

Border States

Journal of the Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association

No. 3
1981



Published by Middle Tennessee State University

CONTENTS

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARY DOHERTY Henry R. Price	1
PATENT MEDICINE ADVERTISING IN AMERICA Robert L. Hungerland	10
PROFESSOR TOBIN'S PARTY LINE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TELEPHONE IN RICHMOND, KENTUCKY: A CASE STUDY Robert N. Grise	21
THE RIGHTEOUS CRUSADE: WORLD WAR I IN THE THINKING OF TWO AMERICAN EVANGELISTS Jerry Hopkins	27
OBSTACLES TO EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN TENNESSEE: 1925-1937 Lyman Burbank	38
THEMATIC TRANSITION IN THE TENNESSEE SHORT STORY-- 1864 TO THE PRESENT Linda Burton	48
IRONY AND THE NARRATIVE VOICE IN THE SHORT STORIES OF PETER TAYLOR Sara Dunne	60
ROBERT PENN WARREN'S POETRY AND SOUTHERN LITERATURE: DREAMS THROUGH THE GATE OF HORN William R. Wolfe	68

EDITORS' NOTES

The papers in this issue of Border States were presented at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Kentucky/Tennessee American Studies Association at Fall Creek Falls State Park, March 28-29, 1980. The program also contained three presentations not reproduced in this issue. Nancy Forderhase, Eastern Kentucky University, reported on "The Project for American Studies in the Secondary Schools." Sarah M. Howell, Middle Tennessee State University, presented her videotape "The Impact of the Scopes Trial on the Vanderbilt Fugitives." This videotape is available on loan from the Learning Resources Center, M.T.S.U. Terry L. Birdwhistell, University of Kentucky, presented his paper "WHAS Radio and the Development of Kentucky Broadcasting, 1922-1942." This essay will appear in a forthcoming issue of the Register of Kentucky History.

The publication of this issue of Border States was made possible by a grant from the Public Service Committee of Middle Tennessee State University. The editors extend their thanks to this committee for their support. The editors also wish to thank Mrs. Rita F. Lynch for her diligence and generosity in the preparation of the manuscript. It was printed at Middle Tennessee State University under the direction of James B. Booth.

Michael Dunne
Sarah Howell

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARY DOHERTY¹

Henry R. Price
Attorney at Law

The close of the eighteenth century was an exciting time for upper East Tennessee. Many land speculators, including a syndicate headed by Robert Morris,² celebrated financier of the American Revolution, acquired immense boundaries of land in upper East Tennessee. Offering this wilderness land for sale at bargain prices created East Tennessee's first land boom. The "boomers" were mainly from Pennsylvania and Virginia.

Hawkins County lay directly in the path of the great movement of immigrants on the Wilderness Road out of Pennsylvania, down through Virginia to Carter's Valley in Tennessee. Many did not stop, but pushed on to Bean's Station and then turned northward through Cumberland Gap into Kentucky. Many came and stayed, however, putting down roots that remain today. Others acquired land and stayed for awhile and then moved on westward. Some pulled up and headed back to civilization in Virginia or Pennsylvania.

One Michael Doherty joined this steady stream of humanity in Virginia and came South, purchasing 200 acres of land from James McWhorter on Patterson's Mill Creek in Hawkins County in 1788.³ He added 200 more acres under a grant from North Carolina in 1791.⁴ What caused Doherty's move to Tennessee is not clear. Perhaps, like so many others, he found the lure of good land at twenty-five pounds Virginia currency per 100 acres inducement enough. Michael Doherty cleared land and built a log cabin for himself and his young wife. After arriving in Hawkins County, this union produced four living children: Mary, the subject of this paper, a brother some two years younger, and two other children, still younger.

After giving him four living children in eight years, the wife of Michael Doherty died, leaving him in the wilderness with 400 acres of land to clear and tend and an eight year old girl, Mary, to assume the duties of keeping house and caring for three younger children, an undertaking almost unthinkable today. While little is known of home life in the Doherty household, it could not have been easy. Life was rough on the frontier and Michael Doherty, though an industrious man, was nevertheless a hard and austere father. The children never attended school or church and seldom mingled with other children in the neighborhood. Doherty and his family seemed to keep mainly to themselves. They were not unfriendly, but they seldom visited with their neighbors. Their social intercourse

with other settlers was usually limited to exchanging a few words with passersby who came through the valley near the Doherty cabin. After the death of his wife, Doherty had taken to strong drink and it was not uncommon for him to be seen intoxicated in public.

At least on one occasion Mary, probably overcome with the futility of her situation, attempted to take the two youngest children and run away. Her father thwarted this attempt, and Mary settled back into her prosaic roles of cook and housekeeper for her father, and foster mother for her younger brothers and sisters.

In April 1806 Michael Doherty disappeared from his home. For the first few days no one was alarmed because he was known to take off on a drunk that would sometimes last two or three days. It was not uncommon for Mary and the other children to be left alone at the cabin to fare for themselves during these absences. On the fifth day a Mr. Beaty and another neighbor, having missed seeing Doherty in the fields or along the valley road, came by the Doherty cabin to inquire of his whereabouts. Mary, who was about age twelve at the time, told Beaty that she last saw her father in one of the cleared fields near the cabin some four days earlier. Beaty, being of an inquisitive or perhaps suspicious nature, and knowing that Doherty always wore his greatcoat when leaving home for an extended time, asked Mary if her father was out in the fresh April weather without a coat. The girl replied that the coat was in the cabin. When Beaty asked to see it, she brought it out and said: "There, I suppose you are satisfied."

In fact, Beaty was not satisfied and began to look around outside the Doherty cabin, which was typical of the period--notched logs resting on four corner stones, somewhat elevated off the ground. Beaty was certain he saw something under the house, but the crawl space was so narrow that neither he nor the other neighbor could scoot underneath.

Beaty and his friend then forced their way past Mary into the cabin. They found blood on the chairs, the floor, and on the wall at the head of the bed. The two of them removed a puncheon from the floor and there underneath was the body of Michael Doherty. The side of his head was black, his skull was fractured, and he appeared to have been dead several days. Beaty accused Mary of having knowledge of her father's death, to which she replied, "Beaty, you lie." Neither she nor the other children showed any alarm whatever over the discovery of the body.

Beaty left immediately on horseback for Rogersville to summon the coroner and the sheriff. John Sheflet and other neighbors agreed among themselves to stay the night with the body and the Doherty children.

News of the event spread rapidly through the countryside and a great crowd gathered at the Doherty cabin to await the coroner and the sheriff. Upon their arrival the next day the inquest began. One neighbor had discovered a blood-stained wheelbarrow in the woodshed. Another neighbor found an axe. It had been washed but there was still some blood in the eye of it. The bed had also been washed, but blood stains were still there to be seen. The floor, too, had been recently scoured, but the stain of blood could still be plainly seen.

In the meantime, Mary had been bound with two ropes. Some old women were pushing her about, beating her and generally reviling her. Finally, John Miller, another neighbor, intervened, untied the girl, took her to a nearby branch, and told her to wash herself.

At the close of the inquest Mary was arrested and again bound and hauled by wagon some twenty-five miles to the Hawkins County jail at Rogersville to await trial. Mary was jailed on April 14 and Court was not due in Hawkins County until September. Her jail accommodations were frugal but not uncommon for the period--a small windowless cell with rough puncheon floor and a pile of straw for a bed. During her confinement between April and September hundreds or perhaps thousands of curiosity seekers came by the jail to get a look at the prisoner, particularly since rumor had it that she was under some kind of hex or spell. She paid no attention to them and seemed undisturbed at being jailed and charged with murder.

Tennessee's judiciary at the time consisted of a Superior Court served by three judges.⁵ They rode a circuit from settlement to settlement and exercised original and final jurisdiction. Serving at that time were David Campbell, Hugh Lawson White, and John Overton, all of whom were destined for illustrious legal, judicial, and political careers.⁶

White and Overton were the two judges who journeyed to Rogersville for the opening of the September 1806 term. They opened Court on Saturday, September 6, by empaneling a grand jury to hear evidence on all alleged crimes in the county since last term.

Because of the strange behavior of the prisoner during her confinement, the case drew a large crowd. Those who could not find standing room in the small courtroom milled around outside in the courtyard and on the hotel balcony across the street. People came from all over the county, by horseback, by wagon, by buggy, and on foot. Although many brought provisions to sustain them for what promised to be a long and exciting term, local merchants were doing a lively business in groceries and fresh produce.

Mary Doherty's case was the most prominent on the docket and hence was the first to be presented to the grand jury.

The attorney general attempted to use Mary's youngest brother, a lad of ten years, as the first witness before the grand jury to detail the events surrounding his father's death. The Court, however, on its own motion, examined the boy with respect to his understanding the oath required of all witnesses. When it became apparent that the boy had no understanding of the obligation of an oath, nor of any of the consequences of swearing falsely, nor even any idea of a future existence, the Court ruled that he was not a competent witness and could not testify.⁷ Neither would the Court allow him to testify before the grand jury without being put under oath.

Mr. Beaty was then called, sworn, and sent before the grand jury. He related the details of his visit to the Doherty cabin on the day Michael Doherty's body was found, and the grand jury returned an indictment against Mary for the murder of her father.

The twelve-year-old prisoner was then brought from the jail to the bar for arraignment, that is, to plead "guilty" or "not guilty." The crowd strained to see and hear her response. But she stood in the dock motionless, with eyes nearly closed, and with no apparent cognizance of what was being said to her or about her. Even the habitual court attendants had never seen anything like this before. There were whispers that the girl was surely possessed.

Because she was poor and without family or friends to assist her, the Court appointed two of East Tennessee's most distinguished lawyers as her counsel: Samuel Powel and Richard Grey. The hour was now late, the crowd was edgy, and the prisoner had stood absolutely mute and without food and drink during the day. Thus Court was adjourned until the following Monday, and the prisoner was remanded to jail.

On Monday, Mary was again brought to the bar and again stood mute. Her countenance was deathly pale, her eyes half closed, and she took no notice of anything going on about her. The Court directed that a jury be empaneled immediately and sworn to inquire whether the defendant stood mute through malice or through some visitation of God.⁸ Those seated for the jury were noticeably discomfited at having been selected. They were also uneasy about the defendant's presence--standing there like a statue.

Mr. Beaty was called to testify. He stated that he lived about a mile from the Doherty home. He had known the prisoner about three years, and she always appeared to him to have common sense. He had in times past heard her talk as other people. He had gone to the jail to see her about a week before the trial and had spoken to her about her brother and the other children. Other persons at the jail also spoke to her, but she made no answer and appeared to be senseless. Her eyes appeared to Beaty to be nearly closed, and her manner did not change while he observed and talked to her.

M. Shiply, another neighbor, was called. He stated that he

lived in the same neighborhood as the Dohertys and that the last time he saw the prisoner before court week was the day she was arrested and taken from home. She talked that day more than he had ever heard her, for she usually did not talk much. He had previously believed that she could talk as well as others. He was at the jail last week, however, and tried to talk to her, but saw no sign of understanding nor alteration in her countenance.

Mr. Patten, the jailer, was then called to testify. He had acted as jailer during three of the four months of her imprisonment. He heard her speak three or four times soon after she came to jail, but only in monosyllables: "yes" and "no." He had not heard her speak for eight weeks. When he first had the care of her, he endeavored to get her to eat for several days, but without success. He left food in her cell, fearing that she would perish. When he came back, the food was gone. He could not say that she ate it, but supposed that she did. He believed that the girl had been insane ever since being in jail. She always lay on a bed of straw, and he always found her on her right side, covered with a blanket, even in the hottest weather. She did not seem at all uneasy about being locked up in jail. He often made efforts to get her to speak, as had many others in his presence, but all without effect. He remembered only two other instances when he heard her make a sound. During the early part of her confinement she spoke to a black girl belonging to a Mr. McAllister. But lately the girl would come by the jail and try to get her to talk, but she would not. On another occasion a Mr. Fane was in jail and asked the prisoner if she would give him her blanket. She replied: "No." Just this morning her brother was at the jail to speak to her. She made no answer, and the brother saw no alteration in her countenance. Her eyes were usually as they are now, nearly closed, and the jailer could not recall ever having seen them blink.

Mr. Long, the former jailer, was called. He kept the jail about thirty days during Mary's confinement. During that time he heard her speak only once, and that was to Mr. McAllister's girl. He once saw her smile when the girl was dressing her. At first the prisoner would not eat anything without force. He thought she would perish with hunger. During his care of her, he never saw the least alteration in her looks; her eyes were always closed and she was always lying down. He tried frequently to get her to speak by persuasion and threats, but never could.

During all this testimony the defendant stood erect in the dock for several hours. Her countenance was ghastly pale, without the least expression or indication of understanding.

The Court then charged the jury that it was not only necessary for them to consider whether the prisoner could speak at all, but whether she had understanding to know what was meant by the indictment. Though she might say "yes" or "no," still she might not know what this court was all about. The jury was visibly shaken. After a short retirement they returned with a verdict that the defendant stood mute under a visitation of God. After the courtroom was quieted, the Court ordered a plea of

"not guilty" entered for the prisoner.

It was now late in the evening. Because it appeared that the prisoner would neither eat nor drink when any person was near, the Court ordered her remanded to jail and brought back the next day for trial on the indictment. An additional forty-eight persons were summoned to provide a panel from which the trial jury could be selected.

Early Tuesday morning Mary was again brought to the bar and placed in the dock. There was no change in her attitude or appearance. The jury was questioned, selected, and sworn. The indictment was read, and it was noted that a previous jury had determined that the defendant stood mute under a visitation of God and that a plea of "not guilty" had been entered for her.

Beaty, who by now had become an experienced witness, was again called and sworn. Though he did not know the age of the prisoner, he supposed her to be about thirteen. The Doherty family consisted of the prisoner, the little boy who had been offered as a witness, and two younger children. Doherty had lost his wife. There was not anything remarkable in the character of the deceased, nor did Beaty know anything of the conduct of the deceased toward his family.⁹ He had visited in the Doherty home and always thought the prisoner possessed as much understanding as common, but she never seemed to be employed as girls her age usually are. He never saw her employed except once or twice, and then she was providing some victuals for the family. Never had he seen the prisoner off the homeplace except once. He had never seen the family in a place of worship, and he believed that they never attended school.

The last time he saw the deceased was a few days before his disappearance. He went to the Doherty cabin because he had been told that Doherty had not been seen in four days and he suspected that Doherty might be dead, being subject to intoxication as he was. Beaty then restated his findings at the Doherty cabin and pointed out that all four of the Doherty children were present when the body was found. None of them appeared to be alarmed in the smallest degree.

John Miller was next sworn. He had helped remove the body from under the cabin and had seen all the blood. He took Mary to the creek during the inquest to get her cleaned up. He felt pity for her, and through persuasion had attempted to get her to confess the crime to him. After examining the circumstances under which Miller's conversation with Mary took place, the Court would not permit further testimony along this line.

John Sheflet was the next and last witness called. He recounted many of the facts stated by Miller. He stayed the night at the Doherty cabin after the body was found. Although Mary, in his opinion, was of an obstinate disposition, she did not offer to escape that night, though she could have done so.

She was not tied up until early the next morning at the inquest.

During this parade of witnesses the prisoner stood motionless in the dock. Her eyes were half closed and she took no notice of the proceedings. At the close of the state's case, counsel for the defendant offered no proof other than the physical presence of the prisoner: a twelve year old girl standing like a small statue before the jury.

The Court gave its charge of murder and the jury, seemingly unable to deal with such a near and visual visitation of God, returned after a few hours of deliberation and announced its verdict: "not guilty."

In addition to his official report of this case, Judge John Overton penned a personal commentary concerning the defendant which has been preserved¹⁰ and which is here offered as a fitting conclusion:

During the trial the prisoner did not discover any symptoms of mind, of alarm or the least understanding of what was passing. Her eyes were nearly closed, nor was she observed to wink. The sheriff took her out of the bar, and in doing this she appeared so perfectly insensible as to strike her head against it.

She stood for some time motionless in the court yard, where great numbers of persons examined her from curiosity. At length it was understood that some charitable women who lived in the neighborhood led her away from the crowd.

The next day, just before the sitting of the Court, two of the judges were walking in a balcony opposite the court house, when one of them observed there was a girl sitting near an old woman at the steps of the court house, who in shape and size very much resembled the girl tried the day before.

After a few moments she threw up her head, and instantly appeared a countenance which was recognized to be the same. Her eyes were open, clear, animated, and emitted striking sensations of complaisancy. In stature she was low, but of a robust, square form. Her cheek-bones high, and her face broad. Instead of her pale death-like countenance exhibited in court, her complexion was vivid and her countenance expressive. As the judges passed by her in going into court she threw up her head and smiled.

These circumstances are mentioned for the purpose of showing the inconceivable effort, and exertion of which the human mind is capable, under certain circumstances. How she became impressed

with the danger in which she was placed, remains to be discovered, for so she must have been to have fitted her mind for the more than human task it had to perform.

After having been arraigned for murdering her father, it would not be strange if every nerve were tremulously alarmed. But how any being endued with thinking powers could so abstract the mind, and withdraw its accustomed emanations from the countenance, upon so awful an emergency, is beyond ordinary calculation.

She certainly practised a deception, and that most completely. No person was seen but supposed she had literally lost her understanding, if not her speech. Several hundreds, if not thousands, particularly examined her from time to time, and none discovered the deception. This part of her character, to some, may appear the more extraordinary, when it is recollected that she was young, without education, decorum, a sense of religion, or the benefit of social intercourse.

But it seems, that these circumstances alone enabled her to perform an effort of dissimulation too much for ordinary belief. To have maintained this abstraction of mind, and to have kept every sensation of the soul from appearing on the countenance, upon so trying an occasion, and for such a length of time, seems to require powers beyond those attached to the human character.

Her education was a disgrace to those whose duty it was to attend to it. Without schooling, precept, example, morals, or the light derived from social intercourse, we behold an extraordinary character. Though the fraud she practiced required determination of mind and command of countenance of which the human character before was thought incapable, there exists a much greater cause for regret than for admiration.

NOTES

¹The factual narrative of the criminal trial related in this paper has been abstracted from the testimony given and the judicial rulings made in the case of State v. Mary Doherty, 1 Tenn. 80-91(1806).

²Samual C. Williams, "Dim Figures in Our Appellate Judiciary," Tennessee Law Review 17 (April 1942): 296.

³Deed Book 1, page 29, Register's Office, Hawkins County, Tennessee.

⁴Grant Book 1, page 350, Register's Office, Hawkins County, Tennessee.

⁵"History of the Supreme Court and Judicial System of Tennessee," Tennessee Digest, 1 (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company, 1950), p. vii.

⁶Ibid., pp. vii and viii.

⁷Under the early Common Law acquired by Tennessee from North Carolina and from England, a person generally had to believe in God and/or a future state of rewards and punishments to be a competent witness in court. Now, however, if a person can understand the obligation of an oath he is competent to testify. Children under age fourteen are presumed to be incompetent, but this presumption may be easily rebutted if the child is aware of the pitfalls of lying and the fact can be elicited under careful questioning. For example: "children who do not tell the truth do not go to Jesus." (Franks v. State; 187 Tenn. 174) (1948); "the bad man will get me." (Logston v. State; 50 Tenn. 414) (1871); and "would go to a bad world." (Vincent v. State; 50 Tenn. 120) (1871).

⁸It should be remembered that in some of the more remote parts of the country, including East Tennessee, the idea still lingers that someone who is defective, deformed, or lacking full faculties is sometimes thought of as having been "marked by God" or "visited by God."

⁹This testimony was undoubtedly elicited by defense counsel under cross examination in an effort to show perhaps that Doherty was a cruel father and that Mary's alleged actions were somehow justified. It is still common in rural murder cases to try the deceased rather than the defendant. That is to say, perhaps the deceased needed killing. If so, this implication helps the defendant.

¹⁰State v. Mary Doherty, 1 Tenn. 88-91 (1806). See material entitled "Original Note" immediately following the official report of the case.

PATENT MEDICINE ADVERTISING IN AMERICA

Robert L. Hungarland
Eastern Kentucky University

No humor was intended when the Lyon Manufacturing Company of Brooklyn published The Silver State Almanac, 1902, for Colorado, and advertised their Mexican Mustang Liniment "For Man and Beast!" As a matter of fact, the company made some very specific claims for their product. It "cures," they said, "ring-bone, spavin, scratches and diseased hoofs in horses and mules." and "foot rot, screw worm, hollow horn, sore tests, etc., in cattle." For man, it was a "speedy cure" for "a running sore or ulcer," and it offered "an easy way and a sure way to treat a case of Sore Throat in order to kill disease germs and insure healthy throat action." This required that one put a teaspoonful of Mexican Mustang Liniment into half a glass of water and "with this gargle the throat at frequent intervals," followed by bathing "the outside of the throat thoroughly with the liniment."

Also featured in this almanac was Lyon's Kathairon. That forerunner of today's dandruff shampoos gave the promise that it "stops the hair from falling out because it stimulates and strengthens the roots," and "completely eradicates dandruff, cleanses the scalp and therefore stops all itching."

When this almanac was issued in 1902, patent medicine advertising had just about reached its peak and would soon be curbed, at least to some degree, as a result of the passage of the Federal Food and Drug Act in 1906. The history of this form of advertising goes back hundreds of years, and much of that history gives a rather sordid picture of the industry and its promotion practices. Some of the earliest examples of advertising represent "cures" for ailments, real or imagined. In truth, many of the "diseases" to be cured had to be invented in order to provide a market for the products.

The term "patent medicines" is, in itself, misleading. More often than not, the word "patent" is used to describe any medicine that can be bought without a prescription but, more properly, it should be used only for those drugs or medical preparations that are protected by a patent. A more appropriate term to describe most of these non-prescription drugs is "nostrum," as it is defined in The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: "A medicine, the ingredients of which are kept secret; especially a quack remedy." The word's Latin roots indicate "our own". In this paper, "nostrum", "patent medicine", and "proprietary drug" will be used interchangeably. Furthermore,

few of the manufacturers or sellers patented their products. For one thing, they wanted to prevent potential competitors from gaining access to their secret ingredients. More important, perhaps, discretion dictated that the consumer not be made aware of some of the ingredients in the bottle.

Although the use of advertising to promote the sale of these nostrums began many centuries ago, the so-called "patent medicine" advertising got its big boost from the growth of newspapers in England during the 17th century. The early news-sheets were supplanted in 1622 by the "news-books" which appeared in pamphlet form and might run anywhere from "eight to forty pages."¹ The first-known news-book advertisement appeared in 1626, but advertising then disappeared from the pages of the news-books until 1647. After that date, advertising became a regular feature of the news-books and later of the newspaper, when the book format was abandoned in 1665. The advertising of quacks and nostrums became and remained a significant part of that newspaper advertising.

Within a few years after the ads began to appear in the news-books on a more or less regular basis, criticisms were directed at the newspapers for carrying the patent medicine advertisements. In the first issue of Mercurius Mastix, Samuel Sheppard wrote:

...they have now found out another quaint device in their trading. There is never a Mountebank who either by professing Chymistry, or any other Art, drains money from the people of the Nation, but these Arch-cheats have a share in the booty; and besides filling up his paper (which he knew not how to do otherwise) he must have a feeling to authorise the Charletan, forsooth, by putting him in the News-book.²

In tracing the English origins of American journalism, Willard Bleyer points out:

From the beginning of advertising, quack doctors and the makers of nostrums recognized the value of the news-books as a medium of publicity. They made the most extravagant claims for themselves and their wares. In an age when knowledge of medicine and surgery was comparatively limited, it is not surprising that charlatanism and quackery should have flourished. "Great Abuses," it was noted in How's CATHOLICK INTELLIGENCE; OR INFALLIBLE NEWS BOTH DOMESTICK AND FORREIGN, "have been put upon good People by the Cheats, and Pretences of Quacks and Mountebanks."³

Coffee and tea were introduced into England as possessing medicinal qualities, and it is said that coffee was advertised

in some fashion as early as the tenth century.⁴ In England, the first printed advertisement for coffee appeared in 1652.² The first English newspaper advertising for coffee came in 1657 in The Publick Adviser and it promised that this

...drink called Coffee, which is a very wholesom and physical drink, having many excellent vertues, closes the Orifice of the Stomack, fortifies the heat within, helpeth Digestion, quickeneth the Spirits, maketh the heart lightsom, is good against eye-sores, Coughs, or Colds, Phumes, Consumptions, Head-ach, Dropsie, Gout, Scurvy, Kings Evil, and many others is to be sold both in the morning and at three of the clock in the afternoon.⁶

Although brands had not become an important part of advertising, some sellers felt compelled to warn their customers of the dangers of buying from imitators. For example, the following ad appeared in Mercurius Politicus in 1660:

Most Excellent and Approved Dentifrices to scour and cleanse the Teeth, making them white was Ivory, preserves from the Toothach; so that, being constantly used, the parties using it are never troubled with the Toothach; It fastens the Teeth, sweetens the Breath, and preserves the Gums and Mouth from Cankers and Imposthumes. Made by Robert Turner, Gentlemen: and the right are onely to be had at Thomas Rookes, Stationer, at the Holy Lamb at the east end of St. Pauls Church, near the School, in sealed papers, at 12d, the paper.

The reader is desired to beware of counterfeits.⁷

In Colonial America, as the number and importance of the newspapers increased, the advertising they carried experienced similar gains. Not that the newspaper was the only medium available. Broad-sides, pamphlets, handbills, and trade cards were in wide use. All of these were getting attention from the patent medicine advertisers. It was, however, the newspapers, that received the lion's share of the business.

On July 10, 1776, when it was publishing the text of the Declaration of Independence on its first page, the Pennsylvania Gazette carried the following advertisement on the back page. Coming at a time when the rabies shot was not available, it offered what must have been false hope for the walkers and "joggers" of the day:

The subscriber begs leave to inform the public that he can and has for several years past, infallibly cured the BITE of a MAD DOG,

as numbers of people in this and the neighboring provinces can testify; my ancestors, for upwards of 150 years, did successfully practice the same cures in Old-England, when the ablest physicians there, after exerting their utmost skill, have failed therein; those who are so unhappy as to meet with such fatal disaster, may find an easy and effectual cure by applying to DANIEL GOODMAN, maker, living in Arch street between Second and Third-streets, Philadelphia.

The practice of medicine was not far advanced when the colonies were established in the New World. Even when the colonial period ended, treatment of the sick and injured was still in a rather crude state, as Curtis P. Nettles' points out in The Roots of American Civilization:

The first colonists commonly regarded disease as the work of supernatural agencies. Plagues and severe distempers were caused by evil spirits; common ailments and disturbances were God's means of punishing or purifying the soul. Many people therefore resorted to the ministrations of the clergy as an antidote to illness and pain. Home remedies, the chief reliance of the household, were efficacious largely because of lessening the patient's fears, they aided natural processes of recuperation. John Winthrop, Jr., advised this cure for ague: "Pare the patient's nails when the fever is coming on; and put the parings into a little bag of fine linen...; and tie that about a live eel's neck, in a tub of water. The eel will die and the patient recover."⁸

It seems likely that the nostrums worked in pretty much the same manner as the home cures "by lessening the patient's fears," although in many cases it was simply a matter of deadening the pain with the alcohol or drugs in the medicine.

The economic growth that followed the Revolution included, of course, westward expansion. As the frontier moved, the population thinned out and many pioneers lived in relative isolation. Certainly, as far as medicine was concerned, they were isolated from doctors and drug houses. This meant that home treatment was the rule. Nostrum-sellers found a new market.

In Texas, in 1838, a broadside advertising Texan Universal Pills,

prepared after a careful personal examination of the diseases incident to this climate, and with a particular reference to the health, comfort,

and happiness of the Citizens of this Republic: By James B. Gilman. The want of some general Medicine within the reach of every one, and particularly where no physician can be consulted, has often been the subject of much regret in this community (Houston).

Thomas W. Streeter, in his Bibliography of Texas, 1795-1845, points out:

Mr. Gilman in his write-up makes it clear that he regards as a "foul aspersion /the state-ment/ that Texas is an unhealthy country," but says that his pills are prepared "with a particular adaptation to the climate of this country... to obviate...the serious evil.../of/ scattered settlements...without any medical aid /which/ has no doubt sent many to an untimely grave." They are to be taken "in all violent and sudden attacks of any disease, such as Bilious Fever, Congestive Fever, Yellow Fever, Cholera, Morbus, &c. &c." From the lurid text it is evident that these pills were extremely purgative.⁹

The increasing demand for these proprietary drugs--for complaints partly real and partly imagined (with a great deal of coaching from the manufacturers) led the firms involved to seek out all likely sales agent and outlets. It was only natural that these medicines should find their way into the general stores that served the rural customers.

In describing the southern country store, Thomas D. Clark explains that:

Proprietary medicine makers found ready customers by the millions in the postwar South. Booming crossroads stores and villages became profitable outlets for a vast stream of tonics, pills, ointments, liniments, and dry-herb mixtures which poured out of "laboritories" in the larger distributing cities.

Three years after the Civil War the manufacturers of Plantation Bitters boasted that below the Potomac they were selling five million dollars' worth of their product each year. It was a profitable business to whet the South's indifferent appetites and to prod its sluggish colons. Alcohol-laden bitters of various types were regarded as fine conditioners for the former Confederate system, and country merchants lined their shelves with them. This was commonplace merchandise which required little or no selling, and only a slight portion of profits went for advertising.¹⁰

As soon as the itinerant peddler discovered the great demand for nostrums, he made them a staple item in his pack or wagon, using either the medicines imported from England or those which he bottled under his own label.¹¹ Much of the advertising for these cure-alls was delivered verbally at the point-of-sale, with peddlers acting as their own advertising men, although some of the customers may have been prepared by print advertising for some particular brand.

Almanacs had long been a favored medium for many kinds of advertising since they seemed to reach a very important segment of the patent medicine market, the farmer. Many of these "farmer's friends" were published and distributed by the manufacturers of a variety of proprietary drugs, but they were also used by the middlemen in the trade. Baker, Graham and Company, Austin, Texas, used this approach. Their Texas Almanac for 1876 carried ads for some of the manufacturers of the drugs distributed by the firm. There was, as usual, a heavy emphasis on testimonial letters.

Here, Jenkins' Annihilator, "The Great Remedy for Rheumatism and Gout," was offered to suffering thousands when the "kind-hearted" Dr. Jenkins could no longer turn a deaf ear to their pleas. His title of "doctor" meant little during this era, as many of the manufacturers or sellers simply assumed the title without ever having had any association at all with a medical school. This particular advertisement gives a graphic portrayal of an altruistic manufacturer whose only interest is in giving aid to the country's suffering masses:

JENKINS' ANNIHILATOR.

The Great Remedy for Rheumatism and Gout

We are introducing to our friends no new and untried remedy, when we offer them Jenkins' Rheumatism and Gout Annihilator. It is true that heretofore it has been confined to a comparatively limited circle, which, as case after case of long standing and obstinate resistance yielded to its healing powers, grew more extended. For many years this simple and harmless preparation of purely vegetable ingredients has been known in the Southwestern portion of Louisiana, all through the Attakapas region, where its extraordinary virtues have been fully tested, and have been certified to by the most prominent and esteemed citizens. Its fame having reached this city, many persons here who were afflicted, and who had tried other medicines in vain, were induced to give the Annihilator a trial, and to their joy found a perfect and complete cure.

The increased demand which naturally followed induced the proprietor to take up his

residence in New Orleans and increase his facilities for the manufacture of the Annihilator.

We deem it unjust to the thousands who are suffering from these terrible diseases, Rheumatism and Gout, that so valuable and reliable a medicine should remain unknown, like a light hid under a bushel, and have therefore determined to place it before our extensive circle of customers, and especially the readers of our Hygienic Almanac. We have witnessed its effects, we are personally acquainted with a number of those who have been relieved and cured by its use, and can therefore, from personal knowledge, recommend it as a sure, safe and speedy exterminator of those scourges of the human family, Rheumatism and Gout.

Mr. Chas. T. Nash, the well-known auctioneer, writes us as follows, viz:

New Orleans, June 11th 1874

Dr. Jenkins: Dear Sir: I take pleasure in certifying to the efficacy of your "Annihilator" in my case, for twenty years I had been a great sufferer from inflammatory Rheumatism and Sciatica. In November 1870, after having visited a few months before, the Hot and Warm Springs of Virginia and received some benefit, I felt the symptoms of my old attacks coming on. Limping along the streets I met an old friend Thomas Askew, who earnestly advised me to try Jenkins' "Annihilator," asserting that it had entirely cured him. Finding him in such good health I resolved to try the remedy--but with little faith in its efficacy. On examining me the Doctor found that the superficial veins of the entire left side of my body were barely discernible from want of circulation. I am glad to say that after taking two bottles of the "Annihilator" a marked change has taken place--pain ceased and a healthy circulation of blood following. I thank God up to this time I have had no serious attack since the first two bottles were taken. If at intervals I experience any of my old symptoms I find that a few doses entirely relieve me. During these four years I have taken about twenty bottles. I am satisfied that if persons using the remedy would give it a fair trial and not indulge in other stimulants they would experience the same benefit that I have derived from it.

Yours truly, Chas. T. Nash,
5 Carondelet Street

In that same almanac were advertisements for: "Ducro's Alimentary Elixir: Extracted from Raw Meat"; and "Creole Vegetable WORM CONFECTIONS: A Pleasant, Safe and Effectual Remedy for Worms." It is interesting to note that both the Elixir and the Worm Confection were manufactured by Wheelock, Finlay & Company, New Orleans, purveyors, also, of "Flavoring Extracts for Ice Creams, Syrups, Jellies, Puddings, Sauce, Cakes, etc. Vanilla, Rose, Lemon, Raspberry, Strawberry, Pineapple, Celery, Almond, Peach."

Poetry, of a sort, was used in the same booklet to promote Dr. Wilhoft's Anti-Periodic, promising that "A Short course of the Anti-Periodic will generally be sufficient to remove all Malarial diseases from the system," and claiming further:

It gives new life to man; remove all ills
That come from fevers ushered in by chills,
Invigorates by killing fell disease,
To mind and body brings delicious ease.

Such claims obviously were exorbitant, and there was no Food and Drug Administration or Federal Trade Commission around to pull back on the reins in the slightest way. It was not enough to claim that the medicines would "cure" just one disease. The list of illnesses that could be cured was usually long and covered a very wide variety of complaints. The Saturday Evening Post, a Philadelphia newspaper, on November 13, 1852, carried several such ads. Consider, for example, Dr. Hoofland's Celebrated German Bitters. The list of illnesses that could be "effectually cured" included:

LIVER COMPLAINT, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, Chronic, or Nervous Debility, Disease of the: Kidneys, and all Diseases arising from a Discarded Liver or Stomach, such as Constipation, Inward Piles, Fullness, or Blood to the Head, Acidity of the Stomach, Nausea, Heartburn, Disgust for Food, Fullness, or Weight in the stomach, Sour Eructations, Sinking, or Flatulency at the Pit of the Stomach, Swimming of the Head, Hurried and Difficult Breathing, Fluttering at the Heart, Choking or Suffocating Sensations when in a lying Posture, Dimness of Vision, Dots or Webs before the Sight, Fever and Dull Pain in the Head, Deficiency of Perspiration, Yellowness of the Skin and Eyes, Pain in the Side, Back, Chest, Limbs, &c., Sudden flushes of Heat, Burning in the Flesh, Constant Imaginings of Evil, and Great Depression of Spirits...

This recitation of the drug's far-reaching capabilities, not only for physical but also for mental problems was followed by a series of testimonials from "cured" and satisfied users.

The term "dyspepsia" was probably the most frequently used, and abused, of all the words and phrases found in the patent medicine advertising. Although it refers, simply enough, to disturbed digestion, it could mean just about anything the advertisers wanted it to mean. Another ad in that Saturday Evening Post from 1852 was for Dr. J. S. Houghton's Pepsin, a "Great Cure for Dyspepsia!" It was, said the ad:

THE TRUE DIGESTIVE FLUID OR GASTRIC JUICE

Prepared from RENNET, or the fourth STOMACH OF THE OX, after direction of BARON LIEBIG, the great Physiological Chemist, by J. S. HOUGHTON, M.D., Philadelphia, Pa. PEPSIN is the chief element, or Great Digesting Principle of the Gastric Juice,--the Solvent of the Food, the Purifying, Preserving, and Stimulating Agent of the Stomach and intestines. It is extracted from the Digestive Stomach of the Ox, thus forming a TRUE DIGESTIVE FLUID, precisely like the natural Gastric Juice in its Chemical powers, and furnishing a COMPLETE AND PERFECT SUBSTITUTE FOR IT.

This is NATURE'S OWN REMEDY for an unhealthy Stomach. No art of man can equal its curative powers. It contains no ALCOHOL, BITTERS, OR NAUSEOUS DRUGS. It is extremely agreeable to the taste and may be taken by the most feeble patients who cannot eat a water cracker without acute distress. Beware of DRUGGED IMITATIONS. Pepsin is NOT A DRUG.

Half a teaspoonful of Pepsin infused in water will digest or dissolve Five Pounds of Roast Beef in under five hours out of the stomach.

Sold by all Druggist and Dealers in Medicines throughout the United States. Price \$1.

F. Brown, Cor. Chesnut and Fifth Sts Agent for Philadelphia

aug. 21

As the boom built to its peak during the second half of the nineteenth century, the country became so inundated with the nostrums and with their advertising that the budding American Medical Association began to publish its own advertisements, warning the public of the dangers in using many of the drugs. The Association was involved also in the publication in the early 1900s, of a series of monographs, Nostrums and Quackery, which sounded the alarm on some of the preparations that were not covered by the recently enacted Food and Drug law.

The Pure Food and Drug Act was finally passed by Congress in 1906 after years of aggressive lobbying against it by the

Proprietary Medicine Manufacturers and Dealers Association. Regulation of the industry and its advertising was now a real possibility. While it did not mean the end of the industry, it did mean that, as the law was strengthened in the years ahead, the promotion of these drugs was at long last brought under some measure of control.

Just as the passage of the law and its subsequent amendments required a major effort on the part of many organizations and individuals, enforcement has also called for many long, hard-fought battles, involving both the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission.

Gerald Carson has pointed out that:

It took the Federal Trade Commission sixteen years, one hundred and forty-nine hearing sessions, eleven thousand pages of testimony, more than a million dollars, and a trip to the Supreme Court to eliminate the little word liver from the trade name and advertising of Carter's Little Liver Pills. But it was legally determined, at long last, that the seventy-year-old preparation, a laxative, did not have any perceptible effect upon the liver.¹²

Then, it took the Commission over a dozen years to get Geritol advertising changed to eliminate the "tired blood" theme. Another long struggle was involved in the successful effort to bring under control the monumental and misleading promotional campaigns for the phenomenally successful Hadacol.

Patent medicine advertising is still with us but it has lost much of its thunder, as well as some of its deception. Obviously, regulation has benefitted the consumer, and it would be unthinkable to return to the ways of old. Even today, advertisers are using many lessons learned from the old patent medicine advertising and the pitchmen.

NOTES

¹Willard G. Bleyer, Main Currents in the History of American Journalism (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1927), p. 6. See also James Harvey Young, The Toadstool Millionaires: A Social History of Patent Medicines in America Before Federal Regulation (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1961), and James Harvey Young, The Medical Messiahs: A Social History of Health Quackery in Twentieth-Century America (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967).

²Bleyer, pp. 38-39.

³Bleyer, pp. 39.

⁴William H. Ukers, All About Coffee (New York: The Tea & Coffee Trade Journal Company, 1935), p. 469.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ukers, p. 470.

⁷"Advertisements", Quarterly Review, 97 (1855), 195-196.

⁸Curtis P. Nettels, The Roots of American Civilization: A History of American Colonial Life, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), p. 498.

⁹Thomas W. Streeter, Bibliography of Texas, 1795-1845 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 205.

¹⁰Thomas D. Clark, Pills, Petticoats, and Plows: The Southern Country Store (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944), p. 189.

¹¹Brooks McNamara, Step Right Up (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1976), p. 6.

¹²Gerald Carsten, "Sweet Extract of Hokum," American Heritage, June 1971, p. 110.

PROFESSOR TOBIN'S PARTY LINE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE TELEPHONE IN RICHMOND, KENTUCKY: A CASE STUDY

Robert N. Grise
Eastern Kentucky University

It has been for only about a hundred years that we have had what Alexander Graham Bell referred to as "the electric speaking telephone." Before the advent of this form of instant oral communication with persons at a distance, life was of a vastly slower nature. People waited for replies with a patience that is quite foreign to us today, when the telephone is ubiquitous, appearing in even the most remote places such as the depths of Mammoth Cave, and indeed making most of the population immediately available for conversation.

Messages in the mid-nineteenth century usually had to be written and delivered by mail, making a delay of days or even weeks before the next step in the exchange could occur. If one were really in a hurry, he could go out back to the stable, saddle up a horse, and ride off to deliver the message personally, distance then being the determinant of speed. These patterns of slow communication were greatly disrupted by the telephone, for it brought to the ordinary person the opportunity to deliver a message and get an instant reply, complete with all the recognizable qualities of the human voice. An examination of the first appearance of this instrument in one Kentucky town might serve as a kind of case study to demonstrate how early telephone communication developed in the stage of experimentation with the new scientific toy.

The telephone came to Richmond, a small college town in central Kentucky, on the morning of April 29, 1878, two years after Alexander Graham Bell had received his basic patent.¹ A young professor of frail physique hurried from the Central University campus to Taylor's Grocery & Hardware store on Main Street some six blocks away. He was Thomas Tobin, a transplanted Englishman, who possessed an active and inquisitive disposition. A Queen's Medalist in the British government's School of Mines and Art, he had found himself stranded in Louisville the previous year, when a tour of British scientific equipment became financially insolvent. Col. Bennett H. Young of Louisville and Nashville Railroad fame was a member of the board of curators of Central University and was able to secure for Tobin the chair of chemistry and physics.²

As he walked, the professor carried a small telephone instrument, one of two he had constructed in his laboratory after having read of Bell's invention in the Scientific American.

He made his way to the back room of Taylor's store, where several friends had gathered to observe a demonstration that he had modestly assured them "would be of interest."³ The previous fall, Professor Tobin and his nineteen science students had constructed a telegraph line between Taylor's store and the laboratory at Central University for the purpose of studying telegraphy.⁴ It was to this line that he attached his telephone instrument, his other having already been connected to the end at the laboratory, where his students stood ready to carry on the electrical transmission of the human voice over a wire, the first such happening in Kentucky, outside the city of Louisville, according to newspaper reports.⁵

The following week, the Kentucky Register, Richmond's weekly newspaper, reported the event. After explaining how Professor Tobin had constructed the two telephone instruments "for his own amusement," it gave the following account:

On Friday last he invited a few of his friends to witness an exhibition of how one person can converse in an ordinary tone of voice with another person at a distance of half a mile. A conversation between Prof. Tobin and a young man at the University was begun and carried on for several minutes. Other parties were allowed to place the instrument to the ear, and the words were distinctly heard; the voice of the party was also easily recognized. A loud laugh in the room at the University was very plainly heard by parties in the room downtown.

The success of the professor's experiment at the distance of half a mile was complete; but not satisfied with this, he was bent on another and longer test. On Tuesday afternoon he adjusted one instrument to the wire at the telegraph office at the Richmond depot, and went with the other to Silver Creek station, a distance of 11 miles. Here the other instrument was attached, and in a few moments the operator in Richmond heard very distinctly, "How are you, McKinney?" Quite a number of citizens have talked over the wire during the week, and Prof. Tobin is very justly the lion of the hour.⁶

Having experienced the marvel, and having had the explanation of it by the professor, the editor sought to enlighten his readers. He wrote:

The construction of these curious instruments and the general principle underlying this application of modern science may be of interest to

our readers. It is not the sound which is conveyed along the wire, but, as in the ordinary telegraph, electricity. The operator at the end of the line desiring to send a message furnishes the entire motive power by talking into a small mouthpiece, which sends pulsations of electricity through the wire, however long it might be. At the other end these electrical waves are converted by a similar instrument into sound which strikes the ear of the listener.

The most wonderful fact is that the passage of the sound effect over the wire is practically instantaneous. No sooner was the question asked than the answer came, apparently in the same breath--scarcely allowing time for the taking of the instrument away from the mouth and placing it to the ear. The telephone is now one of the established curiosities of Richmond.⁷

A brief examination of what Bell invented and Professor Tobin copied may be of interest at this point. Alexander Graham Bell ushered in the age of the telephone in June, 1875, when he was the first to discover that vocal sounds could be transmitted electrically by means of undulating current caused by a varying contact or varying magnetic field. Other inventors such as Elisha Gray and Moses Farmer had for many months been working toward the same goal--an instrument that would transmit the human voice. However, these inventors were all electricians who tended to follow the lead of Phillip Reis of Germany who had been able to transmit tones (but not the qualities of human voice) by using a vibrating "make-and-break" contact as a transmitter. Bell, on the other hand, was a speech teacher who knew less about electricity and much more about the nature of the human voice, and was therefore better able to comprehend the principle of the undulating current.⁸

Without deprecating Bell's discovery to be an iconoclast, I would like to point out that Bell's only invention which was useful to the telephone industry was the hand magneto telephone, later to be used as a receiver. It was this instrument that Professor Tobin copied. Bell placed a permanent magnet approximately five inches long in a small wooden case. Around one end of the magnet was wound a coil of fine copper wire, the ends of which were connected to the telephone line. A thin sheet-metal diaphragm about three inches in diameter was positioned a fraction of an inch from the end of the magnet that held the coil. The undulating current from the line flowed through the coil, causing an electromagnetic effect which alternately strengthened and weakened the pull of the permanent magnet on the diaphragm, causing the diaphragm to vibrate at the same frequencies as the sound waves which were put in at the telephone at the other end of the line. Early difficulties with the wood case soon necessitated a change to a shell of molded hard rubber.⁹

This hand magneto telephone (not to be confused with the later magneto telephone which used a magneto generator for ringing bells) could actually be used as either a receiver or a transmitter. Early subscribers placed the instrument to the ear to listen, and then switched it to the mouth when it came time to talk. As one can imagine, much confusion developed in switching the instrument back and forth, especially when both parties wished to talk at the same time. Those subscribers who could afford it soon found that two instruments solved the problem nicely; as a matter of fact, they were interchangeable--either would do as transmitter or receiver.¹⁰ To summon the person at the other end of the line, the subscriber pecked on the diaphragm with a pencil, causing a similar sound in the other fellow's telephone. At first, the American Bell Telephone Company usually rented these instruments in pairs, with little thought to connecting them with other lines.¹¹

After Professor Tobin's experiments, interest grew rapidly in Richmond, and additional hand magneto instruments were obtained from the Bell Company. The line to Taylor's store was extended to a bank, the railroad depot, the residence of two bankers, and then back across the fields to the university laboratory for experimental purposes, making a loop of approximately two miles.¹² These several telephones were all in series, with conversation between persons at any two being heard at all the other instruments, allowing the practice of eavesdropping even at this early stage.

During the next several months, four additional private lines were erected to connect pairs of telephones located in the residences of merchants and their places of business. "It is only a matter of time," wrote the editor of the Register, "when wires about the town will form a network, and will doubtless extend into the country."¹³ The University chancellor had a private line installed between his office on campus and his home three blocks away. In September, 1879, it was reported that his telephones had been fitted up with Watson-type bells, while the rest of the folks were still pecking away at their diaphragms to call one another.¹⁴ Even in those days, it seems, administrators had to have their status symbols.

Upon hearing of Professor Tobin's party line, a Courier-Journal reporter from Louisville visited the professor's laboratory and reported: "He has operating between the University and the town, all of his own making, a telegraph, a telephone, and a microphone . . . besides many other marvelous pieces of modern mechanism. I heard the tick of a watch at the other end of a two-mile circuit. . . . He assured me he could hear a fly walk at twenty miles, and I was, and still am, fool enough to believe it."¹⁵

Tobin's party line served to transmit what was probably the first telephoned fire alarm in Kentucky in May, 1879, when there was a fire in a professor's house on campus. "The telephone

sent the alarm downtown," reported the Register, and "a crowd started for the scene . . . but it was extinguished too soon for fun or damage."¹⁶ The party line no doubt stayed busy with the exchange of information and impressions concerning the emergency, and the community leaders got their first insight into the possibilities of the instrument for something other than a scientific toy.

In April, 1880, Tobin resigned his position. Between the time of his resignation and the end of the term, however, the amazing little professor drew architectural plans for a small country church and supervised the installation of a culvert and the regrading of a road over a creek near the campus.¹⁷ He went back to Louisville, and died of tuberculosis three years later at the age of 39.¹⁸

After Tobin left Richmond, interest in electrical communication declined, and on February 14, 1881, the editor of the Register observed, "How strange that Richmond, the first place in Kentucky outside of Louisville to have a telephone, and at one time having several lines, should now not have an instrument in use." And so ended the first stage of excitement over the professor's scientific curiosity.

NOTES

¹Kentucky Register, 3 May 1878.

²J. T. Dorris, "Central University, Richmond, Ky.," Register of the Kentucky Historical Society, 32, No. 99 (March 1934), p. 12.

³Kentucky Register, 3 May 1878.

⁴Catalogue of Central University, 1877-78, pp. 18-19.

⁵Kentucky Register, 3 May 1878.

⁶Kentucky Register, 3 May, 1878.

⁷Kentucky Register, 3 May 1878.

⁸K. B. Miller, American Telephone Practice (New York: McGraw Hill, 1905), p. 8.

⁹Miller, pp. 34-39.

¹⁰F. L. Rhodes, Beginnings of Telephony (New York: Harper, 1929), pp. 176-77.

¹¹ John Brooks, Telephone: The First 100 Years (New York: Harper, 1976), p. 60.

¹² Louisville Courier Journal, 10 September 1878.

¹³ Kentucky Register, 24 May 1878.

¹⁴ Kentucky Register, 19 September 1879.

¹⁵ Louisville Courier Journal, 10 September 1878.

¹⁶ Kentucky Register, 16 May 1879.

¹⁷ Kentucky Register, 28 May, 25 June, 1880.

¹⁸ Dorris, p. 12.

THE RIGHTEOUS CRUSADE: WORLD WAR I IN THE THINKING OF TWO AMERICAN EVANGELISTS

Jerry Hopkins
University of Kentucky

Are public figures tied to the "tyranny of the majority"? Can they speak prophetically with criticism and correctiveness regarding the ills and wrongs of society? Or must they become merely the barometer of public opinion and sentiment? Are public figures such as evangelists parrots of the "status quo," or are they symbols of the popular mind? A study of some aspects of the debate over the involvement of the United States in World War I will provide the historian with some answers to these questions.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the response of two American evangelists, William "Billy" Sunday and Mordecai Fowler Ham, to the issues generated in this national debate. This discussion should suggest some conclusions concerning their motivations, particularly if they changed opinions. They were chosen for these reasons: Sunday worked primarily in the North, Northeast and East,¹ whereas Ham was most active in the Midwest, South, and Southwest;² Sunday was very prominent, whereas Ham was only of nominal significance (probably only regionally significant); while Sunday's name reached high levels in the national press during these years, Ham's received, in the main, local press coverage. The differences in these two men should serve to give a balanced view of what evangelical Americans held about the war.

To Americans, World War I, in the beginning, was a European matter. The people and leaders of the United States, for the most part, wanted nothing to do with it. Isolationism was running at high tide. However, the countervailing currents of German submarine warfare, and other hostile actions, combined with the interventionism of some American leaders, brought the United States into the conflict in 1917. Thus it finally became a world conflict. When war first broke out in Europe, however, many did not realize its importance. The attitude of most people was one of horror, smugness and condemnation. Billy Sunday's attitude was; "If European nations were so foolish as to get into a mess, it only proved how decadent they were, and a progressive, modern, Christian democracy like the United States might well congratulate itself on being outside the conflict.³

Sunday was not eager to commit himself when war broke out in Europe. To follow him is to follow the struggle

of America's leadership in making a decision to enter the war. Prior to American entrance into the conflict in April, 1917, he seldom mentioned the conflict. When he mentioned the war, "it was to express the opinion held by the great mass of Americans that Europe should be left to stew in its own juice."⁴

In his Denver crusade in 1914 reporters urged him to make a statement. His reply was, "There'll always be wars. God is the God of love and the God of war too." Then someone asked him if the devil was involved in the war. He said, "Oh, yes, I think the devil has supernatural powers and sometimes I believe that the Lord lets him go on ripping things up just to see how far he'll go." On the whole he made few statements during the Denver crusade about the war. When he did speak it was almost as a casual aside. "A lot of fools," he remarked on one occasion, "over there are murdering each other to satisfy the damnable ambitions of a few mutts who sit on thrones." At another meeting he said, "The war in Europe is a sideshow compared to the damnable effects of the saloons."⁵ At this point Sunday believed the prohibition crusade at home to be more important than the war. At a meeting in Paterson, New Jersey, in April, 1915, he revealed an unwillingness to pray for the end of the hostilities in Europe, insisting that God might be using the war to punish all those involved in it.⁶ The hand of God was upon Europe in judgment and wrath.

The news of the sinking of the Lusitania on May 7, 1915 was a shock to the American public. The great ship sank in eighteen minutes with a loss of 1,198 lives, including 128 Americans. When Billy Sunday heard of the sinking and deaths he cried, "Damnable! Damnable! Absolutely hellish!"⁷

By May, 1916, Sunday was becoming more outspoken and committed to a belligerent stance toward Germany. In his Kansas City campaign he sat to the right of Theodore Roosevelt at lunch. He had come to the meeting ready to support Roosevelt's campaign for the presidential nomination. Sunday said to Roosevelt, "I don't know what the delegates to the convention know about it, but I have been out among the plain people, and I know they all want you. I don't think it, I know it, and if you are nominated at Chicago you will receive the biggest vote given a candidate in the history of the country." Later during the same day Roosevelt received Sunday and his wife in order to express his thanks to them for their support. When Roosevelt greeted them he said, "By George, I am glad to see you, Billy."⁸ They both smiled and shook hands vigorously.

The friendliness expressed toward Roosevelt and Sunday's support of him indicate agreement with Roosevelt's thoughts regarding the war in the spring of 1916, even though William McLoughlin dates the beginning of Sunday's commitment to intervention as late as the fall of 1916. Even in the fall crusade in Boston, however, Sunday was still not willing to commit himself in a sermon. "We are a mixture of all races," he said, "hence we are not a nation in the sense France, England,

and Germany are nations though we have got them skinned, take it from me, and we can whip hell out of the bunch. I hope we won't have to, but if it comes to a showdown, look out!" In the concluding remarks in his call for decisions on one night he said, "You talk about a moral equivalent for war; you can develop more backbone by fighting devils in your neighborhood and city than you could if you were on the firing lines in Europe."⁹

In December, 1916 he made his strongest and clearest statement on the war. But he did not let it be known which side he favored, although his support of Roosevelt probably had made it obvious that he favored the Allies. In the midst of speaking on total commitment to Jesus Christ, he said, "There's no more neutrality about it than in war. There's nobody in the United States that's neutral. A neutral is a nonentity. He's a cipher. Nobody's neutral. I know I'm not."¹⁰

The Boston statement on neutrality was sufficiently vague to permit misinterpretation for either side of the conflict. But in March, 1917 he became very specific, expressing this in a closing prayer:

Jesus, you are surely taking a lot of back talk from the Kaiser. I wish, Lord, you would tell America to help wipe Germany off the map. Count Billy Sunday in up to his neck when war comes-- I'll raise enough of an army myself to help beat the dust off the Devil's hordes. Jesus will be our Commander-in-chief and he has Hindenburg beaten to a frazzle.¹¹

Near the same time Sunday joined in a "council of war" with such men as Theodore Roosevelt and J. Pierpont Morgan. This particular meeting was in preparation for "War Sunday"--this "warlike sabbath" was to "sound the call to arms." War was upon the nation and the clergy, with Billy Sunday in the lead, joined the effort to prepare.¹²

War was declared in April, 1917. On the next day, Sunday said, "Well, it has come at last! I am surprised that we have kept out of the war this long. President Wilson has certainly shown lots of patience. We were just forced to fight."¹³ On May 30, 1917, he prayed again about the war. "O Lord," he prayed, "damn a country /Germany/ like that. I don't pray for them; the sooner we damn them the better off we are. Prayer couldn't stop this war. Gosh! We've got to use bullets now."¹⁴

As the war effort got underway and the war propaganda began to whip up the emotions of the populace for battle, Sunday began to speak with greater power and precision. "All this talk," he shouted in February, 1918, "about not fighting the German people is a lot of bunk. They say we are fighting for an ideal. Well, if we are, we will have to knock down the German people to get

it over."¹⁵ In some ways this view contradicts that of President Wilson, who distinguished between the German people and the German militarists.¹⁶

As the war movement gained momentum and the emotional pitch began to run against Germany, Billy Sunday's rhetoric rose in force. His delineation of the situation was vitriolic. "I tell you it is /Kaiser/ Bill against Woodrow /Wilson/, Germany against America, Hell against Heaven. Germany lost out when she turned from Christ to Krupp and from the Cross of Calvary to the Iron Cross. Either you are loyal or you are not, you are either a patriot or a blackhearted traitor." It was with the same attitude that he spoke of "that weazen-eyed, low-lived, bull-neck, low-down gang of cut-throats of the Kaiser."¹⁷

During the spring of 1918 Billy and "Ma" Sunday planned a trip overseas. President Wilson spoke to them about their proposed trip. Years later "Ma" Sunday recalled the incident:

President Woodrow Wilson called Billy and me to the White House to ask Mr. Sunday not to go overseas. This was during the first World War. We were ready to go. We had our visas and letters from Mr. Wanamaker and others to introduce us over there, and all that. Mr. Wilson said, "Mr. Sunday, I hear you are planning to go overseas, but I don't want you to go. Your preaching is holding the attention of the whole country as you go from place to place. This is doing more to help than anything else you could do. Billy put out his hand to the president and said, "Your wish is law with me." He stayed. Raised over \$1,000,000 for Liberty and Victory loans.¹⁸

McLoughlin states, however, that Sunday and his wife were always resentful that Wilson asked this of them.¹⁹

In the 1918 Washington, D.C., crusade, Sunday's tabernacle was constructed on government property near Union Station. It had a seating capacity of 12,000. During the course of the campaign, many celebrities attended, including generals and European diplomats. Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, an enthusiastic supporter of Sunday, was often in attendance. On one night Senator Harding of Ohio, Champ Clark, Speaker of the House, and Joe Cannon of Illinois were seated on the platform with Sunday.²⁰

It was during this campaign that Champ Clark invited Sunday to give the prayer at a session of the House of Representatives. On January 10, 1918, Sunday prayed a long and eloquent prayer which sums up his position on the war aptly. The United States was viewed as God's country and the flag was exalted. He prayed for victory in the war. He asked God to let the forces of nature join in the battle against Germany. Of Germany, he

said, "Thou knowest, O Lord, that no nation so infamous, vile, greedy, sensuous, bloodthirsty, ever disgraced the pages of history."²¹

The same attitude of belligerence, denunciation and abhorrence continued through the end of armed hostilities in 1919. By this time Sunday was on the decline in popularity and influence. The New York meeting marked the apex of his fame and influence as a national figure. From that time until his death in 1935, his power declined as a public figure.

In one of his last sermons in the 1930s he gave some indication of his views on the conclusion of World War I. In 1934 he revised his sermon on the second coming entitling it "The Coming Dictator." It was a pessimistic and "end of time" sermon. In it he presumed that the world would end in 1935. But, there was a significant note of international perceptiveness in this message. He pointed to impending war, international insults. He blamed the rise of Hitler on the Versailles Treaty and the world armament race on the manufacturers of munitions.²²

Billy Sunday eventually thought of the first World War as a righteous crusade. Yet, as his early expressions of reluctance to fight indicate, he saw violence as a last resort, but by no means an alternative to be shunned.

Mordecai Fowler Ham was a contemporary of Sunday.²³ When Sunday was rising to his pinnacle of fame, Ham was just getting started. Ham was, as indicated earlier, a regional evangelist concentrating his work mostly in the South and Southwest. He was born and lived most of his life in Kentucky, with the exception of a three-year pastorate in Oklahoma City.

When World War I struck Europe, Ham, along with other fundamentalist evangelists, saw it as a support for their doctrine of man's violent and innate sinfulness. He exploited this situation to the fullest. Ham posed the question in his Paris, Kentucky, crusade of 1914: "Will the United States be drawn into the European War?" He then used the Bible to argue that the war fulfilled prophecy. He quoted various verses to prove that it would become a world war before it was finished.²⁴

Preaching in Danville, Kentucky, in the next year, he spoke on the war again. He said that war was the result of sin: "In every case where war is now being waged the people at one time or another disregarded religion and threw the Bible to the winds." Denouncing the English and German universities for "trying to supplant the Bible with other books," Ham asserted that the war was the judgment of God upon the fighting nations. "Europe is in war today," he emphasized, "because she has passed her day of evangelization. Her churches are corrupt. She sought to bring about peace, not by promoting the kingdom of the Prince of Peace, but by increasing her armaments and by Carnegie's ten-million-dollar peace palace at the Hague, by their own

devices, and now they are fighting desperately all around the Hague."²⁵

Five months later in the San Antonio, Texas, crusade, Ham charged that the devastation of Belgium was a result of the death and sorrow meted out to the inhabitants of the Belgian Congo. He declared that the United States would pay in blood for every shipment of arms and ammunition sent to the warring nations. This was before a crowd of about 8,000 people. In a message on June 2, 1916 he mentioned Belgium again, making the point that hell is a necessary result of her barbarous cruelties to the natives in the valley of the Congo. He condemned the Belgian King, Leopold, for his cruel exploitation of the Congolese, preaching that Leopold's greed caused their enslavement and maltreatment, leading to God's judgment of Belgium in war. The next day, June 3, 1916, Ham returned to the problem of the war. He said that war between nations and individuals is caused by lust--lust for power, gain, territory, honor, opinion.²⁶ The cause of the war, therefore, was sin. To enter such a war would be a sin. While pleading for American non-intervention, he recognized that the only reasonable course the nation could pursue was that of national preparedness. In the San Antonio meeting on June 7, 1916, the army band visited and performed in a service, and Ham spoke on preparedness. He conceded that the Bible has nothing to say about the subject of national preparedness: "God never gave the church one word of instructions how to rule a nation. He had as well given a book on ethics to a hog as the New Testament to a Godless nation."²⁷

While he argued for preparedness, Ham was not clear about what should be the Christian's response in reality. This becomes evident, for example, in the same meeting in San Antonio when he asked an audience, "What is the Christian's duty toward war?" He said, replying to his own question, "It is all summed up in Christ's order to Peter, 'Put up thy sword.' And 'He that taketh up the sword shall perish by the sword.'" In another service he came back to the same issue. He said that the attitude of Christians toward war changed after Constantine: "Christ taught that like him, we should shed our blood for the salvation of the other fellow; while war required that we shed the other fellow's blood for our own salvation. Till the time of Constantine such a thing as a Christian going to war was not heard of." In this statement Ham came close to being a pacifist. In the same message he honored William Jennings Bryan: "Bryan got to where he saw that he could not serve his God and his country, so he quit the service of his country."²⁸ Ham thus leaned toward Bryan, whereas Sunday was more oriented to the personality and position of Theodore Roosevelt.

With what proved to be a fallacious prediction, Ham declared on July 10th in the Texas meeting, "Russia and Germany are both going to be dissatisfied with the treaty that will end this war and will federate against the others and will march their armies into Palestine, attack the restored Jews there,

in an effort to win Constantinople, the most strategic point on earth."²⁹ He then declared that the end of time was near. The war had ceased to be the war to end all wars and had become according to Ham the war to end all time.³⁰

The end did not come to the world. The war effort finally ground to a halt in the Armistice. There was not a new alliance or an effort to take Palestine. What Ham said did not transpire. But this did not deter him from continuing to comment on the war through the Twenties. As late as 1928 he said, "The last war was brought on because of a thirst for world dominion on the part of the Kaiser and the Vatican."³¹

Ham, as did Sunday, saw the war as God's crusade against sin. It was a sign of the end, but the end did not come. War was a righteous judgment upon an unrighteous people. There was no exception. None of the nations on the earth escaped guilt. God's wrath, Ham argued, was equally poured out upon them. Nobody really won the war.³²

Sunday and Ham represented the wave of popular opinion among evangelicals regarding the war. During the war the churches were virtually unanimous in supporting the war once it was evident that we could not avoid involvement. Churches mobilized to do chaplaincy work among the training soldiers, conducted parties and special services for the troops, and generally denounced the Germans for their war effort. Most churches did not have organizations working for the war effort, but their pastors kept them informed. Ministers solicited subscriptions to loans, preached on the righteousness of the Allied cause, and justified American entrance into the conflict. Most inhabitants of the United States were reluctant to get involved, with the notable exceptions of the ethnic groups with deep roots still in their homelands, and men such as Theodore Roosevelt who had a strange affinity for war. Sunday was silent until the tide of public opinion shifted, and then he committed himself to that direction. But even this did not save him from decline and a lessening of influence. Ham was not silent. He spoke, but what he said was not pro-English or pro-German. He condemned both sides for their sins and evils, including the United States.³³

In the beginning for both Sunday and Ham the war was a judgment of God upon the European nations. Germany had sowed the seeds of higher criticism; France had sowed the seeds of immorality; England had embraced the false sciences of Darwin and Huxley. They both saw God's hand in the ruin of Europe. As it became more evident that the United States was not going to evade involvement in the war, the two evangelists modified their opinions. Sunday became increasingly anti-German and pro-English. Ham did not so much change his condemnation of any European nation as add to his list the name of the United States. America had departed from her devotion to God and was therefore characterized by moral laxity which brought the judgment of war.³⁴

Such an opinion as that voiced by Ham was favored by many evangelical Southerners. The reaction of people in Dickenson County, Virginia, to the war is reported in this way:

The people of Dickenson knew that alone they were powerless to avert the catastrophe that was coming into their lives. Suffering, destruction and death could not be avoided. God was punishing the world for its sins. America could not escape her share of this punishment, and her people would have to pay along with the rest of the world.³⁵

This attitude, characteristic of the Fundamentalist movement, stood out in sharp contrast to the Social Gospel, popular before the war, which held that evil could be eliminated through reform legislation. Modern trends in theology were increasing their interest in man "not God; on social theory, not the gospel."³⁶ This was the era of progressivism not only in theology, but also in legislation, politics, and social thought.

Fundamentalism, on the other hand, held a totally pessimistic view of man. Ham and Sunday were both prominent in this movement, along with men such as W. B. Riley, J. Frank Norris and Bob Jones, Sr.³⁷ These Fundamentalists saw man as a depraved creature, fallen from a former state of glorification in "the Garden of Eden." He once lived in paradise, but now he was subject to his own squalor and filth. He was a sinner. He was inherently evil. This formed the basis for the evangelistic preaching of this period. Of course, man's sin and his need of God had been dominant themes in varying ways in evangelical thrusts of previous generations. Probably the most important point is that the war reinforced the Fundamentalists' concept of the total wickedness of man. In the thinking of Ham, Sunday, and the other Fundamentalists the war confirmed this idea and disproved the Social Gospel advocates' idea of man's perfectability and progress.

Ham and Sunday are reflections of the evangelical populace's opinion. To hear them is to hear the vast majority of Protestant evangelicals of their time speak. Their lives and income both depended upon not offending the people who supported them. In this sense, Ham and Sunday, rather than shapers of evangelical public opinion, were shaped by evangelical opinion and operated within the dynamics of their particular group in conformity with popularly held sentiments. By examining the public statements of these representative evangelists, we can, thus, study the thinking of their congregations. Ham and Sunday could not have continued to reach large audiences if congregations had repudiated their shifting views, first on neutrality and then on American involvement in the war. And yet, these evangelists did continue to succeed. They are, therefore, especially accurate barometers of the social thought in certain enclaves of American evangelicalism during the years surrounding World War I.

NOTES

¹See William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham (New York, 1959), Ch. 8, for an analysis of his meetings. For a more specific study consult William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Billy Sunday Was His Real Name (Chicago, 1955). For accounts of the many other evangelists working in these years, see also Bernard A. Weisberger, They Gathered at the River: The Story of the Great Revivalists and Their Impact Upon Religion in America (Chicago, 1958), ch. 8; William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America: Its Origin, Growth, and Influence (New York, 1944), p. 170; Grover C. Cloud, Evangelized America (New York, 1928), pp. 279-367.

²Edward E. Ham, Fifty Years on the Battle Front with Christ: A Biography of Mordecai F. Ham (Louisville, 1950), pp. 284-294.

³McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 255; David T. Morgan in "The Revivalist as Patriot: Billy Sunday and World War I," Journal of Presbyterian History 51 (Summer, 1973): 199-215.

⁴McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 255.

⁵McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 256.

⁶New York Times, 29 April 1915.

⁷Thomas A. Bailey, Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace, (New York, 1944), p. 4; Morgan, "Revivalist as Patriot," p. 202.

⁸Theodore T. Frankenberg, Billy Sunday: His Tabernacles and Sawdust Trails (Columbus, Ohio, 1917), p. 202.

⁹McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, pp. 256-57; Morgan, "Revivalist as Patriot," p. 202.

¹⁰McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 257.

¹¹W. L. Clark, Billy Sunday Unmasked (Milan, Illinois, 1929), p. 41.

¹²James R. Mock and Cedric Larson, Words That Won the War: The Story of the Committee on Public Information, 1917-1919 (Princeton, 1917) pp. 820-821.

¹³McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 257.

¹⁴Joseph Collins, "Revivals Past and Present: Relections on Some of their Psychological Aspects," Harper's Magazine, 135 (November, 1917), 862.

- ¹⁵New York Times, 19 February 1918.
- ¹⁶Arthur S. Link, Wilson's Campaigns for Progressivism and Peace, 1916-1917 (Princeton, 1965), pp. 420-26; Bailey, Lost Peace, pp. 10, 15-16.
- ¹⁷McLoughlin, Billy Sunday. p. 256.
- ¹⁸Lee Thomas, The Billy Sunday Story: The Life and Times of William Ashley Sunday, D.D. (Grand Rapids, 1961), p. 180.
- ¹⁹McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, p. 259.
- ²⁰Thomas, Billy Sunday Story, p. 186.
- ²¹Thomas, Billy Sunday Story, pp. 113-114; George Sylvester Viereck, Spreading Germs of Hate (New York, 1930), pp. 195-196.
- ²²McLoughlin, Billy Sunday, pp. 289-290.
- ²³Edward E. Ham's 50 Years on the Battle Front with Christ is the only biography of Mordecai F. Ham available.
- ²⁴Jerry Hopkins, "Mordecai F. Ham: Prohibition and Sensational Evangelism in Kentucky, 1914-1915" (M.A. thesis, Eastern Kentucky University, 1969), pp. v, 5-6, 17, 77-79. Lexington Herald, 31 October 1914.
- ²⁵Hopkins, Mordecai F. Ham, p. 64; Danville Kentucky Advocate, 20 December 1915.
- ²⁶San Antonio Express, 8 May 1916; 2,3 June 1916.
- ²⁷San Antonio Express, 7 June 1916; 7 July 1918.
- ²⁸San Antonio Express, 7 July 1916; 7 June 1917.
- ²⁹San Antonio Express, 10 July 1916.
- ³⁰The Echoes (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma), 22 March 1918.
- ³¹The Echoes, 3 July 1928.
- ³²San Antonio Express, 7 July 1916; 8 May 1916.
- ³³William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York, 1950), pp. 401-405, outlines generally how American clergymen and churches reacted to the war and the country's involvement in it. One of the most thorough studies of clergy involvement in World War I is Roy H. Abrams, Preachers Present Arms (New York, 1933). Arthur K. Davis, ed., Virginia Communities in War Time (Publication of the Virginia History Commission, Source Vol. VI, 1926), pp. 10-11, 188, 256, 274, 367-369, 430.

³⁴Nashville Banner, 5 December 1921.

³⁵Davis, Virginia Communities, p. 188.

³⁶James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison, Religion in American Life (Princeton, 1961), I:297-98; Martin Marty, The New Shape of American Religion (New York, 1959), p. 162.

³⁷C. Allyn Russell, Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies (Philadelphia, 1976).

OBSTACLES TO EDUCATIONAL REFORM
IN TENNESSEE: 1925-1937

Lyman Burbank
Vanderbilt University

Any serious study of American history, from 1865 to the Second World War, must have, as one of the major themes, the implications of the changes in life brought by the shift from an agrarian society to a predominantly urban society. This essay attempts, in a small way, to suggest some of the problems in Tennessee connected with these changes. In a sense, it is a somewhat discouraging essay, because it suggests that those who were aware of the new problems of urbanization were, in fact, unable to overcome the political power of local self-interest.

Like most other rural states, Tennessee had at that time many schools with low enrollment. Before the widespread use of the school bus, no effective means of school consolidation had been found. In any case, the number of paved highways in the state was limited. There was great excitement when the Memphis-to-Bristol highway association was first formed, in 1919, with the purpose of building a paved highway all across the state. However, localism was so strong that it was not until the 1930s that the three regional Teachers Associations--East, Middle and West--were finally brought together in the form of the Tennessee Education Association. Furthermore, the evidence shows clearly that these localisms had built around them large numbers of educational vested interests which developed a very high resistance to any attempts by the State to consolidate schools. As in most other large American states, the Tennessee movement toward the consolidation of schools was closely associated with the progress of building paved roads, and by the time economic depression struck the state, relatively little progress had been made.

It has been a characteristic of the history of American education, that, in nearly every state, there have been enormous variations from one school district to another in the ability to support public education from funds derived from local property taxes. Tennessee was no exception. However, in the twenties, the State was in harmony with the times in its effort to "equalize" educational opportunity, through the use of state funds to supplement the meager sums available in some counties. In fact, much was made in educational circles of the "Equalization Fund" established by the legislature in 1925. This law, passed in the closing minutes of the session after three months of debate, was hailed by the Nashville Tennessean as one of the state's great achievements. Each county levying a minimum elementary school tax of

fifty cents on one hundred dollars of assessable property was now to be granted enough funds by the state to enable it to operate the elementary schools for eight months during the year. Added to that was a provision requiring all counties, receiving State equalization funds, to have the same teacher salary schedule-- a new schedule based upon training and experience.¹

To help finance these reforms, the legislature passed a law taxing the sales of manufactured tobacco. From the receipts of this tax, \$250,000 was to be used for the new educational changes. In 1927 this sum was raised to \$800,000. The immediate results of the passage of the law of 1925 were rather significant. In 1927 the Commissioner reported that the elementary schools in forty-six of the state's counties had been able to lengthen the school year. He further reported that only three counties, lacking sufficient local funds for an eight month term, had failed to apply for state funds. On the forty-six counties referred to above, the number of school days added varied from thirteen in Cocke and Scott counties to sixty-two in Overton.²

Despite some immediate benefits from passage of the 1925 law, there is another side to the coin. The legislature soon began loading the Equalization Fund with private acts, "thus making the Act of 1925 unfair and unjust to the larger counties," according to the Annual Report of the State Department of Education, 1932. The Commissioner of Education finally suggested the wisdom of doing away with an Equalization Fund, and proposed that the State assume payment of all elementary teacher salaries for an eight-month year. He wished to make it a misdemeanor for any County Board of Education to use such proposed funds for any purpose other than payment of teacher salaries.³

Between 1925 and 1933, a total of 758 separate provisions affecting education were passed by the Legislature, and a great many of them nullified the intentions of the 1925 law. It would, of course, be impossible in a short space to list and explain all these separate provisions, but among the more important were the following:

1. The law was amended in such manner that no county was to receive from the State less than it received in the year 1924-25. The Annual Report of the Department of Education for 1930 pointed out that if the daily attendance in any county dropped to zero, that county would still receive the same amount from the State that it had received in 1924-25.
2. A private act of 1927, applying to Pickett County, read as follows:

An Act to create a County Board of Public School Directors in all counties of this State having a population of not more than 5520 nor less than 5200 according to the federal census of

1920....and to abolish the County Board of Education in all counties affected by this Act.⁴

3. The Legislature established the "Chestnut Glade Special School District" in Weakley County. Here the elementary school was operated and administered quite independently of the County System. The County Trustee collected the school funds of the Special District and paid them to the Treasurer of the Special District Board of Education.
4. In the case of the "Big Special School District," in Benton County, "the local school funds are included by the County Superintendent in the county school funds in his report."⁵
5. By 1934 there were thirty-eight County Superintendents elected by popular vote, despite the fact that the law of 1925 had provided that superintendents be selected by the Quarterly County Court.

It is no wonder that the Commissioner of Education reported, as early as 1928, that the two greatest obstacles to educational progress in Tennessee were private legislative acts and failure to observe the school law.⁶ This theme was repeated over and over in the decade following passage of the 1925 law. The Tennessee Educational Commission, choosing another way of saying the same thing, reported that it was impossible to establish a state school system "when the type of organization or type of control is being changed at frequent intervals."⁷ In Tennessee, reported the Commissioner in 1928, there was a dual system of administering and financing public education. He argued that a single State system would be "more economical to the taxpayers than a state-county system." This fact, he said, had been clearly demonstrated by the State system of highway construction.⁸

It is indeed worthwhile to examine in some detail the very straight-forward, and sometimes caustic, remarks in the 1926 Annual Report of the State Department of Education. According to the report, those who had studied the history of public education during the last century found few and brief periods of progress. The authors of the report indicated that progress should be continuous. One of their recommendations was that the county Superintendent of Schools no longer be elected, but chosen by the County Board of Education, which would fix his salary. It was believed that such a change would introduce greater stability. The authors of the report noted that there was no legal means by which the State Department of Education could inspect county records. It was recommended that the Department be given this authority, and also the power to recover misused public funds. The Annual Report also recommended a measure which has never come to pass. In counties with small towns, it seemed

unnecessary to have both a county and a city superintendent. Even though the report urged legislation to make all school systems in the State coterminous with the county lines and county administration, this proposal met tremendous resistance.

Added to the problem caused by countless private legislative acts, by failure to obey the general school laws, and by dual systems on the local level, were the effects of economic depression.

Four days after the re-election of Governor Henry Horton in 1930, the Bank of Tennessee, in Nashville, was in the hands of a receiver. In rapid succession came the closing of the Holston Union National Bank in Knoxville, and of Caldwell and Company in Nashville. In the main, the funds of the State had been deposited in these institutions.⁹ Although dramatic, these financial events did not, in the long run, have as great an effect on the economy of Tennessee as did the agricultural depression.

The Federal Farm Board had undertaken a campaign in 1930 to reduce the cotton acreage. The price of cotton, which had stood at above 18 cents per pound in September, 1929, had gradually drifted downward. Despite the best efforts of the Farm Board, the price reached 12 cents by mid-1930; it stood at 8.5 cents in mid-1931, and it reached a low of 4.6 cents in mid-1932.¹⁰ The condition of the tobacco market "was even more chaotic than that of cotton."¹¹ Tobacco prices in 1931 were approximately 25% of what they had been in 1919.

The educational results were devastating. The Tennessee population, essentially rural in nature, had chosen to finance its schools largely from rural property taxes, and the state's equalization fund had been based on a tobacco tax. County tax delinquency, which had been 13% in 1930, advanced to 24% in 1931. For the cities these same figures were 13% and 27% respectively. Urban unemployment grew as industrial establishments decreased from a peak of 2882 in 1929, to 1561 in 1933.

The high rate of tax delinquency resulted in major importance being attached, especially in the rural counties, to state allocations. A significant problem resulted from this, because the law stipulated that the state should pay its local allocations only twice a year--in January and July. Many school systems therefore resorted to the payment of teacher salaries in the form of warrants.

In any given year the local educational budget had to be finished by July first. However, the local taxes, on which that budget was to be based, were not collected until eight months later and during the interval the only money available for operation of the schools came from state payments. Since neither the Quarterly Court nor the State Board of Education had authority to borrow money to take care of school warrants, many teachers were forced into a choice of discounting their warrants at banks

or of holding them until the county's school funds were collected.

The total amount of county property tax levied in Tennessee in 1932 was close to \$23,000,000, but by June of the following year more than fifty per cent of this was delinquent. Thus a substantial portion of the money anticipated by the schools was actually unavailable to them.¹² The Commissioner of Education expressed pleasure in 1934 over the state's new plan to pay the schools each year in eight equal monthly payments. This would, he said, enable the schools "to meet their obligations promptly."¹³

The financially precarious position of the schools led to a demand from some educators that there be a broadening of the base of taxation, so that all would have a share in payment. There was also a demand for a greater spread of taxes to cover more commodities.¹⁴

By the time Hill McAlister was elected governor of Tennessee on November 4, 1932, economic depression had taken its toll. The average term of county elementary schools in 1931-32 had been 153 days, and some counties had closed their schools after fifty days. In the years 1929-32, salaries of county elementary teachers had dropped from \$618.43 to \$561.56--a decrease of nearly ten per cent.¹⁵

McAlister was an economy governor, who told the Legislature there would be no more money for road construction or school building "until we put our house in order."¹⁶ He added that his new Commissioner of Education would be a man with interests "primarily educational rather than political." When Walter D. Cocking became Commissioner, he was Professor of School Administration at George Peabody College.

When the General Appropriation Bill was finally passed in the spring of 1934, the funds for higher education had been reduced by two-thirds. Elementary schools suffered from a reduction in state appropriations of nearly 20%, and high schools lost 28%.¹⁷ Another bill--a "depression courtesy" to the teaching profession, as some called it--stated that any teaching certificate in the State, valid for 1934-35, would be valid for 1935-36 and 1936-37 even though the holder might not complete any additional work or comply with any additional requirements. "For more than four years," wrote the Editor of The Tennessee Teacher, the Tennessee Educational Association has condemned vigorously this practice."¹⁸ In fact, there was no doubt that one of the purposes of the bill was to protect the jobs of those who already held teaching positions.

In 1933 Governor McAlister appointed a group of lay citizens and educators to study the educational needs of the state and to make a report on which he might base a plan for the future. When submitted in final form, late in 1934, the Commission's

report was, in fact, the most complete picture of the state's educational structure ever to have been publicly presented.

It was not entirely accidental that the Tennessee State Teachers Association was organized in 1934, in time to join in the gubernatorial campaign to secure adoption of many of the Commission's recommendations. The first issue of The Tennessee Teacher was in the spring of that year. Before 1934, the eastern and western parts of the State had maintained "strong but un-coordinated educational organizations," while the Middle Tennessee Teachers Association had "allowed itself to be swallowed up by the state organization."¹⁹ The new Association had a western, a middle, and an eastern division. The Public School Officers Association, previously an independent group, became a department of the new Association. This new organization was of tremendous help in developing a campaign to secure public approval of the Educational Commission's recommended program.

On November 11, 1934, The Nashville Banner printed an article which discussed the proposals of the Educational Commission, soon to be made to the General Assembly. The Banner mentioned "a trebling of State appropriations for education." Although The Banner, and other papers, may have been accurate in their reporting, they were misleading. The increased state expenditures, recommended by the Educational Commission, were to be accompanied by a significant decrease in local property taxes. Proper journalistic reporting of this proposal was lacking. What the Commission had said was:

1. That "full state support" was the most equitable and practical way of financing the public schools.
2. That "for the present" the state could hope to do no more than "increase its financial support to the local units." The Commission added that a small increase in state support would not "help the situation materially."
3. That immediate appropriations be made to an extent that would enable the State to finance "approximately 70 per cent of the cost of the elementary school program and 27 percent of the cost of the high school program." The Commission added that the nearer the State approached full support for elementary and secondary education, "the more nearly will it be able to equalize educational opportunities in the elementary and secondary schools of the State."²⁰

In January, 1935, Governor McAlister presented to the legislature his sales tax plan, designed to raise \$11,500,000. Immediately vested interest groups fought the plan and defeated it. On the last day of the Special Session, the governor signed a bill giving all the divisions of the school system the same revenue as during the previous biennium. Because of inadequate

financing, not one recommendation of the Education Commission was written into law in 1935.²¹

In January, 1936, the Representative Assembly of the Tennessee Education Association adopted a legislative program which, among other things, sought a minimum salary for all teachers of \$60.00 per month, a minimum eight-month term for all elementary schools, and a nine-month term for high schools and an actuarially sound state-wide retirement system.²² After having translated its program into legislative terms, the Association came up with a price tag of an increase of \$10,638,540 in the State's Public School appropriation.²³

Believing that its figures were too high for legislative approval, the Association scaled them down to \$4,395,000 in the bills actually offered for legislative enactment. By the time these proposed laws reached the legislature, Mr. W. A. Bass, former Secretary of the Tennessee Education Association, had been appointed Commissioner. Smooth passage of the 1937 Education laws was in large measure the result of his successful legislative endeavors. The State's appropriations for education were almost doubled, and a good start had been made on the 1936 legislative program of the Tennessee Education Association.

Discussion of education in Tennessee during the Depression years, without reference to the federal role, would be incomplete. As early as 1933-34 many counties had benefited from the funds of the Civil Works Administration, and more than 1500 unemployed teachers were used to organize adult education classes, in which approximately 4,250 Tennesseans were taught to read and write.²⁴ In December, 1933, it was announced that the Tennessee Valley Authority had granted \$75,000 to the Educational Commission for helping to gather data. Funds for 145 workers for this project were later made available by the CWA.²⁵ Actually, in 1934, the Federal Government helped to finance a program which resulted in the employment of 108 teachers for thirty-nine nursery schools throughout the state, and the employment of an additional 1700 unemployed teachers, at a weekly salary of \$14.00, in the Adult Education Program.²⁶

A word needs to be said about the educational expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Large sums were not spent by the TVA on education until 1935-36, however, and it must not be assumed that these funds were all spent in Tennessee. However, Gordon R. Clapp, Director of Personnel at Norris, Tennessee, testified before a Joint Congressional Committee investigating the TVA in 1938 that the Authority had maintained a school with an elementary enrollment of 136, and a secondary enrollment of 164 at the Pickwick Dam construction camp. The cost of this operation was given as \$21,956 for the fiscal year ending in June, 1938, and the costs of similar schools at the Norris Dam construction camp were given as \$46,577.²⁷ Mr. Clapp added that the TVA spent \$193,897 during the year 1937-38 for training of craft and professional employees and for "general adult educational recreation and library services."²⁸

Passage of the laws of 1937, and the general nation-wide improvement in economic conditions, were responsible for a degree of optimism in educational circles. However, the laws of 1937 carried with them no fundamental structure, and the progress which had been made in the improvement of elementary education was not matched at the high school level. The major problems identified in the Report of the Educational Commission remained unresolved.

* * * * *

This paper, presented at an academic conference in 1980, drew several questions from the audience. Most of them concerned possible parallels between the 1930s and the 1980s. In this regard, we must be aware that the financial basis of Tennessee education in 1980 is quite unlike that of the 1930s in two respects. The federal role, both judicial and legislative, is of infinitely greater importance in 1980 than in 1930. The State role is also more significant than in 1930. Nevertheless, one question remains deeply disturbing. Do the new methods of administering education really mean that local self-interest is on the decline? Have we, in fact, made much progress in the manner in which we manage the educational affairs of the State? There are quite obviously some areas in which improvement has been enormous, but there remain too many problems in the 1980s which are disturbingly similar to those of the 1930s.

NOTES

¹State of Tennessee, Annual Report of the Department of Education (Nashville: Baird-Ward, 1925), p. 19. Henceforth referred to as The Annual Report.

²The Annual Report, 1927, p. 19.

³The Annual Report, 1932, p. 30.

⁴Report of the Tennessee Educational Commission (Nashville: Ambrose, 1933), Part I, p. 292. Henceforth known as The Tennessee Educational Commission.

⁵The Tennessee Educational Commission, Part I, p. 77.

⁶The Annual Report, 1928, p. 22.

⁷The Tennessee Educational Commission, Part I, p. 74.

⁸The Annual Report, 1928, p. 18.

⁹Stanley J. Folmsbee, Robert E. Corlew and Enoch L. Mitchell, History in Tennessee (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1960), II, 301.

¹⁰Murray R. Benedict, Farm Policies of the United States, 1790-1950 (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1953), p. 263.

¹¹Theodore Saloutos, Farmer Movements in the South, 1865-1933 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), p. 275.

¹²The Tennessee Educational Commission, Part I, p. 292. State law also required every resident between 21 and 50 to pay a poll tax of \$1.00 unless he were deaf, dumb, blind, or otherwise incapacitated. Each county could add one extra dollar, and all poll taxes were earmarked for local elementary education. In 1932 and 1933 collections amounted to about one quarter of what ought to have been taken in. The uncollected taxes were a total loss to the schools.

¹³The Annual Report, 1934, p. 14.

¹⁴Shelton Phelps, "The Financial Support of Public Education." The Tennessee Teacher, February, 1934, p. 27.

¹⁵Andrew D. Holt, The Struggle for a State System of Public Schools in Tennessee, 1903-1936 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938), p. 390.

¹⁶Ibid, p. 391.

¹⁷Ibid, p. 398.

¹⁸W. A. Bass, "Why did they do it?" The Tennessee Teacher, May, 1935, p. 16.

¹⁹"A United Front," The Tennessee Teacher, February, 1934. Prior to 1934, the only publication which reached the state's teachers, with any degree of regularity, had been the Tennessee Educational Bulletin, a publication of the State Department of Education. See Holt, The Struggle, p. 415.

²⁰The Tennessee Educational Commission, Part II, pp. 100-105.

²¹Holt, The Struggle, p. 442.

²²The Tennessee Teacher, February, 1936, pp. 8-9.

²³The Annual Report, June, 1938, p. 24. Page 19, of The Annual Report for 1930, says, "Pensions in many cases lead to extravagance when prospective pensioners could have a part of their earnings for the age when their savings might be needed. In lieu of pension and retirement funds, this Department believes in paying fair salaries as we go, leaving no obligation on future generations." A State Teacher Retirement Plan was recommended by the Tennessee Education Commission. See Part II, p. 117.

²⁴The Annual Report, 1934, p. 15. When he addressed the Tennessee Teachers Association, on March 31, 1934, Commissioner Cocking announced a federal allocation of \$700,000 to Tennessee. Through the newspapers, he announced an additional \$500,000 on April 3, and said this insured an eight-month term for every elementary school, and nine months for every high school, with teachers paid in cash. See The Tennessee Teacher, April, 1934.

²⁵Holt, The Struggle, p. 404.

²⁶The Annual Report, 1935, p. 19.

²⁷Seventy Fifth Congress, Third Session, Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority (United States Government Printing Office, 1939), p. 3177.

²⁸Ibid., p. 3185. The Civilian Conservation Corps also carried on some educational work in Tennessee. Enrollment in CCC camps in the State reached nearly 7,000 by June of 1935. The Educational work carried on by the CCC was, however, fundamentally practical in nature. In 1937-38, approximately 3% of the men of the CCC were illiterate. Approximately 38% had not graduated from elementary school, and approximately 48% had not achieved a high school education. See Civilian Conservation Corps Activities, July 1, 1937-June 30, 1938 (United States Civilian Conservation Corps, n.d.), p. 26.

THEMATIC TRANSITION IN THE TENNESSEE SHORT STORY--
1864 TO THE PRESENT

Linda Burton
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Although the short story has especially flourished in Tennessee, historically there has been little change in literary technique. We can, however, see definite thematic changes in the perception of values. These changes in the perception of values can be divided into three chronological periods, the first period starting in 1854 with the publication of George Washington Harris's first Sut Lovingood story and culminating around the end of World War I. The second period encompasses the time from the end of World War I to the end of World War II. The third period of distinguishable literary activity is from around the late 1940's to the present. By examining selected short stories by major Tennessee writers, that is, George Washington Harris, Mary Noailles Murfree, Andrew Lytle, Peter Taylor, Madison Jones, and James Agee, we can see significant thematic changes, particularly changes in the perception of values from the inception of the short story in Tennessee to the present.

During the first period of literary activity in Tennessee, 1854 to the end of World War I, we have what has commonly been designated in literary history as the local color movement. This movement includes the work of Harris and Murfree. Of the style of such writers Forkner and Samway observe, "In a sense, these authors were realistic as they attempted to look at their milieu, use dialect, and shy away from techniques used by the romantic novelists."¹ More importantly, in a thematic sense many of the protagonists in Harris's and Murfree's stories share the same perception of values; that is, their protagonists are thoroughly certain of their own values, and rarely do they suffer any sort of value crisis. For instance, Harris's Sut Lovingood, who is often compared to Shakespeare's Falstaff, is a self-assured protagonist, one who acts confidently in a world filled with hypocrisy and who doubts little his perception of this chaotic world. As William Faulkner, who admired Sut greatly, says, Sut "had no illusions about himself, did the best he could; at certain times he was a coward and knew it and wasn't ashamed; he never blames his misfortunes on anyone and never cursed God for them."²

Certainly, for example, in "Parson John Bullen's Lizards," Sut never once seriously doubts his values, his perception of right and wrong. And although Parson Bullen finds Sut and a girl, Sall, in the huckleberry thicket, Sut never once repeats his deed but sets out to unclothe the self-righteous, hypocritical

Parson. Especially appalling to Sut is the fact that the Parson tells the girl's parents about her meeting with Sut. As Sut states:

She begged him, a trimblin, an' a-crying not tu tell on her. He et her cookin, he promised her he'd keep dark--an' then went strait an' tole her mam. Warnt that rale low down, wolf mean? The durnd infunel, hiperkritikal, pot-bellied, scaley-hided, whisky-wastin, stinkin ole groun'-hog.³

Consequently, Sut sets out to expose the hypocritical parson at the "nex big meetin at Rattilsnaik" where Sut hed tu promis the ole tub ove soap-greas" that he would "cum an' hev" himself "converted, jis'" so the Parson would keep "frum killin" him (p. 53). Finally, at the camp meeting, Sut exposes the Parson, both inside and out, by putting seven or eight lizards up the Parson's "britches-laig" and then "sot intu pinchin thar tails" (p. 54). Of course, Parson Bullen must completely undress in front of the congregation to rid himself of what he thinks are "Hell-sarpents" (p. 56), and we find that the Parson's pants not only contain "ni ontu fifteen shorten'd biskits, a boiled chicken, wif hits laigs crossed," but also "a hunk ove terbacker, a cob-pipe . . ." and "a sprinkil ove whiskey," unlikely contents for a parson's pants (p. 55). According to Sut, when Bullen eventually recovers from his ordeal and resumes his pastoral duties,

he hadn't the fust durn'd 'oman tu hear 'im; they hev seed too much ove 'im. Passuns ginerly hev a pow'ful strong holt on wimen; but, hoss, I tell yu thar ain't meny ove em kin run stark nakid over an' thru a crowd ove three hundred wimen an' not injure thar karacters sum. (p. 57)

Obviously, Sut is an active protagonist, certain of his values and ready to expose hypocrisy. He has a strong sense of right and wrong and does not hesitate to judge others by his moral standard.

Likewise, most of Mary Noailles Murfree's mountain protagonists are unstintingly certain about the validity of their own personal systems of values. Nathalia Wright points out that "in depicting the moral nature of her mountain characters, . . . Murfree tends to go to . . . /an/ extreme . . . and to make them noblemen and noblewomen of nature."⁴ Even so, Murfree's characters may be viewed thematically as protagonists who are not in value crises. Whatever conflict these people experience comes from their interaction with their environment and not from a value crisis. Like Harris's Sut, they are sure of their perceptions of themselves. Even in Murfree's first published book, In the Tennessee Mountains, published in 1884 under the pseudonym Charles Egbert Craddock, the author characterizes her protagonists as certain of their values in an uncertain world. For example, in "The 'Harnt' That Walks Chilhowee," first published in William Dean Howells' Atlantic in May 1883, we find Clarsie Giles, a character who sternly lives by her own rules. As her father, Peter Giles,

says, "Clarsie air a likely enough gal. But she air mightily sot ter heven' her own way. An' if 't ain't give ter her peaceable-like, she jis' takes it, whether or no" (p. 286).

Clarsie does not compromise her values, no matter what the consequences may be. Although she is uncertain about whom she is destined to marry and walks late at night into the woods to have her fortune told in the mountain way by a bird's whistle and a cow's lowing, she has no doubts about helping Reuben Crabb, a one-armed man who has been unjustly accused of murder and is supposedly dead. In actuality, it is Reuben's brother Joel who has recently died, and when Reuben must come out of the woods to find something to eat, the mountain people who see Reuben think he is a ghost and wish he would walk a mountain other than Chilhowee. However, the sheriff from the valley is not quite so convinced that Reuben is a "harnt" and decides to capture him. These are the circumstances when Clarsie encounters Reuben in the woods and he asks pathetically for food, saying, "I war a'starvin';--I war a-starvin'" (p. 310). In response, Clarsie eats less at meals in order to feed Reuben. As Murfree writes:

She had been scrupulously careful to put into the pail only such things as had fallen to her share at the table and which she had saved from the meals of yesterday. "A gal that goes a-robbin' fur a hongry harnt," was her moral reflection, "oughter be throwed bodaciously off'n the bluff." (p. 314)

As we can see, Clarsie abides closely by her values as she will take food from herself, but not her family, to give to a starving man.

Early one morning while giving Reuben his food, she is seen by Simon Burney, an aging widower who has been hoping to make Clarsie his wife. Although she and Simon disagree on her feeding of Reuben, both are certain of their perceptions of right and wrong, and neither dissuades the other. When Simon says: "Ye air a-doin' wrongful, Clarsie. . . . It air agin the law fur folks ter feed an' shelter them ez a-runnin' from jestic. An' ye'll git yerself inter trouble" (p. 316), Clarsie replies, "I can't help it. . . . I can't gin my consent ter starvin' of folks, even ef they air a-hidin' an' a-runnin' from jestic." She adds that she would go to "the pen'tiary away down yander, somewhars in the valley," rather than give "my consent ter starvin' of folks" (p. 317). Thus Clarsie will even leave her beloved mountains before she will compromise her values. In the same way, when Simon encounters the near helpless, one-armed Reuben, he promises Reuben that he will take care of him if he will just stand trial for the murder he did not commit. Despite his sympathy, Simon does not back down at all in his values because he believes that people should respect the law so that justice can prevail. Clearly, both Clarsie and Simon follow strictly their own personal moral principles and do not succumb to the values of the society around them. By knowing themselves, they are confident in their perception of moral nature. Each believes he knows the higher value.

After the local color movement lost its impetus around the turn of the century, Tennessee writers, with the exception of minor writers such as Will Allen Dromgoole, produced little short fiction until the end of the first World War when the second, and perhaps the greatest, period of literary activity began. During this period between the two World Wars, several major international literary figures appeared on the Tennessee scene. For example, Robert Penn Warren, T. S. Stribling, Caroline Gordon, Andrew Lytle, James Agee, and Peter Taylor were all producing work that was gaining recognition outside the region. One reason for this distinction, according to Louis D. Rubin, is that many of these writers left the South,

and if they came back home, as many ultimately did, it was in a different relationship to that home. For no longer were they prepared to accept without question the attitudes, ideas, values, and actions of the older Southern community. They had become dislodged from that community, and they began exploring the meaning of this new perspective in their writings.⁵

That is to say, Tennessee writers were, on a grander scale than ever before, probing universal moral problems. Neither Harris's nor Murfree's characters had to search for meaning; they already had it. But the Tennessee writers between the two World Wars found the world suddenly and radically changed, and they often looked to the past in an attempt at self-definition. In short, many of these writers were plunged into a value crisis. In order to forge meaning, they often had to look outside themselves, examining the past and its traditions to help them find meaning in the present. For instance, as representative examples, both Andrew Lytle and Peter Taylor often depict their characters in value crises.

In Andrew Lytle's "Jericho, Jericho, Jericho," we have Mammy, who on her deathbed finds that everything she has believed in for seventy years has meaning to no one else, in particular to her grandson who for the last several years has had his "fling in town."⁶ Expecting to leave her land, Long Courd, to the grandson, Mammy finds that he is about to marry Eva, a totally unsuitable woman with whom he plans to "spend the winters in town" (p. 11). When Mammy hears his unsettling notion, she tells him "to get out of the room," and her thoughts wander back to the past and to all she has performed to keep intact the land that meant her entire existence (pp. 11-12). Lytle writes:

How she had struggled to get this land and keep it together--through the War, the Reconstruction, and the pleasanter after days. . . . The things she had done to keep it together. No. The one thing. (p. 12)

Mammy further reflects that she actually had stolen the land from

its rightful owner, Iva Louise, whose father had given Mammy charge of his property. As Mammy is approaching death, she clings to life in an effort to insure that the land she has sacrificed so much for will be saved. But, her efforts are futile:

How slyly death slipped up on a body, like sleep moving over the vague boundary. How many times she had laid awake to trick the unconscious there. At last she would know . . . But she wasn't ready. She must first do something about Long Gourd. That slut must not eat it up. She would give it to the hands first. He /her grandson/ must be brought to understand this. (p. 17)

Mammy dies, realizing that the values she believed in for so long, and, in fact, based her life upon, mean little or nothing to her grandson. As she dies, Mammy hears "voices . . . singing, Joshua fit the battle of Jericho, Jericho, Jericho--Joshua fit the battle of Jericho, and the walls came a-tumbling down," an appropriate song since Mammy had believed that land was the highest value, and now her values had "come a-tumbling down" (p. 18).

Peter Taylor's protagonists are also often in a state of angst or moral anxiety and, like Mammy, they look outside themselves for values. For example, in Taylor's "The Fancy Woman," Josephine is searching for values, for something to believe in. Not finding any meaning in her present life, which is characterized by her excessive drinking and her present profession as "a fancy woman," she looks to George, who represents to her the Southern aristocracy, an aristocracy that she presumes is certain of its values. While spending a week at George's house in the country outside of Memphis, Josephine believes that she can "make a place for herself at last" if "somehow" she could "get a hold of him."⁷ When three married couples come by unexpectedly to visit George, Josephine finds that although these people have money and social position and are "Memphis society people," their values are no better than hers (p. 179). For instance, during the first night of the visit, Mrs. Roberts begins to dance with Jackson who says, "We like to dance, but there are better things" (p. 185). In the meantime, Mrs. Colton leaves the room with Roberts, supposedly "to dance in the hall where there are fewer rugs" (p. 184). At the same time, Jackson is lusting after Josephine and even visits her room later in the night. Waking the next morning, Josephine assesses what happened the previous night and wonders "who was with George, by damn, all night?" (p. 185). She reflects upon these people's values in this way:

"They're none of 'em any better than the niggers. I knew they couldn't be. Nobody is. By God, nobody's better than I am. Nobody can say anything to me." Everyone would like to live as free as she did! There was no such thing as . . . There was no such thing as what the niggers and the whites liked to pretend they were. She was going to let up, and do things in secret. Try to look

like an angel. It wouldn't be hard since there was no such thing. (pp. 185-6)

Thus, Josephine sees these "society" people for what they are and decides to play their game. Taylor notes:

She even felt that she was beginning to catch on to these people and that she was going to start a little pretense of her own and make a good thing out of old Georgie. It was funny the way her interest in him, any real painful interest, was sort of fading. (p. 189)

Later, when the divorced George's sons arrive, the insensitivity of George and his friends becomes too obvious to ignore. George's son Buddy, who is fourteen, appears at first to Josephine as "honestly kind-a shy. It gave her the shivers to see anybody so shy and ignorant of things" (p. 189). But then he starts reciting verses for everyone's amusement and calls Josephine a "queen of pleasure," which, of course, causes everyone to clap--except Josephine, who thinks "'Queen of pleasure' sounded just as bad as whore!" (p. 191). During the last night of Josephine's visit, George's older son, Jock, tries in the middle of the night to get into Josephine's room, and early the next morning, his father sends him to Memphis. Finally George buys Josephine a train ticket back to Memphis even though he promised her a week's visit at his country estate. She realizes now that

he wasn't such a stickler for his word, after all! Not in this case. He was sending her home. Well, what did he expect her to say? Did he think she would beg to stay on? She would clear out, and she wasn't the one beaten. George was beaten. One of his kids that he was so mortally fond of, one for sure had had notions. (p. 195)

At last, Josephine realizes that these people's values are not what she wants, and she loses herself in another bottle of whiskey. Although Josephine has yet to find something to believe in, she understands that the past, as represented by George and his friends, and the supposedly innocent, as represented by George's sons, have no values higher than hers to offer. Thus, both Taylor's Josephine and Lytle's Mammy are presented as characters in a moral vacuum in which the traditional values of the past are shown to be either ineffectual or corrupt.

Finally, a third period of literary activity in Tennessee begins after World War II. Whereas Lytle's and Taylor's protagonists look outside themselves for a release from angst--a release they often cannot find--the latter-day protagonists, rather than looking outside themselves for values, usually examine the inner self. Robert Penn Warren, for example, points to this change when he says:

I never thought of a combat with the past. I guess I think more of trying to find what there is valuable to us, the line of continuity to us, and through us. The specific Southern past, I'm now talking about. As for combat, I guess the real combat is always with yourself, Southerner or anybody else.⁸

Certainly, in Madison Jones's "The Fugitives," first published in The Sewanee Review in 1954, and in James Agee's "The Waiting," published in The New Yorker in 1957, we find protagonists who look within for meaning. These stories seem to go a step further than Lytle's or Taylor's works. Whereas Lytle's Mammy dies in moral anxiety and Taylor's Josephine drinks to forget the need for values, Jones's and Agee's protagonists go further in finding and understanding man's need to believe in something.

In Jones's "The Fugitives," for example, we find Walt, a young man, in search of meaning. Telling his disgruntled mother that he is going to Nashville to visit a friend, Woody, he leaves his Memphis home to walk South, perhaps all the way to New Orleans. He understands that his family

had given him everything; whatever they knew of to do they had done. Except they seemed never to have known, or else to have forgotten, that stifling sense of tedium, of meeting yourself coming back in a tiny circle which was your birthright ...the right to draw your own circle, or to draw none at all.⁹

This experience is exactly what his encounter with the young fugitive provides for him--an opportunity to find meaning and establish his identity. Late at night, outside a small Southern town, Walt meets the thirsty, young fugitive from Point Creek, Tennessee, in an old boxcar. With home forgotten, Walt is immediately thrust into the present, as Jones writes, "Yesterday and what had come before were things shut out by the level horizon that encircled them" (p. 278). Identifying increasingly with the fugitive who tells Walt that although he has been sentenced to life in prison, he "ain't sorry" because he had warned the man "to stay away from there," Walt suggests to the runaway that he "go to New Orleans" where he would not likely be found (pp. 283-4). When they hear the dogs after them, they head for the swamp, and Walt lets "go his handbag," with all his original thoughts of a pleasure jaunt out of his mind (p. 285). Now, he feels

a difference, a sense of something gone, some unclear haze like departed sleep that left him aware of wretchedness, of sweat and his aching legs, and then, of wonder. It was only this morning--or yesterday--he stood on his own front walk--as though it were someone else, not him, who was fleeing here through the swamp. (p. 286)

Clearly, Walt's archetypal journey has already changed him.

Later, with Walt running just behind him in the cotton field, the fugitive is shot. Calmly turning the boy over, Walt sees "those pale lidless eyes" which "stared at him. He tried to look deep into them, past that look of white amazement, down through the channels of his mind. But the whiteness blinded him" (p. 289). Captivated, Walt is determined to carry the corpse from the field. As the sun rises, however, Walt realistically sees the fugitive for the first time. Jones writes:

There are no shadows on the face now. It looked older than it had before, the features not so clean of cut. And deep indentations, like scars, angled down from the flanges of the nose past the open mouth. But more than these, death had frozen the face in a look of dull and wanton brutality. He turned away. He could not help to carry the body any more. (pp. 290-1)

Walt's awareness has increased finally, and "he felt shattered, as though he had run hard against a barrier of stone" (p. 291). Whereas, Taylor's Josephine drowns her anxiety in the escape of whiskey, Walt imagines

his own figure walking slowly north. At the end of his walk his own front door was standing open and they were watching him approach and the expression on their faces was something between placid satisfaction and mild surprise. (p. 291)

Finally, Walt's encounter with an outsider convinces him not to escape reality, but to approach it again with increased awareness. Therefore, the story ends with Walt's suggested return home--a return that does not just symbolize an end of an archetypal journey, but, more importantly, symbolizes a new beginning. No longer able to indulge in blaming others for his moral anxiety, Walt must look within himself.

In James Agee's "The Waiting," the principal character, Mary, like Jones' Walt, must explore her inner self. Furthermore, like Walt, Mary is forced to look within by a tumultuous external experience. The outside happening that precipitates her increased awareness is the phone call she receives "a few minutes before ten" one night from a man who tells her that "there's been a slight--your husband has been in an accident."¹⁰ He says further that he wants "a man . . . some kin" to come immediately to the scene of the accident (p. 41). Of course, Mary phones her brother, Andrew, who, before going to the accident, brings their Aunt Hannah to stay with Mary during the long wait. At first, Mary tries to escape from the situation by engaging in several illusions, the first being that her husband, Jay, will be home soon. Hoping that "he's well enough to be brought home and not the hospital," Mary decides to prepare the downstairs bedroom for his return home. Refusing to accept even the possibility of his death, she

thing. . . . And no matter what, there's not one thing in this world or the next that we can do or hope or guess at or wish or pray that can change it or help it one iota. Because whatever is, is. That's all. And all there is now is to be ready for it, strong enough for whatever it may be. That's all. That's all that matters. (p. 49)

Mary's acceptance of the situation does not imply any sort of entrapment; on the contrary, it shows that she is a person who is capable of understanding and accepting life and then moving ahead to face the situation, a situation that introduces her to an all-important conflict, a conflict that takes her from illusion to reality.

In addition, we find that death has also brought about Hannah's understanding of life. In some of his best prose, Agee writes:

While she /Mary/ was speaking, she was with her voice, her eyes, and with each word opening in Hannah those all but forgotten hours, almost thirty years past, during which the cross of living had first nakedly borne in upon her being, and she had made the first beginnings of learning how to endure and accept it. Your turn now poor child, she thought; Her soul /Mary's/ is beginning to come of age and within those moments she herself became much older, much nearer her own death, and was content to be. Her heart lifted up in a kind of pride in Mary, in every sorrow she could remember, her own or that of others (and the remembrances rushed upon her); in all existence and endurance. . . . She wanted to hold her niece at arm's length and to turn and admire this blossoming. She wanted to take her in her arms and groan unto God for what it meant to be alive. But chiefly she wanted to keep stillness and to hear the young woman's voice and to watch her eyes and her round forehead while she spoke, and to accept and experience this repetition of her own younger experience, which bore her high, and pierced like music. (pp. 49-50)

Finally, Hannah says:

Whatever we hear, learn, Mary, it's almost certain to be hard. Tragically hard. You're beginning to know that and to face it, very bravely. What I mean is that this is only the beginning. You'll learn much more. Beginning very soon now. (p. 50)

So for both Mary and Hannah, and, as Agee implies, for the reader as well, it is death that illustrates the highest value--that of the importance of the meaning of life.

Death is the frame of reference which gives our lives meaning. For Mary, a reflective person, it is death that has stripped her of illusions and has, thereby, forced her into reality where she must find the meaning of life. Agee points out that this struggle for moral awareness is not an easy one when at one point he shows Hannah losing her faith for a moment: "God is not here, Hannah said to herself; and made a small cross upon her breastbone, against her blasphemy," and finally "her moment of terrifying unbelief became a remembrance, a temptation successfully resisted through God's grace" (p. 52). In this way, Agee presents Hannah as an extraordinarily, sensitive woman who acts in the world to understand the meaning of life, and in Mary Agee depicts a woman with the potential to forge meaning. Thus, we are able to accept the fact that, at the end of the story when Mary's brother comes to tell her that Jay is dead, she is the first to say, "He's dead, Andrew, isn't he?" (p. 60).

In summary, we can see that through external happenings, Jones's Walt and Agee's Mary are given new beginnings, new hopes. And although their lives are changed forever, these changes are presented as necessary in the development of the characters' personal values. Moreover, we find that these stories actually end on a much more hopeful note than those in the second period; for both Jones and Agee not only depict what is, but also depict what can be, showing that while life is still in us, there is a chance for a new beginning, an opportunity to resolve our moral anxiety.

In our final assessment of the short story in Tennessee, we see a definite shift in thematic concerns--a shift that reveals a changing perception of values. In the period of Harris's and Murfree's writings, we see characters who are certain of their values and who do not experience value crises. From Lytle and Taylor, writers of the middle period, we observe characters who are in angst and who experience moral anxiety, and yet are incapable of resolving their value crises. However, in the final period, we see a trend among writers to depict their characters as confronting and coming to terms with the moral ambiguities in their lives. Furthermore, these stories do not end with merely depicting what is, but they leave open a wide range of possibilities for new beginnings. Hence, the thematic development of the short story in Tennessee can be seen within the terms of an emphasis on human values, on those choices which define the human situation as well as our enduring struggle within that situation.

NOTES

¹Benjamin Forkner and Patrick Samway, S. J., eds., Stories of the Modern South (New York: Bantam Books, 1978), pp. xi-xii.

²William Faulkner, in Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews, ed. Malcolm Cowley (New York: Viking Press, 1958), p. 137.

³George Washington Harris, Sut Lovingood's Yarns, ed. M. Thomas Inge (New Haven: College and University Press, 1966), pp. 52-3. All further references to this work appear in the text.

⁴Nathalia Wright, ed., In the Tennessee Mountains, by Mary Noailles Murfree (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1970), pp. xviii-xix. All further references to this work appear in the text.

⁵Louis D. Rubin, Jr., ed., The Literary South (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979), p. 413.

⁶Andrew Lytle, "Jericho, Jericho, Jericho," in A Novel, A Novella and Four Stories (New York: McDowell, Obolensky Inc., 1958), p. 9. All further references to this work appear in the text.

⁷Peter Taylor, "The Fancy Woman," in The Collected Stories of Peter Taylor (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969), p. 175. All further references to this work appear in the text.

⁸Robert Penn Warren, in Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews, ed. Malcolm Cowley (New York: Viking Press, 1958), p. 195.

⁹Madison Jones, "The Fugitive," in The Sewanee Review, 62 (1954), 273. All further references to this work appear in text.

¹⁰James Agee, "The Waiting," in The New Yorker, 5 October 1957, p. 41. All further references to this work appear in text.

IRONY AND THE NARRATIVE VOICE IN THE SHORT STORIES OF PETER TAYLOR

Sara Dunne
Middle Tennessee State University

Peter Taylor is a member of one of Tennessee's oldest and most political families. In the gubernatorial election of 1886, Taylor's maternal grandfather, Robert Love Taylor, was opposed by Taylor's great-uncle, Alf Taylor (brother to Robert Love). Robert Love Taylor won that election, but his brother was elected governor later. Both of the Taylor brothers served at various times in Congress. Peter Taylor's own father, Hillsman Taylor, followed for a time in the political footsteps of his in-laws. He gave up both the practice of law and Tennessee politics to work for the Missouri State Life Insurance Company, of which he eventually became president. Peter Taylor's childhood was influenced both by his family's distinguished history in state and national politics and by his own father's success, even during the Depression, in business. He lived in Nashville, Memphis, and St. Louis and was educated at Southwestern at Memphis, Vanderbilt, and Kenyon.¹

Peter Taylor was never tempted toward law, business, or politics. Much to his father's chagrin, he chose to write fiction and to teach. The elements of his early life, however, are easily discernible in his fiction. Since 1936, he has produced enough short stories to fill six volumes, and many of his stories are set in Memphis or Nashville. The stories are often about life among those Southerners fortunate enough to live in easy circumstances, despite the Depression. Many of Taylor's early stories have been called by critics pleasant but limited, or they have been praised for their quiet revelations of life in the upper middle class in southern cities. Taylor himself has been praised for knowing his own limitations.² His fiction might easily be compared to F. Scott Fitzgerald's or John O'Hara's, but we are relieved to find neither Fitzgerald's self-indulgence nor O'Hara's groveling admiration of the rich. Taylor's stories avoid excesses of this kind through his use of irony, a factor recognized and partially explored by Robert Penn Warren in his introduction to Taylor's first published volume of stories, A Long Fourth and Other Stories, where he writes of Taylor's "skeptical, ironic cast of mind."³ Another Taylor scholar, Albert Griffith, notes that Taylor's oft-treated theme of life among the Southern upper crust is always presented with some "ironic qualification."⁴

Since the publication of A Long Fourth and Other Stories in 1948, Peter Taylor's readers have been aware of the growing ironic distance between the author and his subject matter. His ironic

cast of mind seems most easily identifiable in his latest volume of stories, published in 1977, called In the Miro District and Other Stories and in his latest New Yorker offering, "The Old Forest," published in the May 14, 1979, issue of that magazine. Taylor's use of a particular kind of narrator makes the irony more insistent. This narrator is usually a man who describes himself as being "in late middle age," who grew up in a genteel neighborhood in either Memphis or Nashville, and who remembers some incident or series of incidents from his adolescence or young-manhood. The narrator believes that his stories will be understood in one way, but the author undercuts the narrator through dramatic irony. Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren explain in Understanding Fiction that the reader of Ring Lardner's story "Haircut" feels "a growing need to reassess things and repudiate / the narrator's / attitude."⁵ In a similar fashion, Taylor forces his readers to question and then to qualify the judgments of his narrators in such stories as "The Hand of Emmagene," "In the Miro District," "The Captain's Son" and "The Old Forest."

"The Hand of Emmagene" is the only story in In the Miro District and Other Stories to receive negative reviews. A reviewer in Commonweal called the story "an outright failure," a story "which becomes shrill and Gothic when the protagonist chops off her . . . hand with an ax."⁶ The story is not so bad as this reviewer suggests, however. It is useful to us because there can be no doubt about Taylor's intentions in creating this particular narrative voice. The story is an almost textbook case of dramatic irony.

The narrator's most obvious quality is his blatant snobbishness. He describes his fashionable Nashville house as being full of "nice things." He and his wife, Nancy, have no children but require a cook and a houseman to maintain this house full of nice things. Often, he tells us, they have relatives from their hometown of Hortonsburg down to stay with them. The relatives like to visit because, the narrator says, they "love Nancy's nice things. . . . That's what's so satisfying about having them here, seeing how they appreciate living for a while in a house like ours."⁷ Emmagene is a young, homeless cousin of theirs who lives with them while going to secretarial school. She is a plain, though not ugly, girl who wears no makeup, dresses in plain clothes, and belongs to a fundamentalist church somewhere "over on the far side of East Nashville" (p. 88).

The trouble arises for our narrator and his wife when they realize that "Emmagene had got ideas about herself which it wouldn't be possible for her to realize. She not only liked our things, she liked our life. She meant somehow to stay. And of course it would never do" (p. 90). By way of correcting this sticky situation, the narrator and his wife force Emmagene to go out with some of the boys from Hortonsburg who have also come to Nashville. Emmagene refuses to do so at first, explaining that "They're trash! Not one of them that knows what a decent girl is

like!" (p. 92). When she tells the cook that she would like to meet a boy more like her genteel cousins, the cook bluntly echoes the narrator's sentiments, saying, "Don't git above your raisin', honey" (p. 92). Emmagene finally consents to date one of the Hortonsburg boys, George, but confirms her earlier judgment of such boys when she tells Nancy, "It's my hands he likes. It's what they all like if they can't have it any other way" (p. 96). She also confesses that George and some of the other boys have made obscene telephone calls to her. Emmagene's guilt finally becomes so intolerable that, one night while George is waiting for her in his car in the driveway, she chops off her offending hand with the ax and runs out to the car to show him what she has done. She dies immediately, even though George rushes her to the hospital.

Taylor's narrator says that at Emmagene's funeral, which George's parents also attend, "Nancy and I did our best to make them see George wasn't to be blamed too much. After all, you could tell from looking at his parents he hadn't had many advantages. . . . He had come down to Nashville looking for a job and didn't have any responsible relatives here to put restraints upon him or to give him the kind of advice he needed"(p. 101). Obviously, neither did Emmagene.

The narrator and his wife assume no responsibility for what has happened to their cousin. Because of the social structure of their lives and Emmagene's, even Emmagene seems to assume that George is the cause of her irrational act. We recall that it is George, not to her cousins, that she runs after she has cut off her hand. In this story, Taylor is most obviously forcing the reader to "repudiate the narrator's attitude." The narrator does "not represent the author's view, nor our own."⁸

The title story of In the Miro District and Other Stories is not so dramatic as "The Hand of Emmagene," and in it Taylor's irony is less easily identified. This narrator seems to be older than the narrator of "The Hand of Emmagene," so that in addition to ironic distance, we are separated from the story's events by the distance of time. The narrator remembers three events that occurred when he was eighteen years old and lived with his parents in a large, pillared house in fashionable Acklen Park in Nashville. The year is 1925, and in all three events he was caught by his grandfather in some indiscretion. The narrator, identifying with his parents' values, sees a wide, unbridgeable gap between himself and his grandfather, who, for most of the story, refuses to give up his truck farm some forty miles west of Nashville, refuses to entertain guests or anyone else with reminiscences about the Civil War--he is a Confederate veteran--and who always shows up in Acklen Park dressed in khaki pants, a collarless shirt, and an ankle-length gabardine coat, no matter what the season. Other grandfathers, says the narrator, "seemed all elegance while he seemed all roughness" (p. 164). What the grandfather resists most of all is moving away from the farm to Acklen Park.

The three occasions on which the narrator and the grandfather cross one another provide the reader an opportunity to

see a bond rather than a gap between the two. On the first occasion, the boy and some of his friends have raided the liquor cabinet and are drunk on bourbon. After the boy's friends leave, he expects to be scolded by his grandfather. Before Grandfather can say anything, however, the young boy begins to repeat, in a childish sing-song, all the stories his grandfather has told him over the years about his escape from the nightriders, the formation of Reelfoot Lake, and how Grandfather was forced to hide in the swamp. The boy's long, mocking harangue at his grandfather and his defiance of his grandfather's respected position match in tone something that the grandfather did when he was sixteen. He recalls, "Likely I'm the onliest man or boy who ever called Bedford Forrest a son-of-a-bitch and lived" (p. 173). The young boy has better manners than to call his grandfather a son-of-a-bitch, but the intention is there. Also, the boy's precise repetition of the old man's diction and his clear memory of old stories told to him about Reelfoot Lake by his grandfather belie the older narrator's comment that whatever his grandfather was "was lost forever" (p. 189). It is obviously preserved in this narrative.

The second time the boy is caught by his grandfather, the narrator and three friends have spent the night with "girls of the other sort" (p. 186), in the Acklen Park house while the parents are away in Memphis. The grandfather smacks all the young boys and girls with his cane, and chases them out of the house. Even so, he smiles sweetly at the girls, then helps the boy clean up the house. The boy is surprised by his grandfather's helpfulness, though not particularly grateful for it.

The third occasion does not provide such a good-natured response from the grandfather. This time the boy has brought his own girlfriend, a student at Ward-Belmont, to the house and has slept with her in the room set aside for the grandfather. In a wonderfully comic scene, the girl, when she hears Grandfather's car drive up, hides naked in an oak wardrobe, a piece of furniture brought over from Grandfather's own house. He finds her there, still naked, a few minutes later, and recognizes her as a friend of the family. The grandfather is too shocked to do anything but turn on his heel and leave the house.

As Grandfather is leaving, the narrator remembers thinking to himself, "that his generation and ours were a thousand years apart, or ten thousand" (p. 199). The fact that Grandfather keeps all three of the boy's indiscretions a secret indicates the opposite. Also, the story's structure suggests that these two are not so far apart as the narrator imagines: balanced almost equally with the narrator's accounts of his boyhood misadventures are the grandfather's stories about his adventures as a young man. As an older man, the narrator still believes that he is totally unlike his grandfather, but we notice that he seems as fascinated by the grandfather's stories as the grandfather had been himself. A common trait in both men is their fascination with their own pasts.

Another bit of irony perceived by the reader but not the narrator, is that Grandfather's decision to leave his farm and to conform coincides with the narrator's enrollment in the University of the South. His parents had chosen this school for him before his birth when they converted from the Methodist Church to the Episcopal. Both the boy and his grandfather are the victims of the smug, genteel middle generation who "saw everything in terms of Acklen Park in the city of Nashville in the Nashville Basin in Middle Tennessee in the old Miro District as it had come to be in the first quarter of the twentieth century" (p. 164).

The limited geographic focus of "In the Miro District" is present also in another story from the same collection called "The Captain's Son." It begins with this statement: "There is an exchange between the two cities of Nashville and Memphis which has been going on forever--for two centuries almost. (That's forever in Tennessee)" (p. 5). This story is also narrated by a middle-aged man of genteel background, a native of Nashville, who says about his brother-in-law, "He was what we in Nashville used to think of as the perfect Memphis type. Yet he was not really born in Memphis. He was raised and educated out there but he was born on a cotton plantation fifty miles below Memphis--in Mississippi, which, as anybody will tell you, is actually worse" (p. 6).

The narrator's smug attitude about Nashville is emphasized later in the story when he says of some of his small-town relatives:

They would talk to you as though Gallatin or Franklin, for instance, were places as big as Nashville or Memphis. It was as though they were all of them blind and couldn't see what a city Nashville had become and didn't know what a difference that made in the way you looked at things. They thought too much of themselves and their pasts to observe that some places and some people in Tennessee had changed and had kept up with the times. (p. 19)

The irony is that the story's primary events all take place within a single house on Elliston Place during the mid-1930's. The narrator's married sister and her husband consider buying a house out in Belle Meade, but are persuaded to move in with the family. When the narrator goes to college, he goes to Vanderbilt, a distance of a few blocks. When he graduates from Vanderbilt, he moves to an apartment in one of the suburban developments off Hillsboro Road, a distance of probably less than three or four miles from Elliston Place. Taylor's point, made through irony, is that the small part of Nashville that comprises the story's setting offers as limited and provincial a view of the world as Gallatin or Franklin. Thus, the narrator's claim to be able to look at things differently than his country relatives is questionable. I don't know that we can believe that the narrator, like his relatives, thinks too highly of his past, but the fact that all of the story's action is removed by thirty years indicates that the past is where his emotional roots lie.

The last story we will consider appeared in a May, 1979, issue of The New Yorker magazine. It is called "The Old Forest" and is set in Memphis. One of the story's most interesting aspects is its tone, Taylor's attitude toward his narrator and the story the narrator tells us about his earlier life as the son of a Memphis cotton broker and his engagement and eventual marriage to a Memphis debutante. The narrator is a 65-year-old man named Nat who chooses, out of all his life's experiences, to tell about the kinds of girls he dated in and before 1937. As a young man, Nat classified the girls he knew as either debutantes, such as his fiancée Caroline Braxley, or "demimondaines" like his friend Lee Ann Deehart. Nat candidly reveals his arrogance to the reader in his description of the demimondaines":

Their manners were practically indistinguishable from those of the girls we knew who had attended Miss Hutchison's School and St. Mary's and Lausanne and were now members of the debutante set. The fact is that some of them . . . were from families who were related by blood, and rather closely related, of the debutante set, but families, who, for one reason or another, now found themselves economically in another class from their relatives.⁹

These were girls who worked out the economic necessity in offices, who read books, who went to the opera, and who saw men as protectors, but as equals, no matter what their class. Often the demimondaines might choose to sleep with one of the Memphis society boys, but always with the understanding that it was a matter of choice, not of pressure or status seeking. The older Nat admits that the girls he and his friends typed as demimondaines were the forerunners of modern women, indistinguishable from most of the girls and women one sees on college campuses today. As a young man, however, Nat saw these girls as the kind one might take to a roadhouse or beer garden or to the movies, but never to dances at the Memphis Country Club, and certainly never to the altar.

The older Nat seems at times almost apologetic about his arrogance as a young man, and yet he is not entirely free of the prejudices of his youth. He says about the Braxley's black chauffeur: "There was not, in those days in Memphis, any time or occasion when one felt more secure and relaxed than when one had given oneself over completely to the care and protection of the black servants who surrounded us and who created and sustained for the most part the luxury which distinguished the lives we lived then from the lives we live now" (p. 41).

Later in the story, when Nat describes the circumstances under which he leaves not only the cotton brokerage, but Memphis, he still bears traces of both the snobbery and the limited vision we have observed in Taylor's other narrators. He says: "After years of being married and having three children and going to grownup

Memphis dinner parties three or four times a week and working in the cotton office six days a week, I got so depressed about life in general that I sold my interest in the cotton firm . . . and managed to make Caroline understand that what I needed was to go back to school for a while so that we could start our life all over. . . . Though it clearly meant that we must live on a somewhat more modest scale and live among people of a sort we were not used to" (pp. 58, 82). Even as an older man, Nat is unable to stop thinking of people as types rather than as individuals. Taylor allows Nat some insight into his own limitations: he allows Nat to describe himself in retrospect as a sheltered, arrogant young man, but I think Taylor employs dramatic irony even more effectively in this story by refusing to allow Nat that same insight into himself as an older man. For example, Nat recalls a comment by one of the "demimondaines": "I haven't lost anything at the M.C.C./Memphis Country Club/ That's something you boys can bet your daddy's bottom dollar on" (p. 34). Nat and his friends laughed at what she said, but failed to understand the joke. He says, "There's no way of knowing, after all these years, if it was too broad for our sheltered minds or if the rest of the girls were laughing at the vulgar tone of the girl who had spoken" (p. 34). Even in his sixties, that is, Nat still seems too arrogant to understand fully that he was being made fun of. Taylor, I think, can rely on his audience to join in the snickering at Nat, both as a young and as an old man.

In Anatomy of Criticism Northrop Frye says that "the ironic fiction-writer . . . deprecates himself and, like Socrates, pretends to know nothing, even that he is ironic. Complete objectivity and suppression of all explicit moral judgments are essential to his method. Thus pity and fear/ and in Peter Taylor's case, explicit moral judgments about certain aspects of Southern society/ are not raised in ironic art: they are reflected to the reader from the art."¹⁰ Taylor's use of the first-person narrator necessarily excludes any comment he might offer about his narrative voices, but in these stories he offers sufficient evidence so that the reader might form his own opinion of the narrative voice and of the moral and social values espoused by that voice.

The world that Peter Taylor paints in "In the Miro District," "The Captain's Son," "The Hand of Emmagene," and "The Old Forest" seems at times almost seductively attractive, especially to some of his Southern readers, partly because the stories are set in neighborhoods that modern residents of Memphis and Nashville find worth preserving, and partly because the time setting of the stories especially lends itself to nostalgia. Nat describes 1937 as a time when one was not exposed to "acts of terror . . . which are brought home to us audibly and pictorially on radio and television almost every hour" (p. 39). However, Taylor's use of dramatic irony prevents his fiction from becoming either sentimental or romantic. He is scrupulously careful to view what may have been his personal experience in Nashville or Memphis in the Twenties, Thirties, and Forties with the artist's objective eye. We are reminded by him that what he gives us on paper is not life but art, and, as he says in "Daphne's Lover," still

another story from In the Miro District and Other Stories, one must strive to live upon his imagination rather than in it (p. 130).

Notes

¹Albert J. Griffith, Peter Taylor (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1970), p. 21.

²Morgan Blum, "Peter Taylor: Self-Limitation in Fiction," Sewanee Review, 70 (1962), 559.

³Robert Penn Warren, "Introduction," A Long Fourth and Other Stories (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940), p. ix.

⁴Griffith, p. 144.

⁵Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, Understanding Fiction, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), p. 146.

⁶Robert Phillips, rev. of In the Miro District and Other Stories, by Peter Taylor, Commonweal, 104 (1977), 541.

⁷Peter Taylor, "The Hand of Emmagene," in In the Miro District and Other Stories (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), p. 89. All further references to this volume appear in the text.

⁸Brooks and Warren, p. 146.

⁹Peter Taylor, "The Old Forest," The New Yorker, 14 May 1979, p. 51. All further references to this story appear in the text.

¹⁰Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 40.

ROBERT PENN WARREN'S POETRY AND SOUTHERN
LITERATURE: DREAMS THROUGH
THE GATE OF HORN

William R. Wolfe
Middle Tennessee State University

It is an ancient notion that dreams coming to us through the gate of ivory, the rich gate, are beautiful dreams, sources of immediate delight--dreams that make us want never to awake. Dreams through the more humble gate, the gate of horn, are dark, disturbing dreams, from which we are glad to awake. However, the ancients say, dreams through the gate of ivory, for all their splendor and promise, are false dreams, dreams that it would be foolish and dangerous to believe. Dreams through the gate of horn, less satisfactory in the dreaming, are dreams that bear truth. They are sources of wisdom, at least to the wise.

One reason that I choose to interest myself in Warren's poems is that they are, especially his mature poems, dreams of a sort. In his most recent volume there are poems whose titles identify them as dreams--or as dreams of dreams.

In our language there is a long tradition for the poem that is a reverie or dream; and this tradition is liveliest among poets who deal in what I might call the poetry of ideas. It is in the isolated reveries of such English poets as Keats and Coleridge, and of the American Robert Frost, that they make their most intellectually ambitious and philosophically difficult deliberations. It is in such poetry that the hardest ideas are confronted, the sternest realities admitted, and the most baffling dilemmas despaired of.

These reveries frequently occur in a specific location and appear to emerge through the poet's attachment to that place. In Warren's poems, the significances of a place are often those which have operated over a long time, over the lifetime of the speaker of a poem, or even well before.

It is incorrect to say that Warren's locations are always those of the Kentucky-Tennessee region in which he spent his earlier years, because Warren's material range has no such limits; but it is to those places of his boyhood and youth to which he frequently reverts, even after many years away. It is not misleading to call Warren a regional poet for my purposes here; but certainly he is much else.

If I may call Warren a poet of a region, perhaps I may spend some time on the peculiarities of his region's literature; because the places to which Warren reverts are not just places

that remind him of his personal past. They are places with pasts of their own, often enough peopled by men and women with distinctly regional personalities.

What is the regional literature in which Warren so often works? In the United States there is an understanding that there is such a thing as Southern literature--and that it is the most important of the regional literatures. Other regional literatures have not maintained themselves (as in the case of New England literature) or they have never quite come to be (as in the case of Western literature). The Midwest is so determinedly unself-conscious that all the operations of its Hemingways, Fitzgeralds, and Sinclair Lewises cannot impose a literature upon it. The big-city literatures remain wilfully parochial.

Southern literature is variously conceived. Some people say that self-consciousness is the key. Losers of the Civil War, a war in which moral issues were central and in which defeat was devastating, Southerners sat down to examine themselves, to explain themselves, to restore themselves. Very slow social and economic development (please notice that I do not say recovery) produced a region of considerable social and economic continuity from generation to generation. There was not enough money to support social fluidity; and the later immigrations did not enrich and enliven Southern life.

There was little mobility. Several generations were able to develop a sensitivity to the nuances of a complicated class system among white people--a class system rendered not only complicated, but pathetic and bizarre, by the impoverished Southerners' pretense that money is not the chief determinant of class. Those same generations had to confront, with however much heart and mind, the terrifying ambivalences of the relations of white people and black people.

That America whose problems were the problems of the nouveau riche, worked out on the French Riviera or on Long Island estates, was known to Southerners only through the romances of Scott Fitzgerald. The collision of culture and Philistinism in prosperous Minnesota communities struck Sinclair Lewis's Southern readers, mired down in ignorance and poverty, as an accident the nation could survive. How the young Hemingway's Southern contemporaries must have ached for the luxury of post-World-War I angst. To be suffered through in Paris, no less.

The social and economic differences of the South suggested above are historical conditions; and of course they determine the subjects of Southern literature--as social and economic conditions determine the subjects of any literature that is at all realistic (in the literary sense of that term). As Warren says, "History is what we cannot resign from." But social and economic conditions cannot tell us how Southern literature is a different sort of literature.

History is indispensable; but for all it tells us history does not usually deal directly with how people were getting along

inside themselves at a certain time and place, whereas this is one of the businesses of literature. The economic conditions of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England are well within the range and competence of modern historiography; but if we would see how those conditions brutalized some men and made heroes out of others we must read our Blake and Dickens. The social and economic fluidities of the so-called Jazz Age are well understood historically; but if we would know the moral and psychological uncertainties induced in people by those conditions, we might start our inquiries with The Great Gatsby, attending closely not only to that novel's fictional characters but to their creator.

It is true that not all coherent sets of social and economic conditions produce coherent literatures. Nevertheless, Southern writers have had and have used remarkable opportunities not only to reveal the moral and intellectual conditions of their human subjects, but, more important, to rise above type and come face to face with that universal humanity which reveals itself cogently only in single human beings whose lives are stopped and removed from the flux of history by art.

The regional writer, unless he is a very foolish man, chooses regional materials because he knows them well and, indeed, because he cares about them a great deal. In the case of the Southern writer who so chooses, he thereby takes advantage of those continuities I spoke of before: a fusion of past and present in the consciousness of the human being about whom he speaks and for whom he speaks, and evidences of that continuity in the very physical situations of those people--especially when they are, as in Southern literature, usually rural or small-town.

There is the social continuity: the omnipresence of grandparents and great-grandparents, of uncles and aunts--and these people live in an immobile society in which memories of persons long dead remain quite alive. The old well in disuse is a well once used, and in the memory of men and women still around. The soldier's cemetery is not just a relic of war, a function of national history. It is the cemetery where grandfather or great-grandfather lies; and the historical reminders are more than ambiguous in the sort of patriotism they inspire. The white Southerner's racial home is not in Italy, in Germany, or in Poland--and only barely in Britain. It is, it seems to him, where he is standing and where he has always stood. Southerners are those Americans whose pasts are inseparable from their American place.

This condition and attitude prevails in Warren's poem "Founding Fathers, Nineteenth-Century Style, Southeast U.S.A."¹ The speaker reviews the various sorts of ancestors Southeasterners might have, or perceive themselves as having--from the famous and powerful, like Henry Clay and Sam Houston, to the nameless, poor, and forgotten. It is interesting that although Warren covers quite a bit of historical ground, the oldest people who

operate in the poem are those who

. . . composed declarations, remembering
 Jefferson's language.
 Knew pose of the patriot, left hand in crook of
 the spine or
 With finger to table, while the right invokes
 the Lord's just rage.
 There was always a grandpa, or a cousin at least,
 who had been a real Signer.

In this poem of Warren's at least, the Southeastern founding fathers are kept just short of a firm connection with the founding fathers of the whole United States. A certain separation is insisted upon; and I think some notion of this separation has operated in Southerners from the time of the Civil War until very recent times--if it has in fact entirely dissipated.

In the same poem Warren comments on the Southeastern founding father who is taken up with the study of the classics; and he tells how even the influence of the Greeks somehow worked itself out in peculiarly regional ways:

Some were given to study, read Greek in the
 forest, and these
 Longed for an epic to do their own deeds right
 honor:
 Were Nestor by pigpen, in some tavern brawl
 played Achilles.
 In the ring of Sam Houston they found, when he
 died, one word engraved: Honor.

Warren here suggests that his region is coherent enough, idiosyncratic enough, and separate enough to work its own will with its own history and with whatever more ancient lore it happens upon.

I have been speaking of Southern literature and its circumstances in language that conjures up family relations; and, I think, the medium of communication of Southern literature, and the atmosphere in which that communication occurs, is much akin to the medium and atmosphere in which families communicate among themselves.

In communications within families there is a fusion of past and present. If there is sufficient commerce among generations there is a special history to objects and places that figure in a family's life. The younger members more than half believe that they were present to observe the events of one of grandfather's stories about something that happened long before they were born, because grandfather and other relatives are living connections with the event. Family tales and other family lore activate our imaginations in such a way that such historiographical niceties as the correct order of events become irrelevant. In the poem about the founding fathers, in which Warren has roamed back and

forth over time, he closes with reference to that which destroys all chronology, death. In so doing he reveals that his interest in time and in remembered events, a persistent and importantly thematic interest in his poetry, is by no means shallow or merely nostalgic. He closes the poem:

. . . and they died, and are dead, and now
 their voices
 Come thin, like the last cricket in frost-dark,
 in grass lost,
 With nothing to tell us for our complexity of
 choices,
 But beg us only one word to justify their old
 life-cost.

So let us bend ear to them in this hour of
 lateness,
 And what they are trying to say, try to under-
 stand,
 And try to forgive them their defects, even their
 greatness,
 For we are their children in the light of humanness,
 and under the shadow of God's closing hand.

To Warren the continuities of time, of place, of memory, of experience are a way of bringing human experience together to make it more useful.

There are several poems, among them "Penological Study: Southern Exposure,"² "Boy's Will,"³ "American Portrait: Old Style,"⁴ and "Amazing Grace in the Back Country,"⁵ in which Warren, in various voices and from various points of view, uses the device of going back into the life of a boy, recreating that boy's sensations, and filtering them through the significances of subsequent events. These poems are very hard to cite briefly; but to generalize: these poems are much more than memories. They have a strong dramatic complexion, with the result that in these poems and others like them the boy he creates is not just a boy. It is a boy with a family, a boy who is acting in and being acted upon by family and other intimate characters; and we always have a sense of more than one perspective, more than one set of values. Often the boy is not only watching, he is being watched. Often the boy is not only speaking, he is being spoken to--and he is listening. Everything the boy touches is something that belongs to someone he knows--and someone his father knows. The speaker in these poems is always sensitive to this complex; and as readers we are asked not to observe symptoms but to interpret syndromes.

The title "Boy's Will" puts us in mind of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; and to be so minded is to see the distinct difference between the two, the New Englander and the Southerner. The statement of Longfellow's fine and famous "My Lost Youth," despite its setting in Portland, Maine, is a statement about youth in general. This work was in fact inspired by an old Lapland song; and had the ancient Greeks the slightest interest in what goes on in children's

heads they might have written such a poem as Longfellow's in quite the same tone.

In Warren's poems, the statements he makes can only be made about a youth in a certain place, at a certain time, and among a certain sort of people. This focus of Warren's, and of the other Southern writers, produces a special sort of psychological realism I think to be part and parcel of Southern literature.

Although it is by no means inevitable, or as usual as many Americans think, it is not uncommon that within families people love one another. There is, however, nothing romantic about this love--and certainly nothing idealistic or idealizing. We rarely fool our families about ourselves; and when our families love us it is not only despite our faults but, since our faults and their faults are likely to be the same, because of our faults. We cannot, within our families, wear the various faces that we wear to meet the public every day. Like it or not, if we would accept the affection of our families, we must accept it with the chilling realization that it is gratuitous: we do not really earn it; and too often we get that affection despite ourselves. My own brothers, often enough, speak to me as though it were an established fact that about the really important issues in life I am irretrievably wrongheaded; and, indeed, the fact of my wrongheadedness is, in their minds, not important. They assume my faults, but much worse than that they attach no importance to them. I am what they are stuck with and they must make the best of it.

So it is in Southern literature that writers care very much about the people and places they treat; but if there are defects in those people and things wrong with those places, that is not necessarily immediately thematic. In Southern literature the character with unacceptable social attitudes, or even bad morals, is not necessarily to be despised. He is what he is; and the point is much more often the revelation of what he is--and some suggestion of what we all are--than a judgment of what he is.

In "American Portrait: Old Style," the poem's speaker revisits after sixty years a friend of his boyhood. His friend has allowed his great and single talent as a baseball pitcher to be destroyed by whiskey. There is much recollection as the poem rambles back and forth from boyhood to manhood. There is some lamenting of his friend's decline. But,

. . . no batter
 Could do what booze finally did:
 Just blow him off the mound--but anyway,
 He had always called it a fool game, just something
 For children who hadn't yet dreamed what
 A man is, or barked a squirrel, or raised
 A single dog from a pup.

.
 And I, too, went on my way, the winning and losing,
 or what
 Is sometimes of all things the worst, the not
 knowing

One thing from the other, nor knowing
 How the teeth in Time's jaw all snag backward
 And whatever enters therein
 Has less hope of remission than shark-meat.

In Warren, the easy and graceful acceptance of another man's rationalization allows him to expose that character more fully, with all its contradictions; but Warren is neither so easy nor so gracious with himself or with mankind's lot when he moves on to the statement of the dark theme.

In "Penological Study: Southern Exposure," Warren tells the story, with his usual backward and forward movement through time, of a man who is about to be executed for murder. The situation and the people are in some ways monstrous and the man to be executed has suffered many social evils; however, Warren allows this fact only to explain the man's misfortune, not to excuse his deed.

To return to the family. There is, if you wish, a certain amorality in families. Within families judgments are not clouded by idealistic and romantic affections. When we speak to outsiders we might idealize somewhat, but not when we speak among ourselves. That is the sort of duplicity for which mothers are famous.

Our families look at us unblinkingly, without illusion, and judge us unsparingly--or not at all. No serious Southern writer glorifies the South; and nowhere in American literature are the horrors peculiar to the region more clearly revealed. If we want to learn how poor whites are driven sick and crazy by their poverty, and we do not want the supercilious propaganda of a Karl Shapiro, we must go to Southern writers. If we want to know how evil racial hate can be, we must go to Southern writers, black or white, to discover the real evil: it is possible for some people honestly to see that hate as a virtue. Perceived as virtuous, such hate not only hurts black people but corrupts the conscience and undermines the intelligence of a whole society. It is Southerners who know that the evil done black people is more than the action of one group of people against another. Southerners know that racial hatred is an internecine crime.

To see such a thing in this way is to see its scary complication--of motive, of circumstance, of character, of cause-and-effect relations. In the face of such complexity, categorical judgments will not serve.

So in Faulkner, that Southern writer of the world class, we find wisdom in the maniac, tenderness in the homicide, nobility of character in the social deviant. In honest despair (but sometimes in the ignorant belief that Faulkner's people have no real-life referents) critics have called such characters grotesque. Perhaps so. But is not a human being a grotesque? And is not life a grotesquerie?

In the many poems in which Warren looks back, fusing past

and present, there is nostalgia perhaps, and sentiment, but no sentimentality. Confronting those uncategorizable mixtures that are real persons in an almost existential way, he does not turn from those truths about life and ourselves that are hard to know: not mean, just true. In the many poems in which Warren questions the value of life itself--and in which he ponders the futility of various human enterprises--there is no suggestion that he has somehow fallen away from the virtues of his ancestors. There is no desire to go back into some putative state of innocence. He is like his ancestors; and he does not delude himself that when he was a child he was innocent. In "Amazing Grace in the Back Country," the boy, certainly somehow Warren himself, remembers the effects upon him of a religious revival meeting when he was twelve years old. It is perfectly clear that the boy in question was capable of shame, cynicism, pride, despair. Warren is no wishful rememberer.

Boy, man, grandfather, grandson: all inescapably mankind. Their problems grow not from their age, from their time and place, from their ignorance or erudition. They grow from the fact that they were born into the mortal lot. But Warren, however saddened by our plight, or even frightened by it, is not a man undone by anger. After the speaker has visited the decayed baseball pitcher in "American Portrait: Old Style," he pictures himself as lying on the earth where he and his friend used to play. He asks himself why, when such a thing as his friend's pointless decline can occur, and when such decline is in one way or the other the fate of all of us, he should continue to interest himself in life.

But why should I lie here longer?
I am not dead yet, though in years,
And the world's way is yet long to go,
And I love the world even in my anger,
And love is a hard thing to outgrow.

This is hard, hard wisdom. I think Warren's matter in poetry, when he writes as a Southern regionalist, is strong support for that clarity and complexity of vision, and that ruthless resistance to sentimentality (the natural parent of anger and smallness of heart), that the statement of such wisdom requires.

Unlike lesser regionalists, Warren never falls into the trap of supposing that the past of a person or place is of remarkable interest for its own sake. The past of a society raises questions about a personal present; and it does not answer those questions. Warren, whose language is imbued with the regional lore, hopes for no more than the definition by tradition--by the remembered past--of what to do now. And again, the question is only a question, asked in the kindest of ways; and there is, maybe, hope:

What is it that you cannot remember that is
so true.⁶

And:

It grows on you, at least, God
Has allowed man the grandeur of certain
utterances.

True or not. But sometimes true.⁷

This is wisdom through the gate of horn.

Notes

¹Robert Penn Warren, Selected Poems: 1923-75 (New York: Random House, 1976), pp. 241-43. The poem in question was written between 1954 and 1956.

²Selected Poems, pp. 119-27. Written between 1968 and 1974.

³Selected Poems, pp. 265-67. Written between 1954 and 1956.

⁴Robert Penn Warren, Now and Then: Poems 1976-1978 (New York: Random House, 1978), pp. 3-7.

⁵Now and Then, pp. 8-10.

⁶Now and Then, p. 50, in "Memory Forgotten."

⁷Now and Then, p. 40, in "Waiting."