

The Making and Meaning of Myth

JOHN H. TIMMERMAN

HAVING LOOKED long into the heart of modern man, and after having found there a spiritual wasteland, T. S. Eliot questioned, "After such knowledge, what forgiveness?" Standing face to face with his own spiritual poverty, modern man has often sought forgiveness through temporal means, only to discover that they are in fact the very means of his impoverishment. And in a literary age characterized as a "desolate frontier"¹ in which "the Christian attitude toward life . . . has been completely forgotten by everybody,"² the task of the contemporary author to provide a well-spring of spiritual vision is indeed large. He must at once shape a literary form which will cut through the wasteland of words in order to make the reader mindful of spiritual direction for life, and he must in fact construct a vision of the spiritual significance of life which will work to redeem the age. Faced with such a task, the literary artist must point to origins, to what Eliot called in *Ash Wednesday* "the Word unheard in the unstilled world," to a source which can nourish an arid spirit.

Increasingly, contemporary authors committed to this task are turning to the use of myth to discern and reveal the spiritual order of life. "The present interest in myth," according to Charles Moorman, "reflects a need and search for order and certainty in the midst of the apparent chaos and disorder of

the twentieth century."³ While this interest in myth may indeed be large in the present age, as Moorman suggests, the nature and meaning of myth seem to be often misunderstood. The misunderstanding may be due in part to the confusing use of terms. A literary work may be described variously as mythic, mythological, or mythopoeic, and it may be said to contain a mythos.⁴ Furthermore, contemporary readers often infer from the term *myth* a sense of incipient falsehood, a deliberate effort to lead astray.

Contrary to the popular conception of myth as a "delightful lie," Mircea Eliade argued in his study *Myth and Reality* that "In archaic societies and in recent consideration once again, 'myth' means a 'true story' and, beyond that, a story that is a most precious possession because it is sacred, exemplary, significant."⁵ Moreover, Eliade adds that myth is "living, in the sense that it supplies models for human behavior and, by that very fact, gives meaning and value to life."⁶

My concern in this study will be with the effort in literature to discern these living "models for human behavior" of which Eliade speaks. But mythic literature may appropriately be seen as a response to the nature of the present age, and can only be fully understood when we come to grips with the spiritual tenor of the modern age. In this consideration of

myth in society and literature, I should also like to explore premises offered by a leading theoretician of myth, Mircea Eliade, and contrast those premises to a contemporary demythologizer, Joseph Campbell.

I

WHEN A civilization becomes highly structured, the need for and presence of myth seem to diminish. Such a society establishes structures of laws as a guide for meaning and action. Increasingly, such structures supplant a vital relationship with divine law with an essentially static system of human law. The compelling benefit of a system of human laws seems to be their immediate apparency. Everyone knows when such a law is broken simply because it is so recorded in some codification of laws. The considered value of such laws often lies in a direct proportion to the rigidity or sureness of them. The more often a law may be questioned, manipulated, or circumvented, the weaker it is. Thus human law seeks a sure and immediately accessible structure of determining what behavior is acceptable to society.

On the contrary, divine law is always more abstract. Couched in terms of an ethical imperative flowing from a supranatural authority, inscribed on the human spirit rather than code books, divine law provides a dynamic sense of fulfilling God's will in time rather than simply following the rules and regulations of a time. Divine law cannot be made into mere system; and indeed it is precisely in defiance of "mere system" that myth exists.

Divine law is always seen as living, as active in all life, and therefore it invests all the concrete acts of life with a sense of sacredness. Codification, or what also might be called legalism, tends to segment life into areas and subsections. No one human law can apprise man of appropriate actions for all life. While law books of a systematized culture pile up in increasing complexity, some men seek the cutting edge of a simple, compelling ethic that will slice through the obfuscation of the code books.

The essential contrast, then, is this. The

dynamic culture seeks in the midst of changing temporal events one unchanging, authoritative center of meaning. The static society is far more highly structured by compiling bodies of laws to govern every aspect of life. The first welcomes change as a chance to express the one authoritative voice in a new way; the other abhors change as either a threat to the status quo or as the onerous burden of compiling new laws. Myth is a means by which man perceives the absolute and authoritative will for life.

The breakdown from the dynamic to the static society in Western culture began, perhaps, during the rise of the monarchy in the Greek civilization, a movement which worked to empty *mythos*, or "story" about the divine framework for life, of spiritual significance. One sees this breakdown reflected already in the drama of the Periclean Age. For example, in Sophocles' *Antigone* the essential issue is whether man serves an eternal structure of divine laws or static, temporal, human laws. When King Creon insists that his edict regarding Polyneices be followed simply because Creon is the king and his word must therefore be followed, Antigone argues that:

It was not God's proclamation. That final
justice
That rules the world below makes no such
laws.
Your edict, King, was strong,
But all your strength is weakness itself
against
The immortal unrecorded laws of God.
They are not merely now: they were, and
shall be,
Operative for ever, beyond man utterly.⁷

On one level, then, myth is displaced as a center for meaning with the growth of centralized political structures. But a society also becomes more structured as it becomes more technological, and in a sense the growth of Western civilization may be traced by the concomitant increase in codification of laws and the increase in technological expertise. The rage for order is accompanied by sure and certain signs that order is reciprocated with

some kind of tangible benefit. This technology supplies. Technology is always the fruit of a highly structured society.⁸ In his analysis of modern society, *The Abolition of Man*, C. S. Lewis argued convincingly that such advancement always exacts a certain toll upon the spirit of mankind: "There neither is nor can be any simple increase of power on Man's side. Each new power won by man is a power over man as well. Each advance leaves him weaker as well as stronger. In every victory, besides being the general who triumphs, he is also the prisoner who follows the triumphal car."⁹

Lewis warns that when we forsake the *Tao*, the tradition or norms of spiritual value, we become slaves to what may be empirically held before us as evidence of our achievement. But by so doing, by insisting upon empirical evidence of human worth, the spiritual life is enervated: "Stepping outside the *Tao*, they have stepped into the void. Nor are their subjects necessarily happy men. They are not men at all: they are artefacts. Man's final conquest has proved to be the abolition of Man."¹⁰ Lewis means by *Tao* not just the Christian but also the significant, enduring spiritual directions of all ages, those which might be described as mythic, and argues that only when we are cognizant of the *Tao* are we cognizant of the center of meaning which is eternal yet which takes shape within man. Only with such recognition are we in fact valuable as human. Lewis' warning, I believe, is of critical importance: "While we speak from within the *Tao* we can speak of Man having power over himself in a sense truly analogous to an individual's self-control. But the moment we step outside and regard the *Tao* as a mere subjective product, this possibility has disappeared."¹¹

Two cultural movements, then, contribute to the dislocation of myth. The first is reliance upon political structures to provide readily evident guides for living. The second is the expectation that life can be improved by technological expertise to the point where man has no need for divine benefaction. In the post-naturalistic era of the twentieth century, man has often found both avenues

toward human autonomy at best unsatisfactory. At worst, we find ourselves, as J. Hillis Miller said, in a world from which God has seemed to disappear.¹² Miller means by that that all the old pathways for knowing God have been severed. As E. A. Robinson proclaimed in "Credo," there is no sign to light the way: "There is no star/ In all the shrouded heavens anywhere." Or, as Wallace Stevens more recently wrote, "The only Emperor is the Emperor of ice-cream." We find ourselves in a world of values as whimsical and transient as ice-cream on a hot day. "Let the lamp affix its beam," cried Stevens; and the light falls on a corpse of dead values: "If her horny feet protrude, they come/ To show how cold she is, and dumb." Faced with the compelling need to revivify values in an age which professes no need for such values, modern mythmakers attempt to refocus attention upon the ground of spiritual reality. By looking to that groundwork, perhaps we can refashion the spiritual foundation for life.

II

WHILE RECOGNIZING that "Myth is an extremely complex cultural reality, which can be approached and interpreted from various and complementary viewpoints," Mircea Eliade nonetheless constructs a definition for myth that embraces many of these viewpoints. Its very inclusiveness requires that his definition be printed in full:

Myth narrates a sacred history; it relates an event that took place in primordial Time, the fabled time of the "beginnings." In other words, myth tells how, through the deeds of Supernatural Beings, a reality came into existence, be it the whole of reality, the Cosmos, or only a fragment of reality. . . . Myth, then, is always an account of a "creation"; it relates how something was produced, began to be. Myth tells only of that which really happened, which manifested itself completely. . . . In short, myths describe the various and sometimes dramatic breakthroughs of the sacred (or the "supernatural") into the World.¹³

Eliade thereby establishes the premise that myth recounts some manifestation of divine will, power, and direction in human life. Since this manifestation is always generative, since it begins things in new direction, this creative act is therefore also determinative upon man. With the creative act the supernatural power does not finish its activity. Rather, by virtue of the creative act it initiates an activity and a power that abide with man in all the created order. It provides an exemplary pattern, an ethical structure by virtue of the way the particular order is created. Thus, I would argue, myth is an accounting of the nature of the universe and particularly a revelation of the sacred presence of divine mandates in the created order.

Myth, then, always attempts to glimpse a divine order which is continually unfolding itself in the created pattern. Myth is continuing story. Eliade argues that "If the World exists, it is because Supernatural beings exercised creative powers in the 'beginning.' But after the cosmogony and the creation of man other events occurred, and *man as he is today* is the direct result of those mythical events, *he is constituted by those events*. He is mortal because something happened *in illo tempore*."¹⁴ As men participate in the continuing story, one might say, he may exercise his faculties either to read the story truly, or to attempt to rewrite it to accord with his own demands. One learns to read the story truly by seeking the sacred presence of the divine power immanent in life. One attempts to rewrite the story by establishing one's own autonomy through man-made laws and structures which deliberately ignore the divine law. Such a situation is depicted by C. S. Lewis in *That Hideous Strength* in which we find the dialectic between *Logres*, the community governed by divine law, and *Britain*, the worldly community which abrogates divine law and supplants it with human autonomy. We begin to walk the path toward Britain, Lewis would say, as we begin to ignore the myth, the spiritual fabric of life. Not willing to hear, we hear less and less the divine commands which are shouted throughout the universe. All life becomes merely matter.

Then the myths are all illusions, fables, or lies.

Should one will to hear, to see, to understand, even the stones would cry out to this divine order. So, then, myth as used in the modern age employs story to initiate new hearing, new seeing, new understanding of timeless, divine truths. Modern myth, like the old stories, attempts to glimpse the presence of the sacred in life; the reality of the generation of all creation, and the ongoing, abiding presence of the generative power as it continues to reveal itself in its created order. All myth seeks beginnings; but it does so only so that the present order may be known more clearly. By myth the present, and the past event which shaped the present, coalesce. In myth we are at that primordial time, and by seeing that time, the true meaning of the story, we are better able to shape the nature of our present time to reveal the will of the creator. Thus, in a sense, our time is recreated by looking to the cosmogony of all earthly time. We see it in the light of origins and divine purpose, rather than in terms of our purposes at our time.

Why is it so important to view life with a sense of origin? All events of time have origin in the one creation of time. The events are shaped by, and gain meaning from, the one Creative Event. Myth seeks to bring the light of the primordial, cosmogonic Event that shaped time to bear upon the events of the present. Eliade comments that "It is the first manifestation of a thing that is significant and valid, not its successive epiphanies."¹⁵ There are difficulties with such a statement if we consider it too exclusively, but if we consider it to mean that the successive epiphanies are continuing revelation of one primary, essential manifestation, then I should think we would be bound to agree. Consider that the incarnation of Christ is meaningful insofar as it is understood in the total order of God's revelation. The incarnation was purposive; not accidental. It was soteriological, not coincidental. Furthermore, without the prior fall of man, the incarnation of Christ is meaningless. Without the sense of a created perfection by God, the fall of man is

meaningless. All of these temporal events gain significance in the revelation of God's will in the creative act. We have to look always to the ultimate reality which lies behind the event, the spiritual design to which the events point.

When myths point to this spiritual origin through certain regular patterns, these patterns become known as archetypes. The term "archetype" is particularly open to ambiguity, it seems, and is used with a variety of interpretations. Maud Bodkin has provided a useful definition by discussing archetypes as "themes having a particular form or pattern which persists amid variation from age to age, and which corresponds to a pattern or configuration of emotional tendencies in the minds of those who are stirred by the theme."¹⁶ Bearing in mind Bodkin's concept of recurring but varying themes which evoke emotional tendencies in the mind of the reader (or what might also be called "spiritual insights"), one might also turn to Northrop Frye's distinction between archetype and myth in the glossary to *Anatomy of Criticism*. While Frye's comments on myth are rather narrowly confined within his particular theory, his definition of archetype is helpful by making Bodkin's view specific to literature. For Frye, an archetype is "a symbol, usually an image, which recurs often enough in literature to be recognizable as an element of one's literary experience as a whole."¹⁷ The principal issue is that an archetype is a recurring pattern in literature which points to spiritual themes or experiences common to mankind.¹⁸

An example of an archetype in mythic literature would be the pattern of birth and rebirth, the idea that by seeking a primitive origin one finds the place of true beginning and thereby is reborn. Often this is symbolized in literature by a descent into a cave or tunnel of the earth. In his discussion of the *regressus ad uterum*, or the birth and rebirth archetype, Eliade remarks that there is always "the initiatory passage through a *vagina dentata*, or the dangerous descent into a cave or assimilated to the mouth or the uterus of Mother Earth. All these adventures are in fact initiatory ordeals, after accom-

plishing which the victorious hero acquires a new mode of being."¹⁹

The particular archetype of mythic literature which engages a quest for origins is significant by its extensive use in contemporary literature. On a spiritual plane, this archetype was fulfilled in Christ's descent into hell; the point from which all rebirth begins, the Event to which all such myth points. At the heart of the archetype in literature, however, lies the idea of dying to this world to regain clear insight of an absolute reality which will give new direction and patterns for growth in the temporal world. By undergoing the mythic rebirth, the individual is radically changed. The expectation of myth is that he can also bring this change to bear upon the nature of temporal events.

In a world of rapid change, myth touches upon something enduring and fixed. The sacred *archē* may infiltrate the temporal existence in a dynamic fashion, providing basis for actions, a guide for actions, and a teleological sense of final outcome. Were it not for this mythic reality, the temporal would overcome man so that his actions, directions, and end are merely relative to the time. Yet, it is precisely this relativity to the temporal which the modern demythologizer seeks.

III

THERE ARE basically three ways to consider myth. That myth is a lie is one. The second consideration is that myth is a story which reminds man of the spiritual origin and sustaining reality of life, and such is the view that I have argued in the preceding pages. We should note, however, that there exists a body of critical opinion which would desperately like to discredit such views and which sees myth in altogether different terms. Essentially, this third view sees myth as something that is relative to man's present circumstance rather than revealing of timeless spiritual reality.

For example, Joseph Campbell has argued in *Myths to Live By* that we need new myths since all the old ones have aged to the point of nonsensical senility. Thus, after a lengthy invective aimed at discrediting the argument

for a divine law, the argument I have been setting forth, Campbell asserts that:

The Biblical image of the universe simply won't do any more; neither will the Biblical notion of a race of God, which all others are meant to serve . . . nor again, the idea of a code of laws delivered from on high and to be valid for all time. . . . The problems of our world are not even touched by those stone-cut Ten Commandments that we carry about as luggage. . . . The modern Western concept of a legal code is not of a list of unassailable divine edicts but of a rationally contrived, evolving compilation of statutes, shaped by fallible human beings in council, to realize rationally recognized social (and therefore temporal) aims.²⁰

Curiously, some of the conclusions that this thinking leads Campbell to I fully agree with. I agree that no mere human codification of law should be mistaken for divine authority, and, furthermore, that the product of such human activity is nothing more than an effort "shaped by fallible human beings in council, to realize rationally recognized social (and therefore temporal) aims." But what is discomfiting in Campbell's argument is his effort to eradicate all dependence upon origins as guides for meaning: "Now let us ask: What about the symbolism of the Bible? Based on the Old Sumerian astronomical observations of five to six thousand years ago and an anthropology no longer credible, it is hardly fit today to turn anyone on."²¹ I suspect that the effort of myth is not first of all to "turn anyone on." Indeed, this quest for origins and ultimate spiritual realities is often undertaken with great struggle and with desperate longing. But this very longing, according to Campbell, should be a sign of one's error. In fact, he indicts such a questing as a kind of schizophrenia which divorces one from the reality of the age: "In short, my friends, what I find that I am saying is that our schizophrenic patient is actually experiencing inadvertently that same beatific ocean deep which the yogi and saint are ever striving to enjoy:

except that, whereas they are swimming in it, he is drowning."²²

That "beatific ocean deep" which promises sainthood in Campbell's secular humanism seems to be a kind of mystic peace which one derives from a rejection of a divinely mandated authority for life. This view, most readers are quick to realize, is not unique to Campbell in the modern era, and was perhaps most convincingly set forth by Friedrich Nietzsche. Freed from the sense of living a life which is given by a divine being, and therefore given with certain directions for living, Campbell demands that one focus exclusively on the present, temporal reality. Myth, then, functions to remind us of this reality: "The second function of a living mythology is to offer an image of the universe that will be in accord with the knowledge of the time, the sciences and the fields of action of the folk to whom the mythology is addressed. In our own day, of course, the world pictures of *all* the major religions are at least two thousand years out of date, and in that fact alone there is ground enough for a very serious break-off."²³

While it is fairly easy to detect what Campbell is against in *Myths to Live By*, it is more difficult to discern precisely what he means by "myth." Several presuppositional beliefs are readily apparent. First, his is a man-centered world of present, empirical reality. Secondly, "myth" is not to be construed as story which points to origins and divine revelation, but rather "myth" for Campbell constitutes a vague, impersonal force; what he calls at one point the "Mind at Large." This seems to be some human capacity, a world and life view perhaps but also the ability to effect that view, in dealing with temporal events. The belief is curiously at odds with its naturalistic presuppositional framework. Having stripped himself of a divine spiritual framework, the secular myth-maker still wants to claim some spiritual side of man. Where does it come from? Naturalistic humanism, into which category Campbell either knowingly or unknowingly argues himself, provides no basis for such a claim. In stripping man of spiritual reality, naturalistic

humanism is only left with the quantifiable product of natural law, not with a spiritual being directing or directed by spiritual mandates. Thirdly, then, we would have to qualify Campbell's "myth" as a kind of psychological attitude toward life, an understanding of the data which comprise life's technological way and a willingness to tread its path toward the promised land of individual happiness.

Lurking behind much of what Campbell argues, one immediately suspects, is the powerful influence of Rudolf Bultmann's *Kerygma and Myth*, although appearing here in popularized form. Bultmann's work hit modern theology with huge impact, and the wave-shock is growing ever larger. In short, Bultmann argued that "the mythical view of the world is obsolete," and that "*Man's knowledge and mastery of the world* have advanced to such an extent through science and technology that it is no longer possible for anyone seriously to hold the New Testament view of the world—in fact, there is no one who does."²⁴ Such a view denies (demythologizes) the expectation of Christ's return, any idea of a literal hell or heaven, any concept of miracles or divine intervention. Indeed, belief in the miraculous, or direct intervention by a deity in temporal events in a way not fully explainable by temporal events themselves, is for the demythologizer quite simply an embarrassment. All events must be explainable in terms of the temporal framework in which they occur:

Now that the forces and the laws of nature have been discovered, we can no longer believe in *spirits, whether good or evil*. We know that the stars are physical bodies whose motions are controlled by the laws of the universe, and not daemonic beings which enslave mankind to their service. Any influence they may have over human life must be explicable in terms of the ordinary laws of nature; it cannot in any way be attributed to their malevolence. Sickness and the cure of disease are likewise attributable to natural causation; they are not the result of daemonic activity or of

evil spells. The *miracles of the New Testament* have ceased to be miraculous, and to defend their historicity by recourse to nervous disorders or hypnotic effects only serves to underline the fact.²⁵

Myth for Bultmann is simply a revelation of man's own power, which all too often and unfortunately is displaced into a false spiritual order. Rather than revealing the nature of a spiritual order, myth reveals man's own nature: "Myth should be interpreted not cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially. Myth speaks of the power or powers which man supposes he experiences as the ground and limit of his world and of his own suffering."²⁶

It is a narrow and constricted world that Campbell or Bultmann offer. It is the world of brutal reality which Sylvia Plath, whose acidic vision cauterizes life into a painful scar, describes as "a black shoe in which I have lived like a foot."²⁷ Plath confessed that "I am terrified by this dark thing/That sleeps in me"²⁸ and extinguished the dark thing by placing her head in a gas oven and turning on the hissing jets. It is, says Kenneth Hamilton in his marvelously argued little book *In Search of Contemporary Man*, the easy way out: "And the easy way is also the dishonest way. It is to demand the abdication of reason, so that we may live in the false security of a universe patterned after our wishes and not according to reality."²⁹

This reality which calls from the distant past, and yet speaks clearly in the present age, is what myth seeks to heed. A technological age depersonalizes people, so that we find in our age not what Martin Buber called the *I* longing for communion with the *Thou*, but rather the *It* standing silently with hands pressed to ears. In his drama of shrunken lives, *The Glass Menagerie*, Tennessee Williams depicts three people turning in on themselves, longing for escape from a reality which will not quite let them go. In the moving final scene Tom soliloquizes from the fire escape while Laura blows out the candles in the apartment. Across the vast emptiness

of their broken lives, Tom calls, "Blow out the candles, Laura." Here we have the image of modern man stripped of spiritual presence, a dim candle flickering fitfully in a dark world. The hope, the anticipation of mythic litera-

ture is, as Kenneth Hamilton suggests, that "By bringing an undeniable presence into the void of a meaningless universe, religion will once again, as in the past, kindle the light of the human spirit."³⁰

¹Nathan A. Scott, Jr., *The Broken Center* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 4. ²William Barrett, *What is Existentialism?* (New York: Grove Press, 1964), p. 106. ³Charles Moorman, *Arthurian Triptych: Mythic Materials in Charles Williams, C. S. Lewis and T. S. Eliot* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960). ⁴The latter term, *mythos*, is perhaps most confusing, since it is rather recent to contemporary critical usage. Often the term, which is derived from the Greek root for "story," means in modern critical usage a world and life view revealed by the author or narrator of the story. "Mythopoeic" has a very specific etymology from the Greek *mythopoia* which is the making of myths or fables. The term refers specifically to the narrative structure of the work; that is, rather than narrating an event that is true to life and could *probably* happen in life, it narrates an event that could *possibly* happen given certain characteristics of the narrative world. "Mythology" is usually limited to the inheritance of ancient literature (which was often mythopoeic). ⁵Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 1. ⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 1-2. ⁷Sophocles, *Antigone*, trans. Fitts and Fitzgerald (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1939). ⁸Joseph Campbell, with whose views on myth I am in essential disagreement, is far more emphatic on this point. He states that "With our old mythologically bounded taboos unsettled by our own modern sciences, there is everywhere in the civilized world a rapidly rising incidence of vice and crime, mental disorders, suicides

and dope addictions, shattered homes, impudent children, violence, murder, and despair" (*Myths to Live By*, New York: Viking Press, 1972). My disagreement with Campbell centers upon his argument that this state of contemporary affairs warrants the absolute forsaking of myth in the traditional sense in favor of total concentration upon the technological spirit of our age. ⁹C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), p. 71. ¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 77. ¹¹*Ibid.* ¹²J. Hillis Miller, *The Disappearance of God* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965). ¹³Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, pp. 5-6. ¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 11. ¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 34. ¹⁶Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 4. ¹⁷Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957). ¹⁸Two other works are helpful to an understanding of archetypes: John J. White, *Mythology in the Modern Novel*. (Princeton University Press, 1971), and chapter four of *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature* by Guerin, et. al. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966). ¹⁹Eliade, p. 81. ²⁰Joseph Campbell, *Myths to Live By* (New York: Viking Press, 1972), p. 89. ²¹*Ibid.*, p. 88. ²²*Ibid.*, pp. 219-220. ²³*Ibid.*, p. 215. ²⁴Rudolf Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 4. ²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 4-5. ²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 10. ²⁷Sylvia Plath, "Daddy," *Ariel* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 49. ²⁸Plath, "Elm," *Ariel*, p. 15. ²⁹Kenneth Hamilton, *In Search of Contemporary Man* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1967), p. 21. ³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 22.