbolic can never again tempt John to renounce his grotesque liberation. John remains suspended, dead to the Symbolic and its numbing temptations, but nevertheless still grotesquely alive and liberated within his Non-Symbolic Symbolic lighthouse. John's suspension in the air also points back to the modern "betweenness" discussed in the introduction. That is, John hangs between the floor and the rafters of his lighthouse. This "betweenness" mirrors the "betweenness" of modernism remarked on by such writers as Martin Heidegger and José Ortega y Gasset, and therefore not only situates John and Huxley within the "between" modern environment, but also the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which thrives in the liberating instability of "between" spaces. In a sense, then, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque hangs suspended with John. It hangs between the lost scientific Symbolic, and the threat of this Symbolic again luring the grotesquely liberated back into the numbing comforts of the Brave New World illusion.

Given John's ultimate grotesque liberation through suicide, the final paragraph of *Brave New World*, with its emphasis upon instability and liberating "betweenness," serves as an especially fitting conclusion. Huxley ends his novel with the following passage:

Slowly, very slowly, like two unhurried compass needles, the feet turned towards the right; north, north-east, east, south-east, south, south-south-west; then paused, and, after a few seconds, turned as unhurriedly back towards the left. South-south-west, south, south-east, east... (231)

John hangs from the rafters, suspended in the Real instability that permanently upholds his grotesque liberation within the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. The fact that the novel ends with this image of Real instability adds to the permanence of the grotesque liberation

within the book. The novel, like John, ends, or concludes with an image of anti-scientific, Real destabilization. This final passage also proves important because Huxley compares John to the Real, polysemous anti-symbol of “two unhurried compass needles.” These anti-symbolic “compass needles” in fact relate to the anti-symbolic lighthouse, since both anti-symbols help show the way out of the Brave New World Symbolic. The “compass needles” point the way to the grotesque liberation, or, referring back to Foucault’s ideas discussed above, represent the compass on the Ship of Fools that points away from the Brave New World insane asylum. John, because of his suicide, breaks out of Mond’s hospital, re-boards Foucault’s Ship, and wanders off, using the wandering compass needles as a guide, into his grotesquely liberating Non-Symbolic Symbolic. The guiding compass needles therefore mirror John’s suspended instability, and consequently swing around the compass, continually moving away from Symbolic-like stability. Such unstable, continual swinging of the compass needles makes this the most polysemous anti-symbol discussed. The compass literally shows “many signs,” or many possible directions that lead out of the scientific Symbolic. As Huxley writes above, the needles rotate unpredictably around the compass, going from “South-south-west, south, south-east, east...” This directionless, unstable wandering of the compass needles signifies, that is, not only John’s similar movements as he swings about in the air, but also the various directions that point away from the Brave New World. “Many signs” lead to the grotesque liberation. In the passage above, Huxley also cements the novel’s connection to the grotesque liberation by ending with an ellipsis.

The closing ellipsis implies that Huxley’s novel, like the compass needles moving between directions, and John swinging in the air, never ends. The needles rotate on in

their instability, roaming around the compass, just as John continues to hang suspended, forever rotating within his grotesque liberation. John and the novel therefore conclude by asserting and preserving the grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Following the ellipsis, they never cease in their liberating instability, and in turn forever grotesquely show the way out of the Brave New World Symbolic. Paul Smethurst remarks on Huxley's ending when he writes that the "conclusion to the novel is not intended as prediction of the future but as incitement to the cultured classes of intellectuals to find ways of avoiding such realization of a scientific utopia and to fight for those humanist values of individual freedom" (96). John's suicide stands as perhaps the greatest show "of individual freedom," since it represents his sacrifice of life for the "freedom" of the grotesque liberation. His great sacrifice in turn undermines the "scientific utopia," or scientific Symbolic, Smethurst describes. A final consequence of John's suicide involves Huxley's position as an anti-Schlegelian writer of the grotesque. John dies to help grotesquely kill of the scientific Symbolic, and, by so doing, resurrects the anti-Schlegelian understanding of the grotesque as a liberating force. It frees individuals from illusory states of perfection and completeness, rather than merely arousing the fleeting emotions of comedy and terror. Therefore, the fact that Huxley ends his novel with an assertion of the grotesque as a liberator places him within the anti-Schlegelian camp of grotesque writers. Huxley, like John, uses the grotesque as a force for freedom.

Conclusion

“Hybrid, Transgressive and Always in Motion:” Future Directions for the Anti-Schlegelian Grotesque

“... the synthesis was an asymptote towards which he was forever approaching without ever quite reaching it; it was a reality incapable of complete realisation.”
- Roger Fry, *Cézanne: A Study of His Development* (1927)

This study attempts to correct an error in definition. It proposes a definition for the grotesque that cuts against the grain of its standard critical history that develops from Friedrich Schlegel’s “ridiculous and terrifying” definition of the term in 1798. That is, it subverts Schlegel’s emphasis on the grotesque’s fleeting emotional response of amusement and terror, and, by extension, the grotesque Schlegelian critics of the following two centuries. As discussed, these critics include John Ruskin (or Ruskin’s “terrible grotesque”), Wolfgang Kayser, the Carnavalesque grotesque of Mikhail Bakhtin, the reader response grotesque of writers such as Philip Thomson, and Geoffrey Harpham. Such critics cling to Schlegel’s emotive grotesque, and consequently devalue and short change the term. The grotesque becomes an arouser of fleeting emotions. Individuals laugh, and then cringe in terror. However, once the grotesque stimulus dissipates, the grotesque vanishes, and the individual, although briefly amused and terrified, emerges largely unaffected by their confrontation with the grotesque. Bakhtin’s Carnavalesque grotesque masks come off, and individuals return to their past social positions. The Schlegelian grotesque therefore asserts order and stability. It preserves the status quo, rather than acting as a destabilizing, rebellious force that keeps Bakhtin’s Carnavalesque

masks on. This destabilizing, rebellious power of the grotesque informs the anti-Schlegelian conception of the term this study puts forward for consideration.

The anti-Schlegelian grotesque reaches back to Fabullus' use of the grotesque in the underground chambers, or "grotte," of Nero's 1st century CE *Domus Aurea* in order to counter Schlegel's emotive conception of the term. As outlined in the introduction, this underground, underworld location of the grotesque infuses the term with subversive, and ultimately liberating, powers. Set up against the upper world reality, with its emphasis on the light of reason and rationality, the underground grotesque revels in irrationality, and the pursuit of impulses and desires existing beyond upper world control. This underworld grotesque therefore liberates objects and individuals from above ground reason and rationality. These grotesque underground objects possess the freedom to contain, as Fabullus' paintings highlight, human, animal, and even vegetable parts. Other writers and critics that expand on this anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition relate the grotesque liberation to a number of concerns, including, as discussed in the introduction, the freeing uselessness of art in a reality dominated by upper world, scientific estimations of value, and the human condition in a technologically and scientifically driven world. Such anti-Schlegelian grotesque writers include Friedrich von Schiller, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Ruskin, Charles Baudelaire, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Sigmund Freud. These writers all work alongside Fabullus in the underground chambers of Nero's "Golden Palace." They treat the grotesque as a liberating force, as a freer from the upper world reality, rather than a Schlegelian arouser of fleeting emotions.

While the above critics and writers fit within the anti-Schlegelian grotesque tradition, this study places special emphasis on Jacques Lacan. As explained in the

introduction, Lacan deserves such a prominent place because he provides an ideal critical system for measuring and analyzing the anti-Schlegelian grotesque in a text. His notions of the Symbolic and Real map, in a sense, to the above and below ground realities initiated by Fabullus' grotesque paintings. This study attempts to add on to this Lacanian grotesque terminology with the neologism, "Non-Symbolic Symbolic." Such a term serves the important purpose of securing the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. That is, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic maintains the liberating power of the grotesque. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict between the Symbolic and Real never ceases, individuals and objects in turn remain grotesquely liberated, and the fleeting emotions of the Schlegelian grotesque cannot gain a foothold. The Non-Symbolic Symbolic in this way becomes a type of critical keystone that secures the entire anti-Schlegelian conception of the grotesque. It holds in place the grotesque's liberating power, or maintains the grotesque's liberating transgression into a stabilizing Symbolic. Sociologist Chris Jencks helps add insight into the necessity of sustaining this grotesque transgression in a Non-Symbolic Symbolic when he explains the transgressive act. Jencks writes in the following passage that transgression:

is to go beyond the bounds or limits set by a commandment or law or convention, it is to violate or infringe. But to transgress is also more than this... Transgressive behaviour does not deny limits or boundaries, rather it exceeds them and thus completes them... The transgression is a component of the rule. (*Transgression 2, 7*)

Jencks brings up the compelling idea that the very act of transgression, or the grotesque transgression into a Symbolic for the sake of liberation, ultimately serves a stabilizing function. The grotesque transgressive act, that is, while going "beyond the bounds or limits set by a [Symbolic] commandment or law or convention" runs the risk of becoming

“a component of the rule.” The anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict in turn denies liberation to Symbolically enslaved individuals. To prevent this outcome, the Non-Symbolic Symbolic, it could be said, keeps transgression transgressive. It keeps grotesquely undermining the Symbolic “commandment or law or convention” of permanent stability, and consequently keeps the grotesque liberation alive. Rather than regressing to the false comfort of the Symbolic illusion, Non-Symbolic Symbolic individuals remain grotesquely transgressive, and, because of this transgression, grotesquely liberated. With the importance of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic in this way established, and with Jacques Lacan identified as a prominent anti-Schlegelian grotesque critic, who provides an ideal critical model for analyzing anti-Schlegelianism, this study proceeds to its final goal. Using the Lacanian critical model, it measures the anti-Schlegelian grotesque in the High Modern compositions of T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley.

The application of the Lacanian grotesque model to the High Modern environment hopes to focus attention on the anti-Schlegelianism of this literary period. As the introduction discusses, High Modernism comes custom made for grotesque anti-Schlegelianism because it exemplifies what Martin Heidegger calls, “betweenness.” High Modernism exists during a time of dissolution, or during the breaking apart of once trusted values and beliefs, such as the belief in Industrial Age progress through science, reason, and rationality. High Modernist writers, in fact largely inspired by the Symbolist Movement of the late 19th century, which rejects the trappings of the Industrial Age for elusive symbolism that removes art into a purer world of Aesthetic-style autonomy and freedom, therefore turn away from such an Age, and the Realistic style of writing used to

describe, detail, and contain it. These Symbolist-like High Modernists instead believe that the inner world of the individual, rife with ungovernable passions and urges, and perhaps best revealed by cryptic symbols, trumps the so-called “truth” of the extreme rationality and preciseness of the Industrial Age reality. Prominent High Modernist writers, such as John Middleton Murry in his, “The Break-Up of the Novel,” and D.H. Lawrence in his, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, express this sentiment. The unstable, fluid individual, as Murry and Lawrence argue, exists in an unstable, fluid world, or one divorced from the professed order and stability of the Realistic Industrial Age. This High Modern dissociation from the rigid tenets of the Industrial Age, and the Modern reluctance to profess absolute support for a new, all-encompassing epistemology (that might overpower and suppress the individual) to take the place of the discredited faith in the Industrial Age, cements the Heideggerean “betweenness” of the modern world. Instability reigns, that is, since, in a reality of “betweenness,” stable and solid epistemological ground does not exist. Peter Fuller, in his study, *Art and Psychoanalysis*, writes that this unstable modern “betweenness” represents the conflict between what he calls, “the sublime,” and, “the beautiful.” For Fuller, the sublime serves a Symbolic-like function, since it emphasizes “mergence and union” (199), while the beautiful acts much like a Real destabilizer because it stresses “separation.” In light of this study on the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, Fuller’s ideas on the modern conflict connect to the Lacanian grotesque model. Fuller’s “sublime” resembles the Symbolic, while his “beautiful” compares to the Real. Therefore, it could be said that, while Fuller never uses the word, “grotesque,” his understanding of modernism revolves around a grotesque conflict between sublime order, and destabilizing beauty. He in fact adds to his grotesque analysis

of the “betweenness” of modernism when he writes that this modern conflict between the sublime and the beautiful creates “our relation to the world itself” (172). Individuals relate to the modern world grotesquely, or, as discussed above, exist in a grotesquely liberating, “between” position where the anti-Schlegelian grotesque flourishes. This study showcases such High Modern grotesque anti-Schlegelianism in the body chapters dedicated to T.S. Eliot, D.H. Lawrence, and Aldous Huxley.

The three body chapters, on one level, exemplify the various manifestations of the High Modern anti-Schlegelian grotesque. Eliot’s chapter draws attention to the temporal grotesque, Lawrence’s chapter discusses the contradictory grotesque, and Huxley’s chapter analyzes the scientific grotesque. These chapters also hint at issues raised by the anti-Schlegelian grotesque that point towards future studies. Fuller’s comment, that the grotesque informs “our relation to the world,” stands as the stimulus for these future considerations and developments of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. That is, if individuals relate to the modern world grotesquely (which, in the nineteenth century, Victor Hugo argues in his 1827 play, *Cromwell*), then perhaps this grotesque relationship entails acts of creation. Grotesquely divided and torn individuals, existing in a state of modern “betweenness,” use their grotesque divisions as sources of creativity. They help create, in a sense, their grotesque reality, much as Eliot, Lawrence, and Huxley create their anti-Schlegelian texts in the grotesque “betweenness” of High Modernism. Julia Kristeva, in her work, *Desire in Language*, associates “between” spaces with creative impulses, or, more specifically, with poetic language that attempts to subvert Symbolic control. This poetic language, existing between Symbolic restrictions, and what Kristeva calls the semiotic state of pre-linguistic wholeness, uses creation to free individuals from

Symbolic confinement, much as the anti-Schlegelian grotesque conflict results in the grotesque liberation of the Non-Symbolic Symbolic. Kristeva remarks on this freeing quality of creative, poetic language when she says that the desire to re-create the semiotic “introduces wandering... into language” (136). Individuals, that is, create in an attempt to “wander” away from Symbolic confinement. Also, given the fact that the semiotic, once lost, can never be re-achieved, this wandering creativity continues ad infinitum.

Grotesque “betweenness,” then, when understood through Kristeva’s insights into division-inspired creativity, becomes a breeding ground for the creative impulse. A future area of critical exploration could therefore analyze the connection between creativity and grotesquely liberating “betweenness.” Anti-Schlegelian grotesque authors create because of their grotesque divisions, and, by so doing, enact, in a sense, their grotesque liberation. They create in order to “wander” away from their Symbolic enslavement. A future study that more deeply considers this relationship between the grotesque and creativity should consult Francis S. Connelly’s “Introduction” to, *Modern Art and the Grotesque*. In this introduction, Connelly explains that the grotesque “combine[s] unlike things in order to challenge established realities or construct new ones” (2). For Kristeva, Connelly’s association of the grotesque with creativity relates to the feminine. Femininity, that is, becomes the newly constructed reality created by the grotesque, or that identity that “wanders free” from Symbolic control. A future study could also examine queer identities, and even 20th century dandyism (what Susan Sontag calls, “Camp”), in light of this creativity assigned to the grotesque. Consult Sontag’s essay, “Notes on Camp” for further insight into the grotesque implications of creating queer and Camp/dandy identities.

Kristeva's ideas concerning the relationship between the Symbolic and the semiotic, which help reveal the creative impulse of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque discussed above, also imply that the grotesque possesses the ability to save individuals from the tyrannical grasp of Symbolic structures. Kristeva, and other critics, such as Luce Irigaray and Hélène Cixous, explains that this freedom and ability to save develops from the association of a Symbolic with patriarchy. A Symbolic, by ordering and dominating reality, and by suppressing opposing views, acts, for these critics, as a patriarchal force, which similarly governs and rules over society. Therefore, based upon the ideas above, it could be argued that grotesquely liberating "betweenness" represents the feminine. Both the anti-Schlegelian grotesque and the feminine subvert Symbolic, patriarchal claims to absolute authority. Kristeva, in her, *Powers of Horror* (1982) calls this ability of the feminine to grotesquely subvert a patriarchal Symbolic, "abjection." The feminine grotesquely breaks free from the patriarchal Symbolic gaze, which attempts to standardize perceptions of femininity, with abject, grotesque portrayals of women. Kristeva's abject woman, in Rabelaisian style, therefore becomes grotesquely free due to her abject physicality (her so-called "disgusting" bodily imperfections and processes) that undercut standard patriarchal views of the ideal feminine.

The eponymous "Lady" of Jonathan Swift's 1732 poem, "The Lady's Dressing Room" represents such a grotesquely liberated abject female figure. In Swift's poem, Strephon serves as the perpetuator of the standard patriarchal view of femininity. Women, for Strephon, should live as unspoiled angels, uncontaminated by the base, disgusting, and abject aspects of human existence. To Strephon's horror, though, his supposedly pristine "Lady," Celia, produces filth and grime in her dressing room. Swift

describes Strephon's revolting journey through Celia's dressing room in the passage below:

And first a dirty smock appeared,
 Beneath the armpits well besmeared.
 Strephon, the rogue, displayed it wide,
 And turned it round on every side.
 On such a point few words are best,
 And Strephon bids us guess the rest,
 But swears how damnably the men lie,
 In calling Celia sweet and cleanly. (572-73, 11-18)

This passage reveals, what could be called, Strephon's gradual realization of Celia's grotesquely liberating abjectness. Her soiled clothing, such as her "dirty smock... Beneath the armpits well besmeared," show Strephon that, rather than embodying the ideal, patriarchal view of angelic womanhood, Celia possesses human bodily function. She sweats and dirties her clothing. Strephon, by the end of the passage above, realizes Celia's abject grotesqueness when he "swears how damnably the men lie, / In calling Celia sweet and cleanly." He, in a sense, understands Celia's grotesquely liberating abjectness, or her freedom from the rigid, Symbolic-like, patriarchal view of "sweet and cleanly" femininity. In Swift's poem, Strephon's illusions regarding the ideal woman at last completely crumble when he finds "sweet" Celia's chamber-pot. Gazing inside, Strephon collapses, and shouts, "Oh! Celia, Celia, Celia shits!" (575, 118). Strephon's shouts bring to life the grotesquely liberated abject woman Kristeva remarks on above. The complete, ideal female body breaks down into bodily functions that highlight openings and areas of ejection. "Celia shits!," or expels the ideal patriarchal view of femininity, and, by so doing, "casts the feminine down into a dark space, underground into a cave of abjection" (Barrett ix). Celia enters the grotesque underground of liberating abjection. She lives in "a cave of abjection," or, as the introduction discusses, in a grotto-

like space that harkens back to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's underground beginning.

The grotesquely liberated abject Kristevan woman, as represented by Swift's grotesquely abject "Lady," also adds nuance to the High Modern focus of this study, mainly because of both Kristeva's association of grotesque abjection with an "in-between" state, and the critique that High Modernism exudes chauvinism and sexism. In *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva explains that the grotesquely abject object, by refusing to "respect borders, [and] positions," exists as a "composite" and "in-between" (4) entity. It dwells in the grotesquely liberating space "in-between" a totalizing Symbolic, and the ungovernable impulses of an underground environment. As discussed, the "in-betweenness" of High Modernism provides an ideal breeding ground for the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. It therefore follows that a future study that investigates Kristevan "in-between" abjection in the grotesquely liberating space of "in-between" High Modernism would yield intriguing results. In addition to studying Kristevan abjection, Andreas Huyssen, in his work, *After the Great Divide*, describes the High Modern chauvinism that could serve as the driving force behind a future study of anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness when he writes of "the powerful masculinist mystique which is explicit in modernists" (55). When understood as a period of grotesque anti-Schlegelianism, which this study attempts to reveal, the High Modern "powerful masculinist mystique" breaks apart. High Modern chauvinism becomes the Symbolic-like structure that the anti-Schlegelian grotesque attacks for the sake of the grotesque liberation. Therefore, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque helps undercut Huyssen's "powerful masculinist mystique" often associated with High Modernism. It saves, in a sense, High Modernism from its "masculinist" tendencies. Consult as well Luce Irigaray's, *This Sex Which Is Not One* for

more information on the possibility of arguing for a feminine anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness that helps subvert High Modern chauvinism. Beyond the feminine, it could also be argued that the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's ability to save, or to free objects and individuals from Symbolic structures, applies to humankind as a whole. The grotesque, as this study discusses, saves individuals from the degrading effects of an overly industrialized and scientific world. It cures humanity, or at least helps restore the dignity of the individual in a mechanistic reality.

A future study that more deeply explores this ability of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque to cure and save individuals could refer to a number of critics, including, in the nineteenth century, John Ruskin and William Morris. In his famous description of Venetian glass in *The Stones of Venice*, Ruskin attempts to reverse the Marxist alienation of labor. Rather than detached from their machine-made products, the Venetian glass craftsman create flawed and clumsily cut glass beads that reveal the human touch. These beads, for Ruskin, restore the dignity of human labor in a Symbolic-like reality where machines produce perfect products that mirror the assumed perfection of the Symbolic illusion. Ruskin in fact writes that the people who buy industrial glass beads engage "in the slave-trade," and act as "slave-driver[s]" (197-98). Such people, by buying the products of alienated labor, tighten the bonds that enslave individuals to scientific Symbolic structures. They perpetuate Symbolic enslavement. Therefore, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which acts as a liberator of these enslaved Symbolic workers, could be said to save and free these masses by restoring the value of the flawed human touch to created objects. With Ruskin's imperfect Venetian beads acting as a touchstone, these objects could even be called grotesquely liberated objects, since they represent art

freed from mechanistic, alienated Symbolic production. Ruskin in fact views these artistic beads as the cure for the degraded state of humankind in the Industrial Age. They reassert the value of flawed human creativity. In *The Stones of Venice*, Ruskin remarks on the necessary flaws of grotesque objects and individuals when he writes in the following passage:

The fallen human soul, at its best, must be as a diminishing glass, and that a broken one, to the mighty truths of the universe round it; and the wider the scope of its glance, and the vaster the truths into which it obtains an insight, the more fantastic their distortion is likely to be, as the winds and vapours trouble the field of the telescope most when it reaches farthest. (153)

Flawed, “fallen” humans must create flawed, but grotesquely liberated, objects, such as Ruskin’s deformed Venetian glass. Such deformity, though, or grotesque freedom from the so-called Symbolic norm, imparts a type of purified, cured (Ruskin calls it “noble”) eyesight that beholds “the mighty truths of the universe round it.” The saved, cured grotesque eye, it could be argued in a future study, sees “the mighty truths” of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. William Morris echoes and elaborates on Ruskin’s belief in the curative power of grotesquely liberated art in his work, “Hopes and Fears for Art,” and in his Arts and Crafts Movement of the late nineteenth century, which acted on Ruskin’s praise for the human touch of Venetian glass, and hand-crafted a wide variety of items. In the twentieth century, the Ruskin-indebted association of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque with the curative powers of art, or with a liberated grotesque eyesight, continues in the writings of a number of thinkers, including D.H. Lawrence and Martin Heidegger.

Martin Heidegger and D.H. Lawrence deserve attention in a possible future study on the curative powers of anti-Schlegelian grotesque art because they both, like Ruskin,

remark on the dangers, for art and individuals, of an overly scientific and mechanistic world. Heidegger, in his essay, "Science and Reflection," discusses the value of art in a scientific reality with ideas evocative of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. Artistic creation, for Heidegger, occupies a position in the grotesque underworld, and must remain free from the penetrating eyes of method, or the scientific method that attempts to contain and control it. Heidegger explains how this underworld art must uphold, "the poverty of reflection," or that "promise of a wealth whose treasures glow in the resplendence of that uselessness which can never be included in any reckoning" (181). As broached in the discussion of Ruskin above, this excerpt connects to a potential study on the grotesque's curative powers because it helps reveal the anti-Schlegelian grotesque's ability to cure, in a sense, eyesight. Upper world individuals, previously blind to objects devoid of rational and scientific uses, see the artistic "treasures" that "can never be included in any reckoning." They see with their cured eyesight the anti-Schlegelian grotesque object. A study that reveals this cured eyesight could refer to Lewis Carroll's 1865 novel, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. It could be argued that this specific literary text traces Alice's ability to see the anti-Schlegelian grotesque underworld. She leaves the rational, scientific upper world and literally goes underground. In this underground world, Alice comes to see, or appreciate, the irrational, anti-scientific, and anti-Schlegelian grotesque objects and individuals that inhabit this subterranean space. Alice looks, with cured eyesight, at the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. Heidegger continues to expand on this idea of restoring perverted eyesight in his essay, "The Origin of the Work of Art." In this piece, well worth consulting in a study on the grotesque's curative powers, Heidegger argues that the earth itself becomes a type of shelter and sanctuary for anti-Schlegelian grotesque

art. It protects, in a sense, the new eyesight of the grotesque from upper world “attempt[s] to penetrate into it” (47). Walter Benjamin, in his 1936 essay, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” explains that this new eyesight allows the viewer to see the “aura” of an individual art object, or its non-mechanical uniqueness. The “aura” returns to this object, and shields it from the blinding, piercing light of the scientific upper world. D.H. Lawrence, like Heidegger, also discusses the ability of anti-Schlegelian grotesque art, endowed with a protective “aura,” to inject curative powers into a mechanistic and scientific reality.

D.H. Lawrence merits analysis in a future study of the grotesque’s curative abilities because he not only speaks in a Heideggerean manner concerning anti-Schlegelian grotesque art, but he also specifies what this art does and does not resemble. As discussed in the chapter on Lawrence, he views the Etruscan art of underground crypts as the ideal form of artistic expression. This art, as Lawrence writes in his essay, “Etruscan Places,” rebels “against [upper world] convention” (32), and creates, “An act of pure attention” (55). Lawrence’s “act of pure attention” compares to Heidegger’s “poverty of reflection,” in that this “pure attention” reveals anti-Schlegelian grotesque art. An individual, looking with their cured eyesight, sees, or attends to, the grotesque underworld. Lawrence also specifies the artistic movements and artists that both exemplify this grotesquely liberating “act of pure attention,” and the movements and artists that should be ignored because of their complicity with the Symbolic upper world. The so-called “bad art” that, rather than saving and freeing individuals, in fact aids in Symbolic enslavement Lawrence links to Futurism and photography. In a letter from 1914, Lawrence says that in Futurist work, which glorifies the machine and technology,

“everything is appraised according to its mechanical value – everything is subject to the laws of physics” (181). The curative powers of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, which saves and frees art and individuals from the exacting upper world “laws of physics,” fail in the face of such scientific, Futurist work. Lawrence, in such essays as, “Art and Morality,” speaks of photography in similar terms. The photographic image captures and contains objects in a type of Symbolic prison, rather than, as the anti-Schlegelian grotesque does, freeing objects into a Non-Symbolic Symbolic space that exists beyond Symbolic controls. This so-called “good” art, or art that grotesquely saves and frees objects and individuals from Symbolic containment, Lawrence, and other critics as well, associates with the work of Paul Cézanne. Bloomsbury critic, Roger Fry, in his book length study of Cézanne, explains Cézanne’s connection to the “good” art of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque when he writes, “For him [Cézanne] the synthesis was an asymptote towards which he was forever approaching without ever quite reaching it; it was a reality incapable of complete realisation” (3). That is, Lawrence and Fry admire Cézanne because he forever frustrates Symbolic-like attempts at “complete realisation.” Cézanne’s art slips away and remains free and safe from Symbolic control. It therefore could be said to represent the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation outlined in this study.

The above considerations hope to point out future directions for the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. They plant the seeds for future studies. One such seed, that undergirds the entire study, stems from the anti-Schlegelian grotesque’s curative abilities. By ripping down Symbolic structures that enslave individuals to false promises of security and stability, the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberates individuals, and, by liberating, also saves individuals from Symbolic structures. These individuals remain safe

from the tyrannical grasp of a Symbolic, or, as discussed above, exist cured from what could be called the Symbolic disease. A future study could elaborate on this anti-Schlegelian grotesque cure for the Symbolic disease using the writers touched on above, such as Ruskin, Lawrence, and Heidegger, and extend anti-Schlegelian grotesque considerations into non-literary forms of art. The brief reference to the paintings of Cézanne attempts to open up one such non-literary area for the study of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. Another seed for future study opens up the anti-Schlegelian grotesque in literary periods outside of the High Modern focus of this study. Post-Modernism and postcolonial literature stand as a period and genre worth investigating. In the post-modernist period, William S. Burroughs' 1959 novel, *Naked Lunch* possesses definite anti-Schlegelian grotesque characteristics. The novel's protagonist, William Lee, explains that his story "spills in all directions," and that it must remain "divided into units which be all in one piece and should be so taken, but the pieces can be had in any order" (180). Lee's narrative, that is, resists Symbolic-like attempts at absolute cohesiveness and order. In a grotesquely liberating fashion, it "spills in all directions," or, as Ian Macfadyen writes, its "structure is impossible to grasp because it is... a moving mosaic reconstituted in variant form by every reader through an endless 'piecing together,' a continual reassembling of a text without limit" ("Dossier" 209). *Naked Lunch*'s "moving mosaic" resembles a grotesquely liberating Realness, where similar mosaic-like fragmentation helps undercut Symbolic claims to absolute completeness. The fact that Macfadyen calls Burroughs' novel "a text without limit" also connects the work to the limit-less quality of a Non-Symbolic Symbolic. *Naked Lunch* resists containment and interpretation, just as a Non-Symbolic Symbolic perpetually upsets Symbolic

containment in order to maintain the anti-Schlegelian grotesque liberation. In addition to an investigation of the post-modern grotesqueness of Burroughs' *Naked Lunch*, a consideration of postcolonial anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness could yield intriguing results.

The postcolonial concern for the so-called "humanness" of the Other relates to grotesquely liberated bodies, or to those Kristeva-like abject bodies that, because of their physical deformities and overall distance from the "normal" human figure, problematize definitions of the human. A future study could perhaps argue that the Other, grotesquely liberated body in fact represents the most human form. The "normal" human figure, then, becomes deformed and ugly, or represents the human figure enslaved to false Symbolic claims regarding bodily perfection and beauty. Potential sources for such a study could include John Block Friedman's, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. In this work, Friedman remarks on the interesting relationship between grotesqueness and the Other when he writes, "As long as the definition of 'man' was based upon a Western model, the monstrous races could only be assigned a subordinate place in the Chain of Being" (196). When analyzed against the anti-Schlegelian grotesque, though, "the Chain of Being" breaks apart, and, as suggested above, "the monstrous races" in fact epitomize "the definition of 'man.'" William Shakespeare's, *The Tempest* works well in such a study where the vilified Other represents the grotesquely liberated, ideal human. Caliban, although condemned throughout the play as subhuman and bestial by Prospero and Miranda, perhaps exemplifies a grotesquely liberated human. He exists grotesquely free and beautiful because of his abjection, and determined resistance to Prospero's tyrannical, Symbolic-sustaining power. A final aspect of a potential postcolonial

investigation of anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness could examine specific examples of grotesquely liberating Otherness, such as blackface minstrelsy, where a dominant Symbolic race, by taking on the appearance of a subservient race, in fact attempts to save Symbolic, racial stability from the grotesquely liberated Other. The Symbolic race, in a sense, embodies the Other race they suppress for the sake of continued order. They wear the Other to control the Other. Leonard Cassuto's study, *The Inhuman Race: The Racial Grotesque in American Literature and Culture* serves as a valuable resource for this racial aspect of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque. In this work, Cassuto highlights (consult pages 5-7) the deliberate objectification, such as through blackface minstrelsy, of specific races in order to impart a non-human Otherness to these groups. Dehumanized, that is, and races prove easy to control, or easy to deny the power of their grotesquely liberating Otherness. In addition to postcolonial concerns, Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction theories deserve attention, mainly because they seem to both uphold and refute the anti-Schlegelian grotesque.

The relationship between Derrida's Deconstruction and the anti-Schlegelian grotesque appears strong, since both privilege destabilization. Derrida, in works such as, *Of Grammatology* (1967) and *Writing and Difference* (1967), puts forth the central Deconstruction idea that Western civilization cannot escape the illusion of logocentrism, or belief in a "logos" (which, in Greek, signifies both "word" and "rationality") that guarantees the validity and presence of the linguistic system based on the signifier/signified relationship. This illusory logocentrism relates to the anti-Schlegelian grotesque because it both resembles the Symbolic stage of the grotesque system, which similarly guarantees an illusory state of stabilizing presence, and serves as the source for

attack by forces of destabilization. For Derrida, these destabilizing forces (which resemble the Real forces of the grotesque system) attack the illusion of logocentrism by revealing the inherent “undecidableness” of the linguistic system’s foundation in “différance.” Meaning, that is, never rests in a stable presence of meaning (Derrida calls this illusion of stable meaning the, “transcendental signified”). It instead remains forever out of reach, or, as the term, “différance,” reveals, endlessly “defers” stable signification in a linguistic system where “differences” between words assign meaning in the first place. This endless “play” (“jeu”) of unstable meaning relates to the Non-Symbolic Symbolic stage of the grotesque system, since both the Non-Symbolic Symbolic and Derrida’s endless “play,” or “dissemination,” of linguistic meaning continually tear down illusory sources of stability. However, while the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system in this way possesses similarities to Derrida’s Deconstruction ideas, any comparison reaches an unsurpassable dead-lock once confronted by the issue of individual freedom. A state of liberation from a false, illusory Symbolic source stands as the end result of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque system. Furthermore, a grotesquely liberated individual remains deeply invested in maintaining their freedom, and must continually push away a Symbolic’s alluring illusion of stability and comfort. Such a state of individually-sustained freedom does not exist in Derrida’s Deconstruction. The individual descends into Derrida’s aporia, or “double bind” condition where the play of “différance” reaches an extreme, terminal state of “undecidableness,” and, in result, a text deconstructs itself. Rather than liberated by Deconstruction, the individual therefore relinquishes control to the chaos of chronic “undecidableness,” and, by so doing, exists enslaved to Derrida’s insuperable, deadlocked state of aporia. A text that deconstructs itself in turn carries with

it this helpless, aporia-enslaved individual, who, instead of freed from a destroyed, discredited source of stability, cannot escape and flee from a reality that, although “undecidable,” resists destruction and dismantling. A future study on the relationship between the anti-Schlegelian grotesque and Derrida’s Deconstruction could more deeply probe this self-Deconstruction of texts, and the destruction of individual acts of freedom and liberation that results, in the works of Deconstruction critics, J. Hillis Miller and Barbara Johnson (cf. especially Johnson’s, *The Critical Difference*). The remarks above on Deconstruction and the anti-Schlegelian grotesque also help present the future of grotesque studies, which, in the guise of the so-called “post-grotesque,” seems similarly trapped in an aporia-like state of impotency and insignificance.

James Goodwin’s 2009 study, *Modern American Grotesque* discusses the aporia-like condition of late 20th and early 21st century post-grotesqueness. Goodwin claims that all current and future studies on the grotesque must grapple with the apparent depreciation of so-called “shock value” in a heavily/overly globalized and connected reality. Given the ability of shocking information and imagery, such as the rising death toll of the Syrian Civil War, and images of charred bodies emerging from the Arab Spring, to immediately travel along a globalized network of social media and news sites, individuals become increasingly desensitized and numb to the disturbing qualities of the grotesque. The grotesque, that is, diminishes in importance in a reality where the boundaries and walls the grotesque normally break down and transgress no longer exist in a globalized world. A post-grotesque reality results, or a reality so inundated by grotesque transgressions that the grotesque becomes the norm. It becomes the accepted condition of life for the desensitized, globalized masses. Goodwin remarks that the

defining, dominant figures in this post-grotesque world primarily include individuals that cater to the grotesque, or that perform “stunt[s] merely in the hope of prize money” (188). These individuals win “prize money” because they satisfy the seemingly insatiable hunger for grotesqueness in the globalized, connected, post-grotesque world. They become grotesque to meet the demand for the grotesque. Perhaps this need for grotesqueness in a post-grotesque reality helps explain the enduring popularity of reality television, and other performance-based shows (e.g., *American Idol*, *Survivor*, *The Voice*, etc.). On these programs, those performers that best supply the demand for the grotesque win the “prize money” endlessly doled out by the post-grotesque world. In addition to Goodwin’s study, David K. Danow’s, *The Spirit of Carnival: Magical Realism and the Grotesque* (1995) could prove helpful in an investigation of late 20th and early 21st century post-grotesqueness, mainly because his idea that the post-grotesque springs from the inability to distinguish between a so-called “normal” reality, and a magical, or “sur-real,” reality points towards the near impossibility of resistance to the post-grotesque world. That is, in such a convoluted, normal-magical reality, grotesque-like subversion appropriates objects and ideas that lose their potency as materials of rebellion because of the so-called “normalizing” of them by the upper world reality. The Occupy Movement exemplifies the challenges facing grotesque rebelliousness in a post-grotesque world. While the “rebels” of this Movement engaged in a type of grotesque Carnival by donning identical masks that negated the social positions and statuses of the upper world, the fact that these masks come from popular culture (especially Warner Bros.’ 2006 film, *V for Vendetta*) compromises the actual rebelliousness of the Movement. In a post-grotesque world, Occupy must normalize their grotesque subversions, and in turn doom themselves

to a position of fawning subservience. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque assumes supreme importance in this post-grotesque future of grotesque studies, since its Real sources of destabilization must perform a two-fold liberation. It must liberate not only individuals enslaved to an upper world Symbolic illusion, but also the underground elements of grotesque destabilization that a Symbolic appropriates and normalizes in the post-grotesque world. The anti-Schlegelian grotesque must “de-normalize” an upper world Symbolic illusion.

As touched on in the introduction, though, future studies on the post-grotesque condition, applications of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque to paintings, post-modernism, postcolonial concerns, Derrida’s Deconstruction, and, as this study attempts, to the grotesquely liberating “betweenness” of High Modernism, reveal grotesqueness when these investigations, as Fry hints at above, never quite reach it, or never pin down the grotesque in “complete realisation.” The beauty of the anti-Schlegelian grotesque derives from its stubborn resistance to Symbolic-like codification and cataloguing. To the perpetual frustration of the scholar of the grotesque, it must necessarily preserve some irreducible kernel of its being that exists just beyond the critic’s prying eyes. Justin Edwards and Rune Graulund remark on this inherent obscurity of the grotesque when they write, “For if there is any one thing that defines ‘the’ grotesque it is precisely that it is hybrid, transgressive and always in motion” (15). This so-called “undefinable-ness” of the grotesque in turn works well in the High Modern literary environment because “Modernism” also necessarily resists definition and cataloguing. To be Modern, that is, involves the rejection of labels and identities that attempt to pin-down and contain objects and individuals. Peter Childs comments on this Modern mistrust of labels and definitions

when he writes, “It is now, however, perhaps both impossible and undesirable to speak of a single ‘Modernism’” (12). Like the grotesque, Modernism must be understood according to its refusal to be fully understood. Its definition derives from its determination to resist definition. The study of the undefinable anti-Schlegelian grotesque in such an undefinable Modern period therefore proves especially fitting. Anti-Schlegelian grotesqueness, by resisting definition, thrives in the equally definition-less literary world of High Modernism. This study, then, attempts to define the inherently undefinable in an inherently undefinable literary period. It pinpoints the grotesque with the knowledge that, in the end, the grotesque is “always in motion,” and must ultimately be set free, or allowed to move off into its own grotesque liberation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerley, Chris. *T.S. Eliot: The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock and The Waste Land*. Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks, 2007. E-book.
- Arnold, Matthew. "Dover Beach." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M.H. Abrams. 7th Ed. Vol. B. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 2090-2091. Print.
- . "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M.H. Abrams. 7th Ed. Vol. B. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 2091-2097. Print.
- Augustine. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Trans. Edward B. Pusey. New York: Washington Square Press, 1960. Print.
- Bagehot, Walter. "Wordsworth, Tennyson and Browning; or Pure, Ornate and Grotesque Art in English Poetry." *Literary Studies*. Vol. II. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1895. Print.
- Baker, Robert S. *Brave New World: History, Science, and Dystopia*. New York: Twayne, 1990. Print.
- . *The Dark Historic Page: Social Satire and Historicism in the Novels of Aldous Huxley (1921-1939)*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Dialogic Imagination." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259-300. Print.
- . *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984. Print.

- Barrett, Maria. "Introduction." *Grotesque Femininities: Evil, Women and the Feminine*. Maria Barrett, Ed. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press, 2010. Print.
- Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. London: Routledge, 1975. Print.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*. Trans. Jonathan Mayne. New York: Da Capo Press, 1986. Print.
- Beckford, William. *Vathek*. London: Penguin Classics, 1993. Print.
- Bell, Clive. *Art*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1914. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1973. Print.
- Bergson, Henri. *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946. Print.
- . "Laughter." *Comedy*. Wylie Sypher, Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. 61-148. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *L'Ontologie Politique de Martin Heidegger*. Paris: Minuit, 1988. Print.
- Bradley, F.H. *The Principles of Logic*. Vol. II. London: Oxford University Press, 1928. Print.
- Braut-Dreux, Elise. "Responding To Non-Human Otherness: Poems By D.H. Lawrence And Katherine Mansfield." *D.H. Lawrence Review* 37.2 (2012): 22-43. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 4 Apr. 2014.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Mother Courage and Her Children*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2007. Print.
- Brooker, Jewel Spears. "The Structure of Eliot's 'Gerontion': An Interpretation Based On

Bradley's Doctrine of the Systematic Nature of Truth." *Elh* 2 (1979): 314. JSTOR Arts & Sciences I. Web. 27 Apr. 2014.

Brooker, Jewel Spears and Joseph Bentley. *Reading The Waste Land: Modernism and the Limits of Interpretation*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990. Print.

Burroughs, William. *Naked Lunch*. London: Flamingo, 1993. Print.

Carlyle, Thomas. *Chartism. The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. Vol. XXIX. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-1899. 118-204. Print.

---. *Sartor Resartus. The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. Vol. I. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-1899. Print.

---. "Signs of the Times." *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. Vol. XXVII. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-1899. 56-82. Print.

Cassuto, Leonard. *The Inhuman Race: The Racial Grotesque in American Literature and Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997. Print.

Chao, Shun-Liang. *Rethinking the Concept of the Grotesque*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association/Maney Publishing, 2010. Print.

Chesterton, G.K. *Robert Browning*. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1903. Print.

Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Claes, Paul. *A Commentary on T.S. Eliot's The Waste Land: The Infertility Theme and the Poet's Unhappy Marriage*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001. E-book.

Clark, John R. *The Modern Satiric Grotesque and Its Traditions*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1991. Print.

- Clayborough, Arthur. *The Grotesque in English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Print.
- Combs, Robert. "The Eternal Now of *Brave New World*: Huxley, Joseph Campbell, and *The Perennial Philosophy*." *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. London: McFarland & Company, 2008. 161-171. Print.
- Connelly, Francis S. "Introduction." *Modern Art and the Grotesque*. Francis S. Connelly, Ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 1-19. Print.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2007. Print.
- Davidson, Harriet. "Improper Desire: Reading *The Waste Land*." *The Cambridge Companion to T.S. Eliot*. Ed. A. David Moody. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 121-131. Print.
- DelConte, Matt. "Why You Can't Speak: Second-Person Narration, Voice, And A New Model For Understanding Narrative." *Style* 37.2 (2003): 204. *MasterFILE Premier*. Web. 7 Feb. 2014.
- Diken, Bulent. "Huxley's Brave New World - And Ours." *Journal For Cultural Research* 15.2 (2011): 153-172. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 14 Mar. 2014.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Notes from Underground*. Trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Vintage, 1993. Print.
- Edwards, Justin and Rune Graulund. *Grotesque*. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.
- Eliot, T.S. "Andrew Marvell." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 197-211. Print.
- . East Coker. *Four Quartets*. New York: Harcourt, Inc, 1971. 23-34. Print.

- . "Gerontion." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 22-24. Print.
- . "The Hollow Men." *Collected Poems: 1909-1962*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1991. 77-82. Print.
- . "Introduction to Charlotte Eliot." *Savonarola: A Dramatic Poem*. London: R. Cobden-Sanderson, 1926. VII-VIII. Print.
- . "Introduction to The Sacred Wood." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 59-63. Print.
- . Little Gidding. *Four Quartets*. New York: Harcourt, Inc, 1971. 49-59. Print.
- . "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 3-7. Print.
- . "The Metaphysical Poets." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 224-234. Print.
- . "Sweeney Among the Nightingales." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 36-37. Print.
- . "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. 99-108. Print.
- . *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. Print.
- Ellmann, Richard and Charles Feidelson, Eds. *The Modern Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965. Print.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Selected Essays, Lectures, and Poems*. Ed. Robert Richardson. New York: Bantam Books, 1990. Print.

Fernihough, Anne. *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993. Print.

Firchow, Peter. *The End of Utopia: A Study of Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. London: Associated University Presses, 1984. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization*. Trans. Richard Howard. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature." *The Widening Gyre: Crisis and Mastery in Modern Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968. 2-63. Print.

Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Realism*. London: Macmillan, 1900. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Five Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1977. Print.

---. "The Interpretation of Dreams." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. and Trans. James Strachey. Vol. IV. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1953-1974. Print.

---. "Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. and Trans. James Strachey. Vol. X. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1953-1974. Print.

---. "The Uncanny." *Pelican Freud Library*. Trans. James Strachey. Vol. XIV. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1985. 335-76. Print.

Friedman, John Block. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Print.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.

- Fry, Roger. *Cézanne: A Study of His Development*. London: Hogarth Press, 1927. Print.
- Fuller, Peter. *Art and Psychoanalysis*. 2nd Ed. London: Hogarth Press, 1988. Print.
- Goodwin, James. *Modern American Grotesque: Literature and Photography*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2009. Print.
- Gordon, David. "D.H. Lawrence's Dual Myth of Origin." *Critical Essays on D.H. Lawrence*. Eds. Dennis Jackson and Fleda Brown Jackson. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1988. 238-246. Print.
- Grigsby, John L. "Aldous Huxley." *Magill's Survey Of World Literature, Revised Edition* (2009): 1-5. *Literary Reference Center*. Web. 8 Feb. 2014.
- Harpham, Geoffrey. *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Distanz und Nahe: Reflexionen und Analysen zur Kunst der Gegenwart*. Ed. P. Jaeger and R. Lüthe. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1983. Print.
- . "Holderlin and the Essence of Poetry." *Existence and Being*. Trans. Douglas Scott. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949. Print.
- . "On the Essence of Truth." *Basic Writings*. Ed. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1977. 117-141. Print.
- . "The Origin of the Work of Art." *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. Print.
- . *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Garland Publishing, 1977. Print.
- . "Science and Reflection." *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Garland, 1977. 155-82. Print.

Hitchens, Christopher. Foreword. *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. By Aldous Huxley. New York: Harper Perennial, 2004. vii.-xxi. Print.

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Trans. T.E. Lawrence. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1992. Print.

Hugo, Victor. "La Préface de Cromwell." *Cromwell*. Ed. Annie Ubersfeld. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1968. 61-109. Print.

Huxley, Aldous. *Aldous Huxley: A Memorial Volume*. Julian Huxley, Ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. Print.

---. *Ape and Essence*. London: Triad/Panther Books, 1985. Print.

---. *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2004. Print.

---. *Crome Yellow*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1921. Print.

---. "The Essence of Religion." *Proper Studies*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1927. 171-191. Print.

---. "Foreheads Villainous Low." *Music at Night and Other Essays*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1931. 201-210. Print.

---. "Hypnopaedia." *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2004. 311-320. Print.

---. *Literature and Science*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963. Print.

---. "The New Romanticism." *Music at Night and Other Essays*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1931. 211-220. Print.

- . *Selected Letters of Aldous Huxley*. Ed. James Sexton. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007. Print.
- . "Spinoza's Worm." *Do What You Will: Essays*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1929. 62-92. Print.
- . "Swift." *Do What You Will: Essays*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1929. 93-106. Print.
- Huysmans, Joris-Karl. *Against Nature*. Trans. Robert Baldick. London: Penguin Classics, 1959. Print.
- Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987. Print.
- Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982. Print.
- Jencks, Chris. *Transgression*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Jennings, Lee Byron. *The Ludicrous Demon: Aspects of the Grotesque in German Post-Romantic Prose*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963. Print.
- Jones, Bethan. *The Last Poems of D.H. Lawrence: Shaping a Late Style*. Surrey, GB: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010. Print.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 1987. 9-11. Print.
- Karr, Mary. "How to Read 'The Waste Land' So It Alters Your Soul Rather Than Just Addling Your Head." *The Waste Land and Other Writings*. By T.S. Eliot. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. ix.-xxviii. Print.

- Kayser, Wolfgang. *The Grottesque in Art and Literature*. Trans. Ulrich Weisstein. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. Print.
- Knight, G. Wilson. "King Lear and the Comedy of the Grottesque." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of King Lear: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Janet Adelman, Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978. 34-49. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. Print.
- . *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Routledge, 1977. Print.
- . *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1992. Print.
- . *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977. Print.
- . "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent Leitch. New York: Norton, 2001. 1285-1290. Print.
- Laird, Holly. "'Records of Pain and Hope Now Spent': Elegy and Expenditure in Amores." *D.H. Lawrence: New Worlds*. Ed. Keith Cushman and Earl G. Ingersoll. London: Associated University Presses, 2003. 132-150. Print.
- . *Self and Sequence: The Poetry of D.H. Lawrence*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1988. Print.
- Lawrence, D.H. "Art and Morality." *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 161-168. Print.

- . "Both Sides of the Medal." *The Poems. Volume 1*. Ed. Christopher Pollnitz. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 191-192. Print.
- . "'Chaos in Poetry:' Introduction to *Chariot of the Sun*." by Harry Crosby," in *Introductions and Reviews— D.H. Lawrence*, ed. N.H. Reeve and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 107-16. Print.
- . "Cry of the masses." *The Poems. Volume 1*. Ed. Christopher Pollnitz. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 511-512. Print.
- . *D.H. Lawrence's Stories, Essays, and Poems*. Ed. Desmond Hawkins. London: J.M. Dent, 1973. Print.
- . "Etruscan Places." *Sketches of Etruscan Places and Other Italian Essays*. Ed. Simonetta de Filippis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.
- . "The Future of the Novel." *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 149-155. Print.
- . "Hark in the dusk!" *The Poems. Volume 1*. Ed. Christopher Pollnitz. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 369. Print.
- . "Introduction to These Paintings." *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. Edward McDonald. New York: Viking Press, 1936. 551-84. Print.
- . *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Ed. Michael Squires. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.
- . *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Vol. II. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1979. Print.
- . "Men Must Work and Women as Well." *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. New York: Viking Press, 1970. Print.

- . "Morality and the Novel." *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 169-176. Print.
- . "Nobody Loves Me." *Late Essays and Articles*. Ed. James Boulton. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 311-320. Print.
- . "On Being a Man." *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 211-222. Print.
- . "Our day is over." *The Poems. Volume 1*. Ed. Christopher Pollnitz. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 369. Print.
- . *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. Edward McDonald. New York: Viking Press, 1936. Print.
- . *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Print.
- . *Sketches of Etruscan Places and Other Italian Essays*. Ed. Simonetta de Filippis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.
- . "Study of Thomas Hardy." *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 1-128. Print.
- . *The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of Studies in Classic American Literature*. Ed. Armin Arnold. London: Centaur Press, 1962. Print.
- . *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983. Print.
- . "Why the Novel Matters." *The Open Form: Essays for Our Time*. Ed. Alfred Kazin. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970. 290-295. Print.

- . *Women in Love*. Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey, and John Worthen. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Print.
- Macdonald, Gina. "Brave New World." *Masterplots II: Juvenile & Young Adult Fiction Series* (1991): 1-2. Literary Reference Center. Web. 8 Feb. 2014.
- Macfadyen, Ian. "Dossier Five." *Naked Lunch @ 50: Anniversary Essays*. Oliver Harris and Ian Macfadyen, Eds. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009. 207-13. Print.
- Machen, Arthur. *Hieroglyphics: A Note Upon Ecstasy in Literature*. London: Unicorn Press, 1960. Print.
- Macherey, Pierre. *A Theory of Literary Production*. London: Routledge Classics, 2006. Print.
- Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto. In Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1984. Print.
- McElroy, Bernard. *Fiction of the Modern Grotesque*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1989. Print.
- Meckier, Jerome. *Aldous Huxley: Satire and Structure*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969. Print.
- Meindl, Dieter. *American Fiction and the Metaphysics of the Grotesque*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1996. Print.
- Morris, William. "Hopes and Fears for Art." *The Collected Works of William Morris*. Vol. XXII. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910-1915. 3-152. Print.
- Murfin, Ross. *The Poetry of D.H. Lawrence: Texts and Contexts*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. Print.

Nance, Guinevera. *Aldous Huxley*. New York: Continuum, 1988. Print.

Nanny, Max. “‘Cards Are Queer:’ A New Reading of the Tarot in The Waste Land.” *English Studies* 62 (1981): 335-348. International Bibliography of Theatre and Dance with Full Text. Web. 1 Feb. 2014.

Nielson, Keith. “Brave New World.” *Masterplots, Fourth Edition* (2010): 1-4. *Literary Reference Center*. Web. 8 Feb. 2014.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*. Trans. Ronald Speirs. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

O’Connor, Flannery. “Some Aspects of the Grotesque in Southern Fiction.” *Mystery and Manners: Occasional Prose*. Sally and Robert Fitzgerald, Eds. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 2000. Print.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *Man and Crisis*. Trans. Mildred Adams. New York: W.W. Norton, 1958. Print.

Owen, Wilfred. “Dulce Et Decorum Est.” *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. Eds. Margaret Ferguson, Mary Jo Salter, and Jon Stallworthy. 5th Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005. 1387. Print.

Pater, Walter. *Three Major Texts: The Renaissance, Appreciations, and Imaginary Portraits*. Ed. William Buckler. New York: New York University Press, 1986. Print.

Peacock, Thomas Love. “The Four Ages of Poetry.” Ed. John Jordan. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965. Print.

Poller, Jake. “The Philosophy Of Life-Worship: D.H. Lawrence And Aldous Huxley.” *D.H. Lawrence Review* 34/35 (2010): 75-91. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 7 Feb. 2014.

- Popp, Valerie. "‘Eloquent Limbs’: D.H. Lawrence And The Aesthetics Of Disability." *Journal Of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 5.1 (2011): 35-52. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 7 Feb. 2014.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Tradition and T.S. Eliot." *The Cambridge Companion to T.S. Eliot*. Ed. A. David Moody. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 210-222. Print.
- Richardson, Dorothy. *The Tunnel. Pilgrimage*. Vol. II. London: J.M. Dent, 1967. Print.
- Ruskin, John. "Grotesque Renaissance." *The Stones of Venice*. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1874. 112-165. Print.
- . *Modern Painters*. Boston: Dana Estes and Company, 1955. Print.
- . "The Nature of Gothic." *The Works of John Ruskin*. Ed. E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. Vol. X. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1903-1912. 180-269. Print.
- . "The Work of Iron in Nature, Art, and Policy." *The Works of John Ruskin*. Ed. E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. Vol. XVI. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1903-1912. 375-411. Print.
- Russo, Mary. *The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess and Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Santayana, George. *The Sense of Beauty*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896. Print.
- Sassoon, Siegfried. "‘They.’" *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. Eds. Margaret Ferguson, Mary Jo Salter, and Jon Stallworthy. 5th Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005. 1318. Print.
- Schiller, Friedrich von. *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Trans. Reginald Snell. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954. Print.

- Schwarz, Robert. *Broken Images: A Study of The Waste Land*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1988. Print.
- Scott, Walter. "Novels of Ernest Theodore Hoffmann." *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Scott*. Vol. 18. London: Whittaker and Co., 1834-36. 270-332. Print.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein: Or, The Modern Prometheus*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1992. Print.
- Shelley, Percy. "A Defence of Poetry." Ed. John Jordan. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965. Print.
- Smethurst, Paul. "'O Brave New World That Has No Poets In It': Shakespeare and Scientific Utopia in *Brave New World*." *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. London: McFarland & Company, 2008. 96-106. Print.
- Sontag, Susan. "Notes on Camp." *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*. London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2009. 275-292. Print.
- Spengler, Oswald. *The Decline of the West*. Trans. Charles Francis Atkinson. London: Allen & Unwin, 1926. Print.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986. Print.
- Stokes, Christopher. "'The Pure Present': Presence And Loss In D.H. Lawrence's Look! We Have Come Through!." *Textual Practice* 25.1 (2011): 109-132. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 7 Feb. 2014.
- Swift, Jonathan. "The Lady's Dressing Room." *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. 5th Ed. Margaret Ferguson, Mary Jo Salter, and Jon Stallworthy, Eds. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005. 572-575. Print.
- Thomson, Philip. *The Grottesque*. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

- Tsur, Reuven. "Aspects of Cognitive Poetics." *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Elena Semino and Jonathan Culpeper, Eds. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. 279-318. Print.
- Weiss, Peter. "Eliot's The Waste Land, Lines 77-85." *Explicator* 40.3 (1982): 45. Humanities International Complete. Web. 1 Feb. 2014.
- Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.
- Williams, William Carlos. *The Autobiography of William Carlos Williams*. New York: Random House, 1951. Print.
- Winnicott, D.W. *Playing and Reality*. London: Tavistock, 1971. Print.
- Woodcock, George. *Dawn and the Darkest Hour: A Study of Aldous Huxley*. New York: Black Rose Books, 2007. Print.
- Woolf, Virginia. "The Fleeting Portrait." *Collected Essays*. Vol. IV. London: Harcourt, 1966-67. 204-211. Print.
- . *Flush: A Biography*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1933. Print.
- . *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Nigel Nicolson. Vol. III. London: Mariner Books, 1977-1984. Print.
- Worthen, John. *D.H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979. Print.
- Young, R.V. "Withered Stumps of Time: The Waste Land and Mythic Disillusion." *Intercollegiate Review* 38.2 (2003): 24. Professional Development Collection. Web. 2 Feb. 2014.
- Zekiye, Antakyalioglu. "Memory, Poetry and Tradition For T.S. Eliot and William Wordsworth." *Meridian Critic* 18.1 (2011): 91-98. Communication and Mass Media Complete. Web. 2 Feb. 2014.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1991. Print.

---. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London and New York: Verso, 1989. Print.

