THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
CHARLES GARO ASHJIAN
1969

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

presented by

Charles Garo Ashjian

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in Arts and Letters

Major professor

Date 3 June 69

O-169

BINDING BY
HOAG & SONS'
BOOK BINDERY INC.

JAN 4 1974 306

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

By

Charles Garo Ashjian

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Arts and Letters

1969

G60702
4-23-70

ABSTRACT

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

By

Charles Garo Ashjian

The purpose of this study is to consider and analyze the repeatedly encountered and repeatedly unamplified notion of the poet or dramatic artist as an intermediary between what has been termed the eternal and the temporal. Any artist who conducts his creative activity in such a manner and with such an intent is rightfully regarded as a priest--and in the most literal sense. That the artist, especially the dramatic artist, does participate in such a priestly role has been a common assumption in many periods of artistic creation and critical analysis. Significantly, such periods have been the major ones in the history of dramatic art. These points evidence themselves throughout the study. The following is the definition of the term priest as employed throughout the study: the priest is one who leads a cult in an act of worship through the ritual reenactment of a myth. An elaboration upon this definition and a clarification of the included terms and

implicit ideas form a major segment of the study. Further, those who participate in such a ritual partake of a necessary and redeeming sacrament. Finally, the religious, philosophic, and aesthetic framework and criterion which is established upon such a basis is exemplified in a consideration of the dramatic art of Pedro Calderón de la Barca--a major playwright of the Spanish Golden Age.

The method of this study is through an appeal to the utterances of various significant authorities. This study is concerned primarily with the thoughts of other men and if at times there is an apparent redundancy in ideas, it is due to a desire to corroborate specific points from the vantage points of various disciplines. The arguments and positions are, thus, made more conclusive. Such a method is adequate and justified since the purpose of this study is not to prove the initial problem or assertion but, rather, to engage in an extended amplification and analysis. The bias of this approach is that the presented viewpoint is the most valid one in any consideration of dramatic art. However, this becomes irrelevant since the common but unelaborated doctrine of the playwright as a priest merits analysis and elaboration for no other reason than that it is a frequently declared one.

The major findings of the study include the assertion that the dramatic art and religion both embody the "invisible realities." The objects of sense become the medium for

conveying the apparently indiscernible to the otherwise incapable group of mankind. Religion must resort to art in order to fulfill its task and, thus, religion and art become inextricable and necessary for the fullest success of the other. Dramatic art is capable of attaining the stature of the "holy object" which makes visible and apprehensible the quality and nature of the "divine." Dramatic art becomes a means for the achievement and participation in what man has referred to as religion. Philosophy, in turn, approaches a knowledge of the "divine" by the apprehension of the loftiest concepts. But relatively few human beings are capable of arriving at such a knowledge which requires the attainment and possession of a well-developed intellect. However, they may apprehend such knowledge in an intuitive manner through the medium of dramatic art which resorts to the use of symbols which are grounded in the concrete and, thus, more readily perceived by a greater number of human beings. The task of the significant dramatic artist is inextricable from the concerns and conclusions of philosophy. Another quality and function of the drama is that it more readily presents the insights of philosophy in addition to those of religion. Thus, philosophy and dramatic art become inextricable and necessary for the fullest success of the other.

Charles Garo Ashjian

The playwright who assumes the priestly role commits himself to the task of revealing the "divine" to mankind. The theatre, under the guidance of this playwright-priest, becomes "a cathedral of the spirit" and a place where mankind attains the capacity and strength for achieving the level and stature of spirit. The act of sacrifice is a crucial obligation of the playwright-priest. He renders an object to be used as an aid and route to divinity. The material content of such an aid nullifies itself and its claim to prolonged attention by indicating the realm of the spirit. The playwright-priest, further, assumes the role of a prophet. Within the context of the drama for which he bears responsibility is heralded a vision of the future. Within this dramatic context, also, is an admonition for the audience to render their share in converting such a vision to an actuality. Art as prophetic activity is an illuminated depiction of what mankind "ought to become." Finally, the playwright-priest assumes the role of a pastor within his community. He is a spokesman and advocate of those moral truths and a revealer of those errors in conduct which impinge upon the daily and practical life of man. The stage becomes a place whereupon living examples are encountered within a context which comprehends and reveals the motives and norms and actions which yielded the viewed emotions. The stage grants understanding for utilization in common affairs. The playwright who assumes the priestly role makes such an experience possible.

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

By

Charles Garo Ashjian

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Arts and Letters

1969

©Copyright by

CHARLES GARO ASHJIAN

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to Professor Peter Fischer of the Religion Department, Professor Russel Nye of the English Department, Professor Harold Walsh of the Philosophy Department and, especially, Professor John Yunck of the English Department. Without their patience, encouragement, and understanding, I would not have completed the requirements for the doctoral degree. In my estimate, they are teachers in every best sense of the word.

The type of the free workman is the artist, and the artist is, by definition, one who is concerned with the Absolute Beauty. The Absolute Beauty is God. The artist is concerned with God. As the priest brings God to the marriage the artist brings God to the work. All free workmen are artists. All workmen who are not artists are slaves.

GOD IS LOVE.
THE LOVE OF GOD IS SENSIBLE IN BEAUTY.
THE LOVE OF GOD IS MAN'S ESSENTIAL PERFECTION.
BEAUTY IS AN ESSENTIAL PERFECTION OF MAN'S WORK.

(Eric Gill, Art Nonsense and Other Essays, London, Cassell, 1929)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PART I. THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 2

II. PRIEST. 30

Sacrificer
Prophet
Pastor

III. CULT AND WORSHIP 53

IV. RITUAL, SACRAMENT, AND MYTH. 68

V. THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART. 88

Religion and Dramatic Art
Philosophy and Dramatic Art

VI. THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST. 104

The Playwright as Sacrificer
The Playwright as Prophet
The Playwright as Pastor

VII. RELIGIOUS RITUAL AND DRAMATIC PERFORMANCE . . . 131

Sacred and Profane Language
Sacred and Profane Place
Sacred and Profane Time
Audience and Worship
Audience and Cult
Ritual and Performance as Sacrament

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONT.

Chapter — Page

PART II. CALDERÓN: A PLAYWRIGHT-PRIEST

I. INTRODUCTION. 150

II. THREE PLAYS 167

Life Is A Dream--Sacrificial Doctrine
The Mayor of Zalamea--Prophetic Doctrine
The Great Theatre of the World--Pastoral Doctrine

BIBLIOGRAPHY 230

PART I

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST: THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The title of this study is The Playwright as Priest: The Religious and Philosophical Significance of Dramatic Art. The purpose of this study is to consider and analyze the repeatedly encountered and repeatedly unamplified notion of the poet or dramatic artist as an intermediary between what has been termed the eternal and the temporal. Any artist who conducts his creative activity in such a manner and with such an intent is rightfully regarded as a priest--and in the most literal sense. That the artist, especially the dramatic artist, does participate in such a priestly role has been a common assumption in many periods of artistic creation and critical analysis. Significantly, such periods have been the major ones in the history of dramatic art. These points will evidence themselves throughout the study. The following will be the definition of the term priest as herein established: the priest is one who leads a cult in an act of worship through the ritual reenactment of a myth. An elaboration upon this definition and a clarification of the included terms and implicit ideas shall form a major segment of this study.

Further, those who participate in such a ritual partake of a necessary and redeeming sacrament. Finally, the religious, philosophic, and aesthetic framework and criterion which is established upon such a basis will be exemplified in a consideration of the dramatic art of Pedro Calderón de la Barca--a major playwright of the Spanish Golden Age.

The method of this study will be through an appeal to the utterances of various significant authorities. This study is concerned primarily with the thoughts of other men and if at times there is an apparent redundancy in ideas, it is due to a desire to corroborate specific points from the vantage points of various disciplines. The arguments and positions will, thus, be made more conclusive. Such a method is adequate and justified since the purpose of this study is not to prove the initial problem or assertion but, rather, to engage in an extended amplification and analysis. The bias of this approach is that the presented viewpoint is the most valid one in any consideration of dramatic art. However, this becomes irrelevant since the common but unelaborated doctrine of the playwright as a priest merits analysis and elaboration for no other reason than that it is a frequently declared one. Any intellectual movement which strives toward the establishment of the validity of such a viewpoint is merely apparent and due only to an attempt to render a complete view of the implications of this study.

Let it be emphasized here that this study is a narrow one. Though this may seem a bit ironic when one considers the title of the presentation, a metaphor will quickly indicate the point and implication of such a statement. The practice of genuine art is an attempt by the artist to reconcile God or the hallowed eternal with Satan or the sullied temporal--what is permanent and good and light is to be reconciled and interfused with that which is transient and evil and dark. The artist grasps at each domain in order to draw them together once more. The total artistic task is that noble and perverse. The artistic task entails that much tension and strain--and to be the genuine artist is to bear the burden of embroilment in such a situation. Nevertheless, to render a full and just depiction of the act of artistic creation and the ensuing art object would entail a consideration of this entire scene. This study is a narrow one in that it merely considers the hand of the artist which is grasping God. Such a comprehension of the artistic task and dilemma is far from being a strange and alien one to the artist himself. Consider Blake:

> Although Blake thought of a poet as a visionary, he saw him also as a human, in whom the "contraries battle." Blake himself was subject to fluctuation between the visionary and the mundane, the traditional Western duality. ". . . I am under the direction of Messengers from Heaven, Daily & Nightly; but the nature of such things is not as some suppose, without trouble or care. Temptations are on the right hand & left; behind, the sea of time & space roars & follows swiftly; he who keeps

not right onwards is lost. . . ." As a visionary the poet must evade time and space and see into the Edenic realm of harmony.[1]

And Kazantzakis:

> I felt this was my sole duty: to reconcile the irreconcilables, to draw the thick ancestral darkness out of my loins and transform it, to the best of my ability, into light.[2]

And Ibsen:

> And what is it, then, that I have lived through and that has inspired me? The range has been large. In part I have been inspired by something which only rarely and only in my best moments has stirred vividly within me as something great and beautiful. I have been inspired by that which, so to speak, has stood higher than my everyday self, and I have been inspired by this because I wanted to confront it and make it part of myself.
>
> But I have also been inspired by the opposite, by what appears on introspection as the dregs and sediment of one's own nature. Writing has in this case been to me like a bath from which I have risen feeling cleaner, healthier, and freer.[3]

T. S. Eliot once stated that his criticism was a venture into a realm of interpretation which lent itself neither to proof or refutation--so also is this study. In the obvious absence of absolute knowledge, such a stance is prudent rather than presumptuous. If this is to be interpreted as an admission that one is presenting opinion

---

[1]Hayward Adams. "The Blakean Aesthetic," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIII (December, 1954), p. 245.

[2]Nikos Kazantzakis, Report to Greco (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1966), p. 19.

[3]Henrik Ibsen, "The Task of the Poet," in Playwrights on Playwriting, ed. by Toby Cole (New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960), p. 3.

and outlook, let it also be added that such opinion and outlook has been shared by many significant persons. Many of these opinions will be encountered throughout the course of this study. In effect, what is being presented here is an aesthetic outlook which derives from that point wherein art, religion, and philosophy converge. A major system of religious belief entails certain necessary tenets. The aesthetic outlook to be amplified in this study derives directly from this set of necessary tenets. That such major systems of belief do exist is evident and, further, that such systems do coincide in matters of principle doctrine, above and beyond the obfuscation and bias of particular systems of imagery and mythology is evidenced by Frithjof Schuon in The Transcendent Unity of Religions. Schuon summarizes the main contention of the volume:

> To come now to the main subject of this book, it must be emphasized that the unity of the different religions, or, more generally, of the different traditional forms, is not only unrealizable on the external level, that of the forms themselves, but ought not to be realized at that level, even were this possible, for in that case the revealed forms would be deprived of their sufficient reason. The very fact that they are revealed shows that they are willed by the Divine Word. If the expression 'transcendent unity' is used, it means that the unity of the traditional forms, whether they are religious or supra-religious in their nature, must be realized in a purely inward and spiritual way and without prejudice to any particular form. The antagonisms between these forms no more affect the one universal Truth than the antagonisms between opposing colours affect the transmission of the one uncoloured light (to return to the illustration

> used already). Just as every colour, by its negation of darkness and its affirmation of light, provides the possibility of discovering the ray which makes it visible and of tracing this ray back to its luminous source, so all forms, all symbols, all religions, all dogmas, by their negation of error and their affirmation of Truth, make it possible to follow the ray of Revelation, which is none other than the ray of the Intellect, back as far as its Divine Source.[4]

And Blake makes a similar contention:

> Blake fully understood the risks and proceeded with faith in that thing he called man's Universal Poetic Genius. Blake believed each man capable of spiritual regeneration through the power of this Genius. When he states that "all had originally one language, and one religion" he does not hypothesize the original Indo-European language of the philologists. He means that the vision of all people is of the same pure form. That one pure form is eternally "Imagination," pitted against the mundane form called "Memory," which is a product of the delusory finite world of Generation and Vegetation, which builds up an opaque experience of nature: "There Exist in that Eternal World the Permanent Realities of Every Thing which we see reflected in this Vegetable Class of Nature."[5]

This study assumes the validity and, at least, the value of such outlooks in a manner similar to that of William James writing in Essays in Pragmatism. For James, the absence of total proof in substantiation of a doctrine does not necessitate the abandonment of such a doctrine--and, indeed, the further and possible life-fulfilling value of the doctrine. This universal outlook which is

---

[4]Frithjof Schuon, The Transcendent Unity of Religions (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1953), p. 15.

[5]Adams, op. cit., p. 242.

being alluded to has most frequently and aptly been termed the "Perennial Philosophy." Aldous Huxley defines it in this manner:

> Philosophia Perrennis--the phrase was coined by Leibniz; but the thing--the metaphysic that recognizes a divine reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, divine reality; the ethic that places man's final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent ground of all being--the thing is immemorial and universal.[6]

The framework of this study is a religious one. There should be no mistake about this point. The sense in which the term "religion" is being considered has been stated by Whitehead:

> Religion is the vision of something which stands behind and within the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, and yet waiting to be realized; something which is a remote possibility and yet the greatest of present facts; something that gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good and yet is beyond all reach; something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest.[7]

The believer in the validity of such a religion or the "religious man" has been described by Eliade:

> Whatever the historical context in which he is placed, homo religious always believes that there is an absolute reality, the sacred, which transcends this world but manifests itself in this world, thereby sanctifying it and making it real. He further believes that life has a sacred

---

[6]Aldous Huxley, The Perennial Philosophy (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962), p. iv.

[7]Alfred North Whitehead, Science and the Modern World (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927), p. 275.

> origin and that human existence realizes all of its potentialities in proportion as it is religious--that is, participates in reality.[8]

Skeptics and literal minded people lacking sufficient spirituality will recoil at such assertions. They will, further, question the relevance of such assertions in any consideration of art. Artists, they will say, have little to do with such theory. Indeed, what does an artist, the creator of a concrete art object, care for theories and concepts of any sort? These matters will be dealt with in a thorough manner. For the moment, consider the remark of Herbert Read in considering the practice of certain artists of the quattrocento in their desire to realize the substantial existence of the external world. He states:

> For our present purpose it is sufficient to note the perfection of this new dimension of consciousness in Piero della Francesca, Alberti, and Leonardo. All these artists left documentary evidence of their views, in the form of treatises or notebooks, and the fact that they were conscious theorists is perhaps their most significant characteristic.[9]

Such examples may be accumulated for many of the significant epochs of artistic activity. Indeed, such is the rule rather than the exception. That artists have little comprehension of the status and nature of their own

---

[8]Mircea Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 202.

[9]Herbert Read, Icon and Idea (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), p. 99.

products is probably a fallacy promulgated by self-justifying and insecure art critics. Such an attitude is tolerated and fostered by many artists for it is in their interest to engender discussion of a work rather than end such discussion by an authoritative and conclusive statement of their own. Further, in regarding the spiritual and even mystical viewpoint of the artist, consider this assertion by Paul Klee:

> Presumptuous is the artist who does not follow his road through to the end. But chosen are those artists who penetrate to the region of that secret place where primeval power nurtures all evolution. There, where the powerhouse of all time and space--call it brain or heart of creation--activates every function: who is the artist who would not dwell there? In the womb of nature, at the source of creation, where the secret key to all lies guarded.[10]

Friedrich Schlegel, along the same line, states "All artists are religious."[11]

And Thomas Mann states:

> Every artist, simply in his character as artist, may venture to call himself a religious man.[12]

Not only is great art--the art which meets the criterion to be established here--based on faith and a belief in the divine, but so, also, is aesthetic theory. Consider

---

[10] As quoted by Read, ibid., p. 123.

[11] As quoted by Gerardus Van der Leeuw, Sacred and Profane Beauty (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Inc., 1963), p. 147.

[12] As quoted by Geraldine Trask, ed., Storytellers and Their Art (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963), p. 65.

this point made by Ananda Coomaraswamy in a study of Christian and Oriental aesthetic doctrine. Coomaraswamy avers:

> It will not be out of place to say that I believe what I have to expound--for the study of any subject can live only to the extent that the student himself stands or falls by the life of the subject studied; the interdependence of faith and understanding applying as much to the theory of art as to any other doctrine.[13]

And, also, Katherine Anne Porter states:

> The arts . . . live continuously, and they live literally by faith; their names and their shapes and their uses and their basic meanings survive unchanged in all that matters through times of interruption, diminishment, neglect; they outlive governments and creeds and the societies, even the very civilizations that produce them. They cannot be destroyed altogether because they represent the substance of faith and the only reality. They are what we find again when the ruins are cleared away.[14]

The dramatic art to be described finds its true place within this sphere of faith in the transcendent and can only be composed beneath its light. There is a desired and desirable realm which transcends both space and time--if for no other reason because men believe it to be so. The ontological status of this transcendent sphere is irrelevant and indeterminable. Nevertheless, this does not disturb the validity of the outlook to any degree. The

---

[13] Ananda Coomaraswamy, Christian and Oriental Philosophy of Art (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. 23.

[14] As quoted by Lawrence J. Hatterer, The Artist in Society (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 9.

Absolute or God is worthy of total respect and worship whether existent or not--whether subjective or substantial. William James states the matter thus:

> The further limits of our being plunge into an altogether different dimension of existence from the sensible and merely 'understandable' world. Name it the mystical or supernatural reason, whichever you choose. Yet the unseen region . . . produces effects in the world. When we commune with it, work is actually done upon our finite personality . . . . But that which produces effects within another reality must be termed a reality itself, so I feel as if we had no philosophic excuse for calling the unseen or mystical world unreal . . . . Our normal working consciousness . . . is but one special type of consciousness, whilst all about it, parted from it by the filmiest of screens, there lie potential forms of consciousness entirely different. We may go through life without suspecting their existence; but apply the requisite stimulus, and at a touch, they are there . . . . No account of the universe . . . can be final which leaves these other forms of consciousness disregarded . . . . If then there be a wider world of being than that of our everyday consciousness, if in it there be forces whose effects on us are intermittent, if one condition be the openness of the subliminal door . . . at these places at least . . . it would seem as though transmundane energies of God, if you will, produced immediate effects within the natural world to which the rest of our experience belongs.[15]

Artists do assume a coincident attitude even though it may merely be in an unconscious or intuitive manner. And again, the ontological status of the Absolute is irrelevant to the contention of this study. It is no problem affecting the possibility or impossibility of

---

[15]As quoted by A. Savill, Alexander the Great and His Time (London: Rockliff Publishing Corp., 1955), p. 291.

creative activity--be this activity philosophical, religious, or artistic. The artist is perplexed but not halted in the success of his endeavor. De Rougemont states the surmountable predicament of the artist:

> This problem, let us observe, torments not only the artist, but also, and more consciously still, the physicist of today. Do I invent, he says to himself, or is it rather that I discover a reality? Do I project into the cosmos the forms of my spirit, or is it rather that I espouse by the spirit some of the objective forms of the real? And the man who receives a call sometimes subsists in this doubt to the point of anguish. Do I surrender to some obscure determination of my desire, or is it rather that I really respond to a summons received from somewhere else? Where does the voice come from? Who speaks? Myself, or the other? Such is the predicament which the intervention of the Holy Spirit creates in man.[16]

De Rougemont continues to assert his own belief in the substantial existence of this reality.

Similarly, consider this discussion of Lord Shaftesbury by Nahm:

> "No poet," wrote Shaftesbury in "A Letter Concerning Enthusiasm," ". . . can do anything great in his own way without the imagination or supposition of a divine presence." Shaftesbury goes to the root of the problem--the need is to transport or inspire the mind, "with more than I feel at ordinary hours." And he adds, sagely enough, that whether the "divine presence" be spectual or real is of no consequence.[17]

---

[16] Denis de Rougemont, "Religion and the Mission of the Artist," in Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature ed. by S. Hopper (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 185.

[17] As quoted by Milton Nahm, The Artist as Creator (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 173.

When Schlegel or Mann state that artists are religious in outlook, they must also be aware that artists can also be atheists. The resolution of this apparent contradiction is found in the above remark by Shaftesbury.

In placing this study within its proper context, consider a further implication or problem contingent upon what has gone before. Certainly many thinkers, whether they be artists, clerics, or philosophers, in using the various terms such as Divine, God, Absolute, Mind, Spirit, Logos, Nous, Being or whatever to signify the ultimate ground and source of reality have not been using these terms synonymously. To equate, for instance, the immanent and evolving "Mind" or "Absolute" of Hegel with the transcendent and perfected "God" of Christianity would be fallacious to say the least. But an extensive inquiry into the nature of these and similar terms would show not so much a difference in the conception of this entity but, rather, a difference in the ontological status of this entity. It has already been indicated that the ontological status of the total and ultimate object or commonly, God, is irrelevant to the act of artistic creation. Whether God is ideal or real, subjective or objective is irrelevant. What is relevant is the actual existence of God whether such an actual existence is contingent upon the mind of man solely or contingent and, rather, intrinsic to the nature of reality as the word "reality" suggests the cosmos or

universe in its entirety. What is relevant, further, is that art be considered an overflow of or insight into the Absolute--even if such an Absolute is entirely contingent upon the mind of man. It is such a framework that is being established. Schelling states:

> My general view of art is that it constitutes an efflux from the Absolute.[18]

From such a vantage point, whatever is can merely and finally be a predicate of the Absolute. Thus, all branches of scholarly and artistic endeavor are merely considerations of a single object from unique vantage points. Thus, Hegel has stated that philosophy is the conceptual apprehension of the Absolute; religion is the symbolic apprehension of the Absolute; and art is the intuitive apprehension of the Absolute. To speak of conceptual apprehension is to refer to those conclusions that are expressed in an imageless fashion and which are the result of an abstractive process by the intellect. To speak of symbolic apprehension is to refer to those conclusions that are expressed through imagery which is reemployed without a significant change in referent or meaning. To speak of intuitive apprehension is to refer to those conclusions that are expressed through changing imagery without a significant change in referent or meaning. Hegel, also,

---

[18]As quoted by E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Wordsworth and Schelling (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 121.

employs the term "Mind" to refer to the Absolute and refers to the "ideas" of Mind or the permanent structures which permeate reality due to the processes of Mind. It is even as the Christian who refers to the "eternal verities of God which display themselves in nature." Hegel reiterates the single object of the various areas of scholarly, religious, and artistic endeavor. He states:

> Fine art is not real art till it is in this sense free, and only achieves its highest task when it has taken its place in the same sphere with religion and philosophy, and has become simply a mode of revealing to consciousness and bringing to utterance the Divine Nature, the deepest interests of humanity, and the most comprehensive truths of the mind.[19]

And again:

> This is an attribute which art shares with religion and philosophy, only in this peculiar mode, that it represents even the highest ideas in sensuous forms, thereby bringing them nearer to the character of natural phenomena, to the senses, and to feeling.[20]

The convergence of art, philosophy, and theology has been expressed, also, by a twentieth century philosopher. Wilhelm Dilthey states:

> Both philosophy and theology express a Weltanschauung based on actual, vital experience. The same is true of art, especially of literature. All three of them must ultimately correspond.[21]

---

[19] F. W. Hegel, Philosophy of Fine Art (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1886), I, p. 12.

[20] Ibid., p. 13.

[21] As quoted by Hirsch, op. cit., p. 7.

Such ideas as those employed by Hegel and Dilthey have also been repeatedly voiced throughout the ages by such thinkers as Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Dionysius, Augustine, Bonaventure, Aquinas, Fichte, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger. This is merely an incomplete list. Nevertheless, consider the following corroborative recapitulations of the aesthetic doctrines of Heidegger, Plato, and Kierkegaard. Versenyi, in comparing both Hegel and Heidegger, asserts:

> In both Heidegger and Hegel "great art and its works are great in their historical emergence and being only because they accomplish a decisive task within the historical existence of man--they reveal, in the manner of the work, what all that is is, and they preserve the revelation in the work. Art and its work are necessary only as a way and as an abode of man, in which the truth of all that is, i.e., the Unconditional, the Absolute, discloses itself."[22]

Versenyi continues with his summary of Heidegger's aesthetic doctrine:

> What has happened? What is at work in the work of art? Revelation, aletheia, truth. A work of art does not so much reveal what this or that individual thing is as it discloses to us the essential nature and structure of a whole world. The simpler, the purer, the more primordial and unadorned the work, the more immediately and inevitably it does so. "In its way, the work of art opens up the Being of what is." This opening up or disclosure is the happening of truth. The essence of the work of art is thus the unfolding of truth. "Art is truth at work."[23]

---

[22] L. Versenyi, Heidegger, Being, and Truth (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p.102.

[23] Ibid., p. 92.

Thus, intellect and affection seek the same end. Art becomes a means for attaining this end. Versenyi continues the discussion of Heidegger's aesthetic theory by showing its concurrence with the doctrine of Plato. He presents Heidegger as follows:

> Plato was right when he held that "it is beauty's fate alone to be ekphanestaton (that which most shines forth) and erasmiotaton (that which is most to be loved)" (Phaedrus 250D). For "as the beautiful lets Being light up, and is as the beautiful the most attractive it transports man out of and beyond himself to Being."[24]

Crites, in relating the doctrine of Kierkegaard, shows the identical aesthetic conclusions of this philosopher with those of Hegel. As with Hegel, Kierkegaard concludes that philosophy is a synthesis of the ideal and the real in the sphere of ideality and art is a synthesis of the ideal and the real in the sphere of sensuality--Kierkegaard states, according to Crites:

> But philosophy, as Hegel argued, is the ultimate medium for the idea, since thought is the idea's own pure element; so philosophy is able to grasp in pure ideality what art had first expressed in a material medium, and what a natural science could grasp only for a limited purpose and within a limited frame of reference. This does not mean that speculative philosophy could simply replace art or science. A particular idea cannot come to expression at all apart from its appropriate medium, and it can never come to satisfy the whole man in the austere medium of pure thought with the same intensity as in the sensuous media of art. But Hegel tried to show that philosophy can grasp ideas, once given, in their purity and in their necessary relation to one another as logical

---

[24] Ibid., p. 94.

> moments in the absolute idea. To Kierkegaard this meant at least that it is possible to approach art philosophically, and at most that speculative philosophy might justly claim to be the supreme intellectual realization of the aesthetic standpoint in general.[25]

One conclusion which certainly may be drawn from this passage is that the subject and source of art and beauty is God as God is the source and constitution of the absolute idea. Those who consider art must not hesitate to say as much. Theodore Spencer, referring to the drama, states:

> Great drama has to admit the unforgivable; it has, in other words, if it is to express man's spiritual awareness, to recognize the existence of a force which needs no name but which has been called "fate," or "destiny"; in religious terms, "God"; or, metaphysically speaking, "a power under God."[26]

It is the attitude of Coomaraswamy, also, who states:

> Let us tell them (the audience) what these works of art are about and not merely tell them things about these works of art. Let us tell them the painful truth, that most of these works of art are about God, whom we never mention in polite society.[27]

Again, the criterion for this "most" will be established. Evelyn Underhill, in quoting St. John of the

---

[25] From the introduction by D. Crites to Soren Kierkegaard, Crisis in the Life of an Actress (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 23.

[26] Theodore Spencer, "Man's Spiritual Situation as Reflected in Modern Drama," in Hopper, op. cit., p. 46.

[27] Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 20.

Cross, reiterates in more poetic terms the notion of God as the source and ground of all beauty. Underhill states:

> "God," says St. John of the Cross again, "passes through the thicket of the world, and wherever His glance falls He turns all things to beauty."[28]

Within the synoptic frame that has been established, consider the more specific manner in which art and the artist function in order to gain the intended and already designated end. Kaminsky, in his study of the Hegelian aesthetic doctrine, reiterates the philosopher thus:

> It is the function of art "to expunge the divergence between the purely natural and the spiritual, to exalt the external bodily appearance to a form of beauty, that is, a form throughout dominated and suffused with the animation of spirit.29

Hegel, in the Philosophy of Fine Art evidences the conviction that phenomenal appearance places as a Hindu might say, a "veil of illusion" over that which is ultimately real and born of Mind and the Divine. The appearances of art as the appearances of ordinary experience point beyond themselves to that sphere of ultimate value and reality. Hegel states:

> Art liberates the real import of appearances from the semblance and deception of this bad and fleeting world and imparts to phenomenal

---

[28]As quoted by Evelyn Underhill, Worship (New York: Harper and Row, 1936), p. 6.

[29]Jack Kaminsky, Hegel on Art (New York: University Publishers, Inc., 1962), p. 66.

> semblances a higher reality, born of mind. The appearances of art, therefore, far from being mere semblances, have the higher reality and the more genuine existence in comparison with the realities of common life.[30]

And Pope Pius XII asserts accordingly:

> The function of all art lies in fact in breaking through the narrow and tortuous enclosure of the finite, in which man is immersed while living here below, and in providing a window on the infinite for his hungry soul.[31]

And, again, James Gillis:

> Art is revelation. If a painting shows only what is there, it is not art. Art like fine music or high literature must carry the beholder beyond this world and all that appears in it, transport him to the shores of the eternal world and enable him to see and hear the things not given to the tongue of man to utter.[32]

That this ultimate referant of art is meant for intellectual apprehension or intended for the "mind's eye" is evidenced by this further statement of Hegel:

> Again, the mode of appearance of the shapes produced by art may be called a deception in comparison with philosophic thought, with religious or moral principles. Beyond a doubt the mode of revelation which a content attains in the realm of thought is the truest reality; but in comparison with the show or semblance of immediate sensuous existence or of historical narrative, the artistic semblance has the

---

[30] Hegel, op. cit., p. 15.

[31] As quoted by Ralph L. Woods, ed., The World Treasury of Religious Quotations (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1966), p. 27.

[32] Ibid., p. 26.

> advantage that in itself it points beyond itself, and refers us away from itself to something spiritual which it is meant to bring before the mind's eye.[33]

We shall encounter similar assertions below. What is presumed, however, in such a view is that the ultimate object or referant of art is some "concept" (e.g., Hegel), or "idea" (e.g., Plato), or "universal" (e.g., Augustine) having its ground in the Absolute. Ultimate art points to a spiritual realm. Granted there are other modes of artistic expression but these are considered deficient when an encounter with God and the spiritual may be attained instead. It is admitted that other modes of artistic expression have value also--but, it need hardly be emphasized, the concern here is the ultimate in artistic apprehension and expression.

This desired and ultimate type of contact between the spiritual and the sensuous is most cogently expressed in the following remarks of Hegel:

> In art, these sensuous shapes and sounds present themselves, not simply for their own sake and for that of their immediate structure, but with the purpose of affording in that shape satisfaction to higher spiritual interests, seeing that they are powerful to call forth a response and echo in the mind from all the depths of consciousness. It is thus that, in art, the sensuous is spiritualized, i.e., the spiritual appears in sensuous shape.[34]

---

[33] Hegel, op. cit., p. 16.

[34] Ibid., p. 73.

Kaminsky, in his study, reasserts the role of the artist as envisioned by Hegel and whose goal is the revelation of the concept or type within Mind which underlies the phenomena of sense perception. Kaminsky summarizes:

> The role of the artist is now quite clear. What makes him an artist is his ability to organize sense objects in such a way that they will serve to call attention to the indicative nature of sense perception. If the artist succeeds, then the observer of his work will suddenly see more than the mere imagery; he will also see in an intellectual sense the underlying concept of which the imagery is supposed to be a manifestation. If the artist fails, then no underlying concept has appeared.[35]

Again, Kaminsky states:

> The great artist, Hegel concluded, will always be able to lift "the soul high above all its painful perplexity into the ordered limits of the real."[36]

Schiller, also, states that the form or the idea or the archetype within the mind of God is what gives light and life to a work of art. He states:

> Therefore, the real artistic secret of the master consists in his annihilating the material by means of the form, and the more imposing, arrogant and alluring the material is in itself, the more autocratically it obtrudes itself in its operation, and the more inclined the beholder is to engage immediately with the material, the more triumphant is the art which forces back material and asserts

---

[35] Kaminsky, op. cit., p. 27.

[36] Ibid., p. 103.

[37] F. Schiller, On the Aesthetic Education of Man (New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1965), p. 106.

> its mastery over form. The nature of the man who sees or hears the work must remain completely free and inviolate, it must go forth from the magic circle of the artist pure and perfect as from the Creator's hands.[37]

The material element in art, though never ignored or omitted, must finally be destroyed so that an artist or participant may gain the clarified proximity and vision of the source of being. Art unfolds or unmasks the ideal. When it fails to do so it may only be considered as being good, defective, or mediocre. Hegel, again, states:

> Concrete reality is so overburdened with the phenomenal, that is incidental or accidental detail, that we frequently cannot see the forest for the trees, and often the most important fact slips by us as a thing of common or daily occurrence. It is the indwelling insight and genius of the artist which first adds the quality of greatness to events or actions, presenting them fully in a truly historical composition, which rejects what is purely external, and only brings into prominence that through which that ideal substance is vitally unfolded.[38]

And summarily Hegel states:

> And, therefore, what the particular arts realize in individual works of art, are according to their abstract conception simply the universal types which constitute the self-unfolding Idea of beauty. It is as the external realization of this Idea that the wide Pantheon of art is being erected, whose architect and builder is the spirit of beauty as it awakens to self-knowledge, and to complete which the history of the world will need its evolution of ages.[39]

Any contention that such is the esoteric doctrine of a theoretical philosopher with no real or provable

---

[38] As quoted by Kaminsky, op. cit., p. 113.

[39] Hegel, op. cit., p. 175.

application in art is easily refuted. Martin Lings, in Shakespeare in the Light of Sacred Art, adheres to a coincident aesthetic system. Hegel as Lings, it should be indicated, in the Philosophy of Fine Art also considers Medieval Art to have been the ultimate exemplification of proper artistic practice. Lings, continuing in the cited study, establishes that a principal reason for the unique status of Shakespeare amongst his fellow playwrights was due to a faithful and prolonged adherance to the Medieval outlook. Ling states:

> In the form of his drama Shakespeare belongs to his age. Marlowe's "Dr. Faustus" is outwardly in some respects more medieval than anything Shakespeare wrote. But in outlook Marlowe was altogether a man of the Renaissance, as were Ben Johnson and Webster, whereas Shakespeare seems in a sense to go back as time goes forward and by the turn of the century he had become, unlike any of his fellow dramatists, the continuer and the summer-up of the past, the last outpost of a quickly vanishing age.[40]

Lings, further, considers Shakespeare as a Medieval artist and presents his explanation, in a manner similar to that of Hegel, for the general superiority of Medieval and Oriental Art in contrast to the art of epochs wherein the transcendent sphere was not acknowledged or sought after so avidly by the individual artist. He states:

> The reason why Medieval art can bear comparison with Oriental Art as no other Western art can is undoubtedly that the Medieval outlook, like

---

[40]Martin Lings, Shakespeare in the Light of Sacred Art (New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1966), p. 17.

> that of the Oriental civilizations, was intellectual. It considered this world above all as the shadow or symbol of the next, man as the shadow or symbol of God; and such an attitude, to be operative, presupposes the presence of intellectuals, for earthly things can only be referred back to their spiritual archetypes through the faculty of intellectual perception, the insight which pierces through the symbol to the universal reality that lies beyond. In the theocratic civilizations, if an artist himself was not an intellectual, he none the less obeyed the canons of art which had been established on an intellectual basis.
>
> A medieval portrait is above all a portrait of the Spirit shining from behind a human veil. In other words, it is as a window opening from the particular on to the universal, and while being enshrined in its own age and civilization as eminently typical of a particular period and place, it has at the same time, in virtue of this opening, something that is neither of the East nor the West, nor of anyone age more than another.[41]

It is contended that great drama is the ultimate mode for manifesting the Absolute through artistic practice. Hegel states as much:

> The drama is the synthesis of lyric and epic poetry. It combines the best elements in both art forms and produces a poetry that indicates man's highest endeavor to uncover all that is ideal in human existence. The drama more than any other art form can finally convey to us how the Idea, the Absolute, makes its appearance among human beings.[42]

And it is contended that the greatest playwrights, as Shakespeare described by Lings, are similarly religious in their outlook. Kitto, to cite another authority, assumes the literary greatness and stature of Aeschylus and Sophocles and states:

---

[41] Ibid., p. 12.

[42] As quoted by Kaminsky, op. cit., p. 156.

> We have examined in detail the structure and style of certain classical Greek plays. We assumed that Aeschylus and Sophocles were in complete command of their own art, and had very good reasons for shaping their plays as they did; and we have, I think, found nothing to disturb that assumption. From this examination there has emerged the conception of "religious" drama, a form of drama in which the real focus is not the Tragic Hero but the divine background.[43]

The focus of such religious drama is again the divine background. It is the "ethereal world" described by Rosenheim who concurs:

> For it is that same ethereal world wherein all we do and suffer while on earth gets written in the "Book of Wisdom" kept by the Eternal Justice. And it is from these exalted "records of eternity" that every genuine poet derives his initiation when he strives for his pertinent imaginations and creative inspirations. To them he owes his primal insight into the consonance of man's terrestrial fate with his eternal destiny, which his genius then breaks down into his own peculiar code of rhythm, harmony and melos. Thus he translates the wonders of the universe into a language comprehensible to the receptive hearts and ears of all who listen to what he has read and captured from the eternal chronicle.[44]

It is in the "eternal chronicle" or the "records of eternity" that literary art gains its own proper words. And such words, when manifested in the manner of dramatic art, reveal themselves within the mold of the highest form

---

[43] H. D. F. Kitto, "Religious Drama and Its Interpretation," in Tragedy, ed. by L. Michel and R. Sewall (Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 147.

[44] Richard Rosenheim, The Eternal Drama (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1952), p. 124.

of dramatic art or what Rosenheim refers to as the "Mystery Drama." He states:

> The term "Mystery Drama," used in its proper sense, refers exclusively to that highest and purest form of drama which, inspired by super-sensory experience, aims at a vigorous inner transformation of the beholder.
>
> By presenting before his eyes of the mind the divine counterpart of his own fate, the genuine Mystery Drama tends to re-unite his soul once more with the harmonious world of pure spirit from whose precincts he, as a member of the world of sense-experience and brain bound intellect, has been tragically barred. If one looks from this exclusive point of view upon the dramatic output of all times and gones, it seems quite obvious that the true Mystery Drama is fundamentally characterized by three marks of quality by means of which it automatically protects itself against being confused with any sort of drama which simply treats worldly matters in a mysterious, or mysterious matters in a worldly fashion. They are--
>
> 1. The genuine Mystery Drama always contains and reveals in one or another kind of concentrated presentation the basic fact of Spiritual Creation. It always reflects in some way the eternal will of the loving Creator for continuous creative transformation of the world. It always points to harmony in metamorphosis--
>
> 2. For the accomplishment of this uplifting purpose the genuine Mystery Drama employs as appointed media the visible music of the inspired human body and the audible music of the inspired human word. By force of their combined assistance it offers to those who earnestly seek for absolute truth the miracle key opening their eyes to conscious realization of the eternal interdependence of the Creator and His Creation in order that by passing through the purgatory of reverence and compassion he might attain to a better and deeper understanding of his own being and becoming.
>
> 3. This key, however, the genuine Mystery Drama offers only to humanity in strict accordance with the degree of maturity reached at a certain time by a certain part of the human family in a certain region of the earth. It always is both test and

> proof of a new stage of spiritual and moral progress achieved by humanity on its organic course of evolution.[45]

The playwright who attempts to render such a "Mystery Drama" within the purposeful and worshipful context of the religious and philosophical background which has, so far, been presented is rightly considered to be a priest.

---

[45] Ibid., p. 103.

CHAPTER II

PRIEST

A consideration of the priestly role and its various functions will be presented now. The role, as described, will be broad enough to encompass the functions of the priest irrespective of any distinctive or unique quality a particular creed may impose upon these functions. Further, the description will be definitive enough so as to render an adequate designation of the unique characteristics of each of these functions.

Initially, let us designate the accord between the artistic and priestly function. The commensurable relation of the artist and the priest--indeed, the necessary connection between the endeavors has been acknowledged, also, from the vantage point of religious thought. Cardinal Suhard, writing in Priests Among Men, designates this quality and relation of the priest:

> In order that "the growth of the Church," a prerequisite of universal redemption, take place without deviating from the true "meaning of God," a divine artisan is required: the priest.[1]

---

[1] Emmanual Cardinal Suhard, Priests Among Men (Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1951), p. 9.

Here the metaphor which opened this study should be reconsidered. The artist as priest stands as mediator between the eternal and temporal or the infinite and finite. The strain and tension of such an attempt at reconciliation is enormous and ultimately destructive of the bearer. This priestly task and burden has been emphasized, also, by Suhard who quotes Charmot:

> But the priest is not a hybrid. Neither is he neutral, that is to say, in the etymological sense of the word, "neither one thing or another." He is remote from any colorless indifference. Rather he intensely partakes of both sides of his nature at the same time. Christ is Mediator because He is at once Man and God; "He first effected the junction between the finite and the infinite . . . . Priests, like Christ, reconcile in themselves, as two natures, God and man." The priest must not limit himself to communicating God's gifts and word, nor to chanelling the prayers of mankind, but he must make his own the matter of their salvation to the point of feeling the anguish of their redemption more keenly than they do. And here lies the mystery of the priest. What he unites in himself is what tears him apart. At every moment of his life he must answer two callings and entirely satisfy each of them without ever sacrificing either. Those two tendencies seem contradictory. They are at least opposed to one another and import to one's nature a kind of violent and painful tension which can end only in death. The priesthood resembles martyrdom.[2]

That such a stance is an act of love and charity--and not an act of self-seeking is understood. Cardinal Montini, later Pope Paul VI, writing in The Priest, states the proper motive for the assumption of such a martyrous position. He states:

---

[2] Ibid., p. 36.

> The priesthood, we know, is not dignity and power for him on whom it is bestowed; it is a work of mediation between God and man; on the one hand its end is the glory of God, on the other, as its proximate end, the care of souls. Charity toward God and neighbor are of the essence of the priesthood.[3]

This "care of souls" is a duty assumed in order to meet the demand of a humanity which senses its own weakness and the contrasting power of the eternal upon which it can draw in order to overcome such weakness. Gunnar Landtmann, writing in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, designates the origin of the priesthood thus:

> Priesthood, broadly speaking, owes its origin to the universal need felt by mankind of superhuman assistance in the struggle of life. Among all peoples the belief exists that, under certain circumstances, advantages of some kind or other are obtainable from the supernatural world.[4]

E. O. James, likewise, recognizes this strength rendering function of the priest. James states:

> In short, in a precarious, unpredictable and hazardous environment the institution of priesthood has enabled struggling humanity to advance on life's pilgrimage with hope and confidence and with a sense of security by supplying a power to help and to heal, to renew and to reassure, to cohere and to conserve.[5]

He, further, renders this broad description of the priesthood:

---

[3]Giovanni Battista Cardinal Montini, The Priest (Baltimore: Helicon Press, Inc., 1965), p. 39.

[4]Gunnar Landtmann, "Priest and Priesthood," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings, X (1921), 278.

[5]E. O. James, The Nature and Function of Priesthood (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1955), p. 209.

> Priesthoods are the duly accredited and spiritually endowed official instruments and representatives of God or the gods under whom they serve and on whose behalf they exercise their office in its several capacities. They are set apart for the specific purpose of establishing, maintaining and restoring intercourse and adjustment between the sacred and the secular spheres, theistically interpreted in terms of a personal Deity at once transcendent and immanent. As this very delicate equilibrium is always liable to be disturbed, either inadvertently or through human frailty, perverseness and inability to refuse the evil and choose the good, the function of the priesthood consists in restoring the balance, as and when required, and in strengthening the bond by the prescribed techniques and ministrations. As occasion demands the priest has to mediate, expiate and absolve; reveal, conserve and guard sacred learning and knowledge; administer and maintain the hierarchic organization in relation to the social structure; and above all to stand between heaven and earth at the altar as the master of sacrifice.[6]

These "several capacities" of the priest are, again, reiterated by Suhard:

> His priesthood is all-embracing . . . . He assumes simultaneously all the mediating functions--which in His mysterious character cannot be dissociated from each other--the roles of Moses, Aaron, Abraham, Melchisedech. Because Christ is Mediator by all that He is, all the functions He exercised whether in His hidden life or during His public life are to find their place and be renewed in the life of the priest. He is to be spiritual director, pastor, preacher of the kingdom, benefactor of men, contemplative servant of the Father. Everything which flows from Christ's role as Mediator ought to be present at least to some degree in His continuers, the priests throughout the world.[7]

Such varied and apparently disparate functions have been aptly delineated in the traditional analysis of the

---

[6] Ibid., p. 293.

[7] Suhard, op. cit., p. 19.

priestly role. The entire priestly role may be considered in terms of three functions, i. e., the sacrificial, prophetic, and pastoral functions. The sacrificial function of the priest entails the negation of individuality for the sake of the eternal and Absolute. The prophetic function entails the presentation and promulgation of "divine" knowledge and a qualified acceptance of the present for the sake of a more desirable and future state of existence. The pastoral function entails the ministering to the temporal needs and goals of a people. Obviously, there is an overlap and continuity in these functions--after all, they are merely functions of a single endeavor and borne, hopefully, by a single priest. Nonetheless, the essential characteristics of each function may be designated.

Drawing upon the Christian context where Christ as the ultimate priest remains the ultimate model for any priest, Bishop Emile--Joseph de Smedt states the threefold mission of the priest:

> As we have seen, Jesus is priest, prophet, and king. He has been sent among men to redeem them by His sacrifice, to teach them in truth, to accomplish the Kingdom of God in them. The glorious Christ wishes this threefold mission to continue on earth. Since this work still remains to be done, He appeals for the collaboration of his priestly people. Hence, our vocation. We must live in union with Jesus who lives visibly in the midst of his people: (1) In union with Christ, offering sacrifice in the midst of His people;

(2) In union with Christ teaching in the midst of his people; (3) In union with Christ ruling in the midst of His people.[8]

Again he defines the three functions of the priestly role, i.e., (1) the sacrificial, (2) the prophetic, and (3) the pastoral. He states:

1. In the Service of Christ Offering Sacrifice In the Midst of His People

Through the ministerial priesthood Christ makes it possible for His people to have access to the sacramental offering of His redeeming sacrifice and the graces that flow therefrom.[9]

And:

2. In the Service Of Christ Teaching In the Midst of His People

Through the authorized ministers of His Word, Christ makes it possible for His people, and gives them the right to attain revealed truth without fear of error, as it has been preserved in the Bible, apostolic tradition, and the teaching of the Church. This Magisterium is a living organism that has the assistance and the authority of Christ Himself.[10]

And:

3. In the Service of Christ Ruling In the Midst of His People

In the person of the members of the clergy, Christ the King wishes to guarantee to the faithful His light and His encouragement for the accomplishment in justice and in charity, of the work of humanizing, spiritualizing, and consecrating the world--in view of its final destiny.[11]

---

[8]Bishop Emile--Joseph de Smedt, The Priesthood of the Faithful (New York: Paulist Press, 1962), p. 25.

[9]Ibid., p. 77.

[10]Ibid., p. 85.

[11]Ibid., p. 92.

We shall consider each of these in detail. E. O. James, writing in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, defines sacrifice thus:

> Sacrifice may be defined generally as a rite in the course of which something is forfeited or destroyed, its object being to establish relations between a source of spiritual strength and one in need of such strength, for the benefit of the latter.[12]

And again, James states:

> In its broader interpretation 'Sacrifice' (from the Latin sacrificium; sacer, 'holy' and facere, 'to make') involves the destruction of a victim for the purpose of maintaining or restoring a right relationship of man to the sacred order. It may effect a bond of union with the divinity to whom it is offered, or constitute a piacular expiation and propitiation to 'cover', 'wipe out', neutralize or carry away evil and guilt contracted wittingly or unwittingly.[13]

And Hubert and Mauss, in their volume Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function, state in accord:

> Sacrifice is a religious act which, through the consecration of a victim, modifies the condition of the moral person who accomplishes it or that of certain objects with which he is concerned.[14]

The purposes of sacrifice are stated by Yerkes in Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. In this comparative study, he concludes:

---

[12] E. O. James, "Sacrifice," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings, XI (1921), 1.

[13] E. O. James, Sacrifice and Sacrament (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1962), p. 13.

[14] Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss, Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 13.

These four purposes, therefore, were expressed in sacrifice:

1) To learn the will of God.

2) To cooperate with God and do that will.

3) To rely upon God for protection when doing his will.

4) To surrender oneself entirely to God and his will.[15]

The motive force for such purposes has been stated by Evelyn Underhill. She states:

> . . . --those three great motives of sacrifice which the ancient rituals express--the deep sense of sin and penitence, the need and longing for communion, the impulse to that total self-giving which is the preparation of sanctity--are all found operative in the most profound experiences of the soul.[16]

These motives engendering their own purposes fulfill the three great functions of sacrifice. Again, Underhill states them thus:

> For in sacrifice something is given voluntarily and unconditionally to God, in defiance of the inveterate possessiveness and claimfulness of man; and this gesture of generosity is felt to be the best that we can do (a) to atone for our shortcomings in other respects, (b) as a means of that approach to God which is an essential element in worship, (c) as an earnest of devotedness . . . . Cost is always essential to it. Thus wild animals and fruits are never used by agricultural peoples for the purposes of sacrifice. They must give something into which they have put their own life

---

[15]Royden Keith Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 201.

[16]Underhill, op. cit., p. 59.

> and work; for within that total, visible offering which is ritual sacrifice, is always implied the total invisible offering of the self, and everything the self best loves.17

The intermediary of such sacrifice is the priest. It is the priest who stands as the link between the sacred and the profane. Without his assistance, participation, and leadership such sacrifice may not be rendered effective. Again, Hubert and Mauss emphasize the point:

> There are sacrifices in which there are no other participants than the sacrificer (i.e. the subject to whom the benefits of sacrifice accrue or who undergoes its effect) and the victim. But generally one does not venture to approach sacred things directly and alone; they are too lofty and serious a matter. An intermediary, or at the very least a guide, is necessary. This is the priest. More familiar with the world of the gods, in which he is partly involved through a previous consecration, he can approach it more closely and with less fear than the layman, who is perhaps sullied by unknown blemishes. At the same time he prevents the sacrificer from committing fatal errors. Sometimes the profane person is even formally excluded from the sanctuary and the sacrifice. In this case the priest becomes, on the one hand, the mandatory of the sacrificer, whose condition he shares and whose sins he bears. On the other hand, however, he is sealed with a divine seal. He bears the name, the title or the role of his god. He is his minister, even his incarnate presence, or at the very least the repository of his power. He is the visible agent of consecration in the sacrifice. In short, he stands on the threshold of the sacred and the profane world and represents them both at one and the same time. They are linked in him.18

---

[17] Ibid., p. 50.

[18] Hubert and Mauss, op. cit., p. 22.

This priest bears the paradoxical burden of being both the sacrificed and the sacrificer. Again, drawing on the priestly and paradigmatic model of Christ, Suhard states:

> At the altar, the priest, like Christ, is the victim. But he is also the sacrificer; he is then the dreadful man, the one who works death, the one who kills sin and burns it, the one who is crucified and who crucifies, the one who cannot save the world, nor will consent to its salvation save through nailing it to the Cross. "Without the shedding of blood there is no redemption."[19]

Montini reiterates the priestly paradox and the necessity of such. Addressing other priests, he states:

> The drama of Christ will then come to its fulfillment in you. You know that the mysterious greatness of the sacrifice of Christ lies in the identification of priest and victim, of the one who offers and the one who is offered, the one who represents the hidden will--the ancients would have said the fatal destiny--that is above the rite to be performed; an irresistible will, a great will that overcomes our limited human wills. Lord take from me this chalice; but not my will but yours be done. And the priest is the minister of this will that descends from heaven and that arises from the tragedy of sin. There is need of sacrifice; and the priest performs it.[20]

The tragedy of sin which Montini speaks of has its own palliation and compensation when a rightful relationship to God is maintained. This rightful relationship manifests

---

[19]Suhard, op. cit., p. 83.

[20]Montini, op. cit., p. 66.

itself in the sacrificial act. Such a rightful relationship can only lead to a lifegiving joy. Thus, sacrifice is ultimately an act of joyful revification and renewed unity with what is holy and enduring--or God. Jane Ellen Harrison, in Ancient Art and Ritual, asserts this implication of the sacrificial act. She states:

> We are so accustomed to think of sacrifice as the death, the giving up, the renouncing of something. But sacrifice does not mean "death" at all. It means making holy, sanctifying; and holiness was to primitive man just special strength and life.[21]

Antoine De Saint Exupery, a literary artist, states this life renewing function of sacrifice also. He states:

> Sacrifice signifies neither amputation nor repentance. It is, in essence, an act. It is the gift of oneself to the being of which one forms a part.[22]

This sacrificial return "to the being of which one forms a part" was recognized by Saint Thomas Aquinas. Boylan, in The Spiritual Life of the Priest, quotes him thus:

> . . . and St. Thomas insists: "The sacrifice which is offered externally, represents the inward spiritual sacrifice by which the soul offers itself to God" . . . . The outward sacrifice is the manifestation of the inward sacrifice by which "a man offers himself to god, as the principle of his activity and the object of his beatitude," (cf. Cont. Gen. iii. 120).[23]

---

[21]Jane Ellen Harrison, Ancient Art and Ritual (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 90.

[22]As quoted by Woods, op. cit., p. 873.

[23]Eugene Boylan, The Spiritual Life of the Priest (Westminister: The Newman Press, 1959), p. 47.

This total surrender to God, this denial of any personal claim to ascendance, is in the manner of the crucial and salient sacrifice of the Christian tradition. Boylan refers to this sacrifice of Christ as the model for any further sacrificial endeavor. He states:

> It must here suffice to draw attention to Our Lord's example. His whole humanity was completely subject to the will of God. He emptied Himself, laying down all initiative, all use of His own powers. He summed it up Himself: I am in the Father and the Father in Me. The words I speak to you I speak not of myself. But the Father who abideth in Me, He doth the works, (John XIV, 10). There is our model. If the Son of God can so completely deny His own self, empty His own self, deliver His own self--surely we must go and do likewise--surely we must go and die with him![24]

To continue, the prophetic function of the priestly role will be considered. The prophet bears the tidings of God. He acts as an intermediary, a voice, between mankind and God. This prophetic or daemonic mission has been described in dialogue by Plato speaking through Diotima in the Symposium. He states:

> "What special powers," I said, "belong to this order of beings?"
> "They act," she said, "as interpreters and conveyors of human things to the gods, of divine things to men: they carry the prayers and sacrifices of men, the commandments of the gods and their responses

---

24. Ibid., p. 93.

> to the sacrifices: occupying a place between the two, they fill up a gap, and cause the whole universe to be a coherent whole. All divination takes place by their means, the art of sacrifices and mystical rites and incantations; in a word, all divining and magic. A god has no immediate relation with a man; all converse between men and gods; whether in a waking state or in sleep, takes place through the daemon-kind." (202 e).[25]

The prophet will render his message irrespective of the desire of a people whom he may encounter. The prophet often stands in opposition to those whom he would influence. The prophet disrupts and disturbs but he has no other choice as greater allegiance is due to the divine than the temporal. But it is only for the reason that he would draw the temporal closer to the divine that the prophet arouses and withstands the enmity of a people. An apparent act of hostility is really an embrace of love. E. O. James asserts:

> The prophet, however, as the spokesman and interpreter of the divine will exercises his functions as an individual who is in personal contact with the supernatural order and the recipient of a revelational self-disclosure. He may or may not be a member of a cult organization, but he must be capable of becoming en rapport with the spiritual world and of receiving divine inspiration. Only so long as this relationship is maintained does he prophesy, but when he is filled with the prophetic afflatus he is compelled to deliver his message whether the people will hear or whether they will forebear.[26]

---

[25]As quoted by Edwyn Bevan, Sibyls and Seers (London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928), p. 158.

[26]James, The Nature . . . , p. 101.

The prophet is not his own spokesman--indeed his own self must count for little. His words are grounded in eternity and the prophet is but the feeble instrument of a mighty musician beyond. Philo, in the Quis Rerum Divinarum Haeres, comments:

> This describes what happens to the man who goes into the state of enthusiasm, the state of being carried away by God. The sacred scripture bears witness that it is to every virtuous man that prophecy belongs, for a prophet utters nothing of his own; in all his words there is to be discerned the voice of Another. It would not be lawful for any not-virtuous man to become the interpreter of God, so that by the fitness of things no vicious man is capable of the state of enthusiasm. Such things belong to the wise alone, because the wise man alone is the sounding instrument of God, struck and played by God after an invisible sort.
> . . . How beautiful then is the indication Moses gives of the God-possessed man by the phrase "About the going-down of the sun, an ecstasy fell!" By the sun he denotes, in a symbol, our human mind, for thought in us has a function analogous to that of the sun in the cosmos. Each gives light. The sun sends forth to the universe a radiancy perceived by the senses: the thought in us sheds intellectual day through our apprehensions of truth. Now so long as our mind spreads its light abroad in us and is concerned with our persons, pouring, as it were, a noonday radiance into every part of the soul, we remain within ourselves, we cannot be occupied by God. But when this sun declines to its setting, it may well be that ecstasy falls upon us, possession by God, the divine madness. For wherever the divine light dawns, the human light sets: when the divine light sets, the human light arises and ascends. To the fellowship of prophets this is what often happens: the mind in us is dispossessed of its abode at the coming of the divine spirit: when the divine spirit withdraws, the human mind again comes into occupation of its house. It would not be lawful for the mortal and the immortal to be housemates together. Hence the setting of the human reason, a darkness in respect of the reason, produced (in Abraham) ecstasy, the madness which is a rapture by God.

> And what followed the Scripture goes on to declare: "It was said unto Abraham." Yes, the prophet, even when he seems to be speaking, is in truth quiescent: it is Another who uses his vocal organs, his mouth and tongue, to show forth whatsoever he desires. This Other plays on these instruments by an invisible art of consummate music, and so achieves an utterance fair-sounding, harmonious, full of all possible symphony.[27]

Saint Justin Martyr, a second-century Apologist of the Christian Church, speaks of the prophets:

> There were long ago men more ancient than any of the philosophers now in repute, men who were happy, upright, and beloved of God, who spoke by the Divine Spirit and gave oracles of the future which are now coming to pass. These men are called prophets.[28]

This vision of the future, of "divine and heavenly things," is reiterated by Justin:

> Neither by nature nor by human thoughts is it possible for men to know things so great and divine, but by the gift which descended from above upon the holy men of old. They needed no art of words or skill in disputation; they needed but to offer themselves pure to the energy of the Divine Spirit, so that the Divine plectrum itself, coming down from heaven, and using those righteous men as a sort of musical instrument, harp or lyre, might reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things.[29]

And Athenagoras, another second-century Apologist of the Christian Church, concurs in the instrumentality of the prophets. He states:

---

[27]As quoted by Bevan, op. cit., p. 168.

[28]As quoted by Woods, op. cit., p. 789.

[29]As quoted by Bevan, op. cit., p. 173.

> The prophets, after their own processes of mind had been eliminated by ecstasy, were moved by the divine Spirit, and so uttered the things which His energy made them utter, the Spirit using them just as a flute-player does the flute into which he breathes.[30]

The prophet is a witness to the beyond or the eternal event. He is a sign and a proof that such a sphere is real and thus a goal worthy of all endeavor. His very nature and conduct is a monument to the reality of such a sphere. The prophet is a witness for the eternal. Suhard declares as much:

> A reflection, a sign, a proof, and a presence; all of these are realized in the person of the priest. Since he is consecrated to his finger-tips, even his movements are and should be no longer secular. Everything he touches is, as it were, exorcised and blessed. By everything that he does or is he must convey the sense of sacredness. His very presence posits the existence of an order of invisible and superhuman values to a world which does not understand, or fights against the evidence. He makes the infinity of God tangible, as it were, reflecting the mystery of it in his own person.[31]

The priest as prophet is a breeder of revolt. His is a discontent with the temporal for the sake of the eternal. His concern is not with the law of men but with the law of God. The revolution of the prophet is for the sake of enhanced greatness--for the sake of God. The prophet is an "artisan of the future." Suhard states the task cogently:

---

[30] Ibid.

[31] Suhard, op. cit., p. 41.

> The revolt which the priest must advocate is the insurrection of consciences, the order which he comes to disturb is the apparent calm which covers up disorders and hatreds. Like the hero and the saint, the priest in human society is not a passive docile citizen, he is not of common calibre. His own way of being a good citizen is to be, in most sincere obedience to legitimate authority, eternally unsatisfied, not so as to upset social peace but so as to foster continually a higher goal for mankind. A paradoxical function: as prophet of the consummate Being, he reflects the supreme peace and stability thereof in passing civilizations; as prophet of the living God, he rejects the calm which means death. He has to be the artisan of the future, of the new order that is developing within the souls of individual men, as well as in the stream of history. So it can be said without contradiction that his way of bringing about order is to start a ferment. His way of obeying the laws of men is to appeal unceasingly to the Law of God.[32]

And when the prophetic voice is silenced, the religious body falters in its vitality and true purpose which is contingent upon the responsive relationship with God which the active prophet makes possible. Kung cautions thus:

> What becomes of a Church in which the prophets are silent? What becomes of a Church in which there is no one who gives direct expression in words to the promptings of the Spirit, even if in a different form from the prophets of Paul's time; a Church in which there is no one with a conviction of his calling and responsibility to illuminate the Church's path in both present and future in a particular situation? A Church in which prophets have to keep silent declines, and becomes a spiritless organization. Outwardly everything may seem all right, things will run smoothly, according to plan and along ordered paths, situations will be weighed up in advance and all unforeseen things

---

[32] Ibid.

> will have been allowed for or will simply be left on one side; but inwardly it will be a place where the Spirit can no longer blow when and where he wills, where the Spirit, given the smooth running machinery, is no longer needed and would be at best a disturbing influence, where the ecclesiastical way of life is a way without real life.33

If the priest as prophet is concerned with the arousal of ferment in the life of man, then the priest as pastor is concerned with the restoration of peace and calm. It is no contradiction that both functions may cooperate in a single human being. On the contrary, since the priest is borne forth by an all-embracing love for God in his entirety, thus including all of His creation; it would only be a contradiction if these apparently disparate functions did not coexist in such a manner. The priest is also a pastor and it is this function of the priestly role which shall be considered here.

Karl Rahner, the noted Jesuit philosopher, after defining "pastoral theology" states, that taken literally, this term only refers to the pastoral activity of the individual pastor. He states:

> In contrast with basic ecclesiology, which deals principally with the enduring transcendental and sacramental nature of the Church, pastoral theology deals with the Church as a dynamic entity, with a communal structure and subject to the vicissitudes of history; an entity that must express itself here and now in present actuality

---

33Hans Kung, The Church (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 433.

> in order to be concretely what it ought to be, and to do concretely what it ought to do.[34]

The priest as pastor is concerned with the "here and now." If sacrifice is necessary, it is primarily for the sake of the eternal. If prophecy is necessary, it is primarily for the presentation of doctrine and knowledge required for the proper guidance of the "here and now" or the concrete, temporal, and historical. If temporal creation is of God, then such a creation is worthy of care and concern. Accordingly, the pastor finds his task and duty. Montini directs the new priest to his pastoral end thus:

> To be of help you will have to join the people, know them, become their friends. The apostolate must become capillary, and whatever worth it has will be determined by the living and personal relationship extended to all those to whom you will preach the kingdom and the grace of God. Without this personal giving of oneself, today's pastoral life will leave no imprint. This work, too, of course, requires great effort and great delicacy. It is not, though, an unbearable load. It implies above all that our great authority, our high dignity, becomes what the Lord wished it to be--service to others, humility, a friendship which becomes dialogue, heart speaking to heart, person to person. Learn this work and you will be truly pastors and teachers, guides of souls; and if you do not, you will be an empty "bleating voice" heard by no one.[35]

The pastor must give understanding and love, strength and affection. He must arouse, share, and sustain the

---

[34]Karl Rahner, ed., The Pastoral Mission of the Church (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965), p. 8.

[35]Montini, op. cit., p. 34.

strength which is requisite for the conduct and fruition of temporal life. The pastor is concerned with the present growth and welfare of a people. He creates the necessary and present conditions for the attainment of God. Wise, in Pastoral Counseling, states:

> The central element in pastoral counseling, as in all pastoral care, is the relationship that the pastor creates with his people. His ministry stands or falls on this. Through his relationship the pastor may give a great deal that is vital to the growth, welfare and salvation of persons. He may give an understanding of the painful and disturbing aspects of life as well as the positive creative side. He may give reality to a reverence for persons, a faith in persons and a love toward persons. In this way, he not only ministers in the name of God: he brings God to men in a real way. He makes the spirit of Christ a living resource for others. He does not try to become God; he rather tries to create conditions through which the grace of God can operate to produce healing and growth. His is a humble service for which mankind today stands in great need.[36]

The priest, also, must never forget his own humanity. Indeed, as pastor, he must also minister to his own needs. In his work is personal salvation, too. He is in need of strength, repentance, and forgiveness for his own weakness and transgression also. At least this much has been acknowledged by Montini in advising the new priest. He states:

---

[36]Carroll A. Wise, Pastoral Counseling (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 221.

> All this is well known, I repeat; but we are consoled by the knowledge that in our pastoral activity we can find instances of the most meritorious penance preparing the way for the kingdom of God . . . . St. John Berchmans said of himself, "My greatest penance is community life;" and we ought to be able to say of ourselves: "My greatest penance is pastoral life." Our basic asceticism is our faithfulness to our daily pastoral work-taking care of children, of young people, of immigrants, the poor, the sick, and of all the unforeseeable circumstances. We spend our life in the confessional, in administering baptisms, weddings, funerals, preaching at sacred functions, a sublime and exhausting penance that our patron St. Charles, among others, taught us, and which must be the backbone of our sacerdotal life.[37]

The priest, finally, is concerned with love--its ground and source, its growth and extension. The priest is a victim and bearer of love so that, in the end, love may reign triumphant over the whole. Suhard states:

> In the light of Love everything about the priest is clarified. Others in the "human city" have chosen glory, wealth or pleasure. Still others have elected to devote their lives to knowledge, power, or conquest. As for the priest, he has relinquished everything, abandoned all, given all. He waives all possessions, he renounces his own self. But there is one thing which he retains and which nothing can make him relinquish, a good which he tenaciously desires for himself; in the human community he has chosen Love. He has elected it in preference to everything else. He wants it for the sake of his brethren who are his only heirs.[38]

In the beginning there was Love--and in the end there shall be love because of the priest who acts in love using Love as the source of all accomplishment.

---

[37]Montini, op. cit., p. 207.

[38]Suhard, op. cit., p. 112.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, the priest stands as a mediator between God and man or between the eternal and temporal. The task and focus of the priest is a dual faceted one but priority must be given to God and that which strengthens and exalts the triumph of God. The priest is motivated by a pure love and devotion to God and nature which is contingent for its well-being upon this God. The priest assumes his noble task in response to a universal need and demand by mankind in its temporal striving for the transcendent and eternal. The task of the priest and of the artist is compatible and convergent, at least, in this crucial and necessary concern. The priestly role may be considered in terms of three functions, i.e., the sacrificial, prophetic, and pastoral functions. The sacrificial function of the priest entails the negation of individuality and materiality for the sake of the eternal and Absolute. In order to sustain and renew life, that which is of value is subordinated or relinquished for the sake of an entity of greater value and priority. The prophetic function entails the presentation and promulgation of "divine" knowledge and a qualified acceptance of the present for the sake of a more desirable and future state of existence. The prophet presents a vision of the future or a vision of "divine and heavenly things." The prophet stands as an "artisan of the future" as he renders a salient witness to the eternal. The

prophet may disrupt or disturb his environment but this apparent act of harshness is the result of a greater allegiance to God which may justifiably be imposed on others. The pastoral function entails the ministering to the temporal needs and goals of a people. The pastor acts in order to convert the "here and now" to becoming "concretely what it ought to be." In all matters, the priest acts in love so as to expand that domain of love which finds its beginning and end in God.

CHAPTER III

CULT AND WORSHIP

A priest is the leader of a cult. The cult is a grouping of people united by a shared and hallowed set of beliefs and aspirations. Commonly, such beliefs and aspirations are embodied within the activity of ritual. A cult renders worship to that which it discerns as ultimate and, therefore, worthy of respect and homage through the medium of such ritual. The term cult, itself, is an ambiguous one. On occasion, the usage of the term emphasizes the signs, symbols, and formalized activities of the group rather than the poeple who constitute such a group. Primarily, however, the term emphasizes the members of the group and the signs, symbols, and formalized activities of the group are considered as the elements of ritual. It is in this latter sense that the term cult will be considered in this study. Gould and Kolb contend that such is the consensus among "most anthropologists" who consider the term cult in the following manner.

> Most anthropologists define cult as a body of religious beliefs and practices associated with a particular god or set of gods, constituting a specialized part of the religious institutions of

> a society. By inclusion the officiants and practitioners in such a part of the religious structure of a society are sometimes called a cult.[1]

The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, further, defines the cult in such a manner also:

> A cult is the sum total of organized beliefs and ritual concerned with a specific spirit or spirits, generally associated with particular objects and places, together with the ritual worship and officiants.[2]

In accord and most pertinent to this study, Klapp defines the cult thus:

> . . . cult is the group aspect of ritual; or, following the definition of Wach, a body of people rather durably united by ritual and its appropriate beliefs. A wide variety of groups, then, can properly be called cults: nations, tribes, clans, families, communities, associations--to the extent that they are organized by ritual in common.[3]

Later in this study, the audience at a theatrical performance will be included among the "wide variety of groups" which may be designated as a cult. Here, however, let it be reemphasized that the approach of this study can only be described as a religious one--and in the manner already defined. Thus the cult, as the bearer of the

---

[1]Julius Gould and William Kolb, eds., A Dictionary of the Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan Co., 1964), p. 151.

[2]Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Notes and Queries on Anthropology (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951), p. 180.

[3]Orin E. Klapp, Ritual and Cult (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1956), p. 14.

elements of religion, becomes a significant object for consideration. The cult occupies a central place in the life of religion. Vogt states:

> The cult is central in religion not only historically but also logically. This is because it is the cult which contains, organizes and gives effect to all the elements of religion.[4]

Religion, through the activity of the cult is a celebration of the "God of All Reality." Through the religious life and activity of the cult, man acquires understanding of life and reality in its broadest dimension and an admonition and command toward the moral life. Vogt asserts accordingly:

> It is a moving and revolutionizing faith to hold that all existence is somehow one reality with unity and wholeness, that throughout all that existence there is unceasing movement and power, forming individuals and structures of order. It is the religious task of the cult to celebrate this God of All Reality. It is the religious work of the individual to find his dependence and his freedom within this cosmic whole, and accept the moral tasks implied.[5]

Through the cult, man acquires a recognition of his inextricable unity and relationship with God, nature, and his fellow-man. Vogt again emphasizes the harmony and accord which is engendered by a participation in the

---

[4]Von Ogden Vogt, Cult and Culture (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951), p. 159.

[5]Ibid., p. 244.

activity and brotherhood of the cult:

> In the rituals of true worship, all things are celebrated in their togetherness as all things, and in their several functions as separate things. The public cult of religion celebrates the works of nature or God and the works of man. That celebration imparts to men the creative urge. The proper cult of religion stirs men to fruitful living, in commerce and in all else. It is in the culture of religion that men are brought to that accord with all things by which they become partners with one another, with nature and with God in the perpetual works of creative providence.[6]

Emphatically, the cult fosters and actualizes the principles of morality. The members of the cult, through participation in cultic activity, are made aware and, subsequently, loyal to the principles of right conduct. Through the cult, the activity of man toward his God and the nature about him becomes reverent and noble. Through participation and loyalty to the cult and its endeavors, man engages in actions toward his fellow-man which are more tolerant, fruitful, and wholesome. Man acquires a loving attitude toward humankind through his membership in the cult. According to Vogt:

> The moral principles are inculcated by the cult. It is the cult which gives them both definition and social force. By the awesome action of the cult, the sense of obligation is lodged deeply within the individual consciousness. The celebrations of the cult reveal the worthful realities and stir the motions of acceptance and loyalty.[7]

---

[6] Ibid., p. 103.

[7] Ibid., p. 238.

Vogt summarizes the efficacy and attraction and power of the cult in the following manner:

> What then is it that gives the cult its power? . . . First of all, the ritual acts of the cult have or are thought to have actual objective practical effects . . . . Secondly, it is in the cult that all the factors of men's life are surveyed for appraisal and relative arrangement . . . . Thirdly, it is by and through the cult that religious ideas and moral ideals are given popular force and currency . . . . Fourthly, the cult has power because it is enjoyed . . . . Lastly, the cult is powerful in society because it produces for the individual that inner spiritual order which is necessary to outer political order. The great cultures of history have had outer order and beauty and wholeness because a great cult has afforded inner spiritual order and integrity to the people . . . . The cult is itself a spiritual order, its intellectual, moral and esthetic components harmonized. When any of these parts fails of vitality, the order is jeopardized and society itself falls into confusion.[8]

The cult renders a constant call to its members for an active engagement with the life of spirit. Through such an engagement, the life of the individual and his community are enhanced and ennobled. Through the cult, man acquires a proper attitude and orientation toward God. Through the cult, man is led to the worship of God.

If there is any quality which characterizes the cult, it is the necessity to express and ennoble its communal vision in the profound and reverent act of worship. Thus, it is necessary that worship or the act of veneration directed toward, in this instance, a supernatural power or

---

[8] Ibid., p. 161.

divine being be considered in a more thorough manner. The religious exercise or ritual which lends concrete structure to the worshipful act will be considered in a later discussion.

That worship is a necessity of life can hardly be denied. Mankind, from the earliest days onward, has expressed an awesome and reverential confrontation with the world through the act of worship. It has proven a necessity in the struggle of life. Without worship, societies crumble and individuals deteriorate. The quality of life is diminished and profanity and commoness flourish as worship no longer remains an integral and significant facet of life. The significance and quality of worship in the life of a society is a measure of the maturity of this same society. The same is true of the individual life. Without reverence for the divine as manifested in worship, life becomes banal and disorientated. When worship is absent, it is a sign that a society has lost its center, its point of significant meaning and, thus, the common focus which makes for real community. There is no true community or cult without the vital necessity of worship. Guy Allen Tawney addresses himself to this matter:

> Worship is like a breathing spell in a long and arduous foot race, or the hour of roll call in a prolonged and hard fought battle: . . . it is altogether indispensable to sane and wholesome living--it is important enough

> in life to warrant the erection of classical temples and Gothic cathedrals. It is indeed so important that one finds one's self sometimes wondering how any of us can afford to do anything but educate ourselves in this art . . . . To be effectively a person and thereby help others to be persons is the sum of the abiding satisfactions of life. Worship in the sense of this aim is natural and necessary, and in the Great Community all mature men worship.[9]

It is noteworthy that Tawney has chosen to speak not only of the necessity of worship but, also, of the naturalness of this act. It is as if such a necessity to worship is intrinsic to the constitution of man. Indeed, it is as if an instinct--a permanent and universal impulse--insures the proper direction and persistent return of the physical to the spiritual. Worship is the steady tendency of the natural toward the supernatural or absolute. Underhill does not hesitate to assert as much:

> For worship is an acknowledgment of Transcendence; that is to say, of a Reality independent of the worshipper, which is always more or less deeply coloured by mystery, and which is there first . . . since humanity's universal instinct to worship cannot be accounted for, if naturalism tells the whole truth about life. That instinct means the latent recognition of a metaphysical reality, standing over against physical reality, which men are driven to adore, and long to apprehend.[10]

---

[9]As quoted by Von Ogden Vogt, Modern Worship (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), p. 2.

[10]Underhill, op. cit., p. 3.

This "metaphysical reality" or the goal of worship has been called God or spirit. Worship is a sanctifying thrust toward God--an attempt to enter the realm of spirit. Worship is effective and meaningful in so far as it succeeds in this endeavor. To worship truly and fruitfully is to draw nearer the presence of God. Ehrensperger makes this point also:

> Dramatically effective worship succeeds in lifting the worshiper out of himself and in bringing him into the spirit or presence of something higher than himself. This may be from a source within himself or from something he feels outside himself. True worship establishes a relationship with this presence or spirit. The enduring quality of the relationship and the intensity of the reality are tests of the validity of the experience. In this sense, then, true worship is the recognition, identification, and relationship to the noblest, the highest, and the best that one can conceive. It is a coming into the presence of God and remaining there.[11]

What Ehrensperger has referred to as the enduring quality of the relationship to God displays itself in the enhanced quality of life. Life, after an encounter with spirit, is revitalized and sanctified. It acquires greater value and newer meaning. The old is freshened and matured by the sacred encounter--and it is through the act of worship that such access to the source of greater strength and further growth is acquired. Henry Nelson Wiemann states:

---

[11]Harold Ehrensperger, Religious Drama: Ends and Means (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 107.

> It would seem that worship is one of the sources out of which new creations in the art of living arise. It is in worship that new paths open up; worship is the only suitable preparation for the greatest creative artistry in all the world, the art of reshaping the total vital process of living.[12]

This "total vital process of living" certainly asserts itself in the heightened individual life. Worship arouses the divine in man. It renders a new awareness and a greater pride. As pride is aroused so, also, is self-esteem and, accordingly, the quality of the individual human life. Worship elevates man by showing the kinship of humanity to God. It is the vital process, the active engagement that reminds man of his own godliness. Worship is the path to the divine. One can only recognize the outer divinity because of a direct experience of the divinity which resides within and is encountered only when unveiled. It is through worship and a more personal meeting with the holy that man heightens the quality of life and reveals divinity to himself. Underhill asserts:

> Thus worship purifies, enlightens, and at last transforms, every life submitted to its influence--and this is not merely in the ethical or devotional sense. It does all this, because it wakes up and liberates that "seed" of supernatural life, in virtue of which we are spiritual beings, capable of responding to that God who is Spirit; and which indeed gives to humanity a certain mysterious kinship with Him. Worship is therefore in the deepest sense creative and redemptive. Keeping us in constant rememberance of the Unchanging and the

---

[12]As quoted by Vogt, Modern . . . , p. 56.

> Holy, it cleanses us of subjectivism, releases us from "use and want" and makes us realists. God's invitation to it and man's response, however limited, crude or mistaken this response may be, are the appointed means whereby we move towards our true destiny.[13]

Man performs a duty toward God and gains the appropriate reward. Man reaches his truest destiny. Man performs his obligation in a reverential and sincere manner and gains the benefit of a life which is transformed by the presence and enhanced attainment of God. The individual life, in turn, is exalted in a very specific manner. This, too, has been described by Underhill who refers to the individual worshipper:

> To worship well is to live well. His whole being, physical, mental, and spiritual, is required to be subject to the transforming action of God, and it is his privilege to cooperate in this redemptive task. His prayer too must contribute to that end. Humble supplication, passive self-abandonment, and loving adoration will all play this part; for Christian worship is in itself a purifying force. Entering it, we enter a tide of the Spirit which sets Godwards; and sanctification is accomplished in the soul in proportion to the extent in which it is self-given to that movement of love. Man is pressed towards the worship of the Holy, so that bit by bit he may be transformed by the Spirit into the likeness of that which he adores, and take his place in the Communion of Saints--not for his own sake, but for the Glory of God.[14]

Spirit acts not only upon the individual but, finally, upon the society of which this individual is a part.

---

[13] Underhill, op. cit., p. 18.

[14] Ibid., p. 79.

Through proper and sincere worship, rapport is established in individuals until rapport and harmony must establish themselves within the totality of a society constituted of these same individuals. Reverence for self due to an awareness of the divinity within leads to a reverance for others and a cooperation and a love rendered toward these others. Through worship, not only the individual, but the society is reconstituted and transformed for the better. Through worship and communion with God, the broader society of man is elevated. Vogt states:

> But endowed with this spirit, religion may declare its own necessary power and unique function. The mandates of the spirit cannot achieve composure for persons or order for society until they are harmonized and universalized. The only discipline which performs this great office is the discipline of worship. The art of worship is the supreme composition. Its spiritual form composes and celebrates all the vital mental and moral and aesthetic values of life, mingles their mutual influences, and makes them pathways to the final apprehension--communion with the Most High.[15]

Thus far a significant element of the art of worship has received inadequate attention--namely, the inextricable relationship and dependence of worship upon artistic creation and aesthetic experience. The act of worship renders itself appropriate to the sight of God by immersing itself in external and internal beauty. Worship is not primarily

---

[15]Von Ogden Vogt, Art and Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1948), p. 252.

an activity of intellect but a motion of soul toward spirit. Aesthetic experience is the primary vehicle for such a motion. Man has proper and intense love aroused more readily by his capacity to recognize beauty than by his capacity to recognize truth. Certainly such beauty must encompass truth--but truth must be attractive before it is sought or attained. Thus art, with its greater and broader appeal, becomes the most effective and appropriate medium for the act of worship. MacGregor, in Aesthetic Experience in Religion, states:

> In corporate worship we are especially aware of a peculiar manipulation of aesthetic experience. As art, such worship has a special motif of its own, varying considerably with the individual culture, but always making use of aesthetic experience as an essential basis for a special activity not ostensibly mystical in character but having, indeed, a mystical direction.[16]

Art, again, becomes the appropriate basis for worship due to its capacity to arouse a greater and more total response from human nature. Art, further, has the capacity to arouse a vaster body of human beings. Some men are capable of discerning unadorned truth but most men are only capable of responding to a truth which, whatever the disadvantages, is adorned in beauty. Vogt makes this point:

> The art of worship is the all-comprehending art. No other art can satisfy the demand of human nature for an all-inclusive experience.

---

[16]Geddes MacGregor, Aesthetic Experience in Religion (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1947), p. 230.

> Nor can the conditions favorable to that experience be ever freshly reproduced without the aid of all the arts.[17]

And Vogt again:

> The art of worship is the combination of all the arts; the experience of worship is the consummation of all experience, whether of beauty or of goodness or of truth.[18]

Further, this most suitable intermingling of worship and artistic experience--this implicit and symbolic characteristic of art, its appropriateness, in relation to its referent has been well-asserted by Underhill:

> When man enters the world of worship, he enters a world which has many of the characteristics of an artistic creation. Much crude and unedifying controversy would die away, were this fact commonly admitted; and the poetry and music which enter so largely into expressive worship were recognized as indications of its essential character. The true object of our worship cannot be directly apprehended by us. "No man hath seen God at any time." The representative pattern, the suggestive symbol, the imaginative projection too--all these must be called into play and their limitations humbly accepted if the limited creature is to enter into communion with the Holy and so develop his capacity for adoring love.[19]

One final point is necessary. This pertains to the character and sincerity of the leader of worship or the priest. His sincerity should be impeccable. The depth of his committment to the object of worship must be of the profoundest order. His love must be total. He must

---

[17] Vogt, Art . . . , p. 4.

[18] Ibid., p. 6.

[19] Underhill, op. cit., p. 29.

always maintain the capacity to project the totality and depth of his love and vision. Less than this is to deprive the participating community or cult of a necessary and life-giving experience. Without the sincere and total experience and leadership of the priest, the cult which worships is deprived of its total source of strength. The experience of the cult can be no greater or worthier than the experience of its priest. Ehrensperger states thus:

> Unless the leader of worship himself is having the experience of worship there can be little hope for a worship experience on the part of an individual being lead. The leader must, therefore, feel genuinely everything he does. Through the experience he transmits his own feeling. He is not playing a role; he is not assuming a position. He is worshiping. He is part of a total process.[20]

Worship can reach no greater height than the stature of the priest will allow. The obligation of the priest is enormous. Without the faithful adherence of the priest to this obligation, the cult falters in the approach to God and salvation.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, a cult is a grouping of people united by a shared and hallowed set of beliefs. Such a cult renders worship through a ritual performance--indeed, cult is the group aspect of ritual. A cult actualizes itself to the extent that it is organized and united by a

---

[20]Ehrensperger, op. cit., p. 108.

common ritual and achieves its power due to its facilitation of practical effects within the life of the participants. Through the cult, the factors which impinge upon the lives of men are objectivized and analyzed, thereby, leading to the establishment of an inner order within these same lives. A cult fosters moral ideals and actualizes these principles of morality within the communal life of the cult. A cult is bound by a necessity to express and ennoble its communal vision in the profound and reverent act of worship. Such worship is necessary to the well-being and fruition of a group or society and such benefits are derived from a necessity to acknowledge transcendence and God. Indeed, worship by a cult is a coming into the presence of God. Through worship, the cult member derives purification, enlightenment, and transformation. Thus, the individual and society derive great and required benefits. Proper worship is inextricably entwined with aesthetic experience. Such worship is made appropriate for God and the participant by immersion in external and internal beauty. Love is aroused more readily by affection and beauty than by cognition and truth, thus, worship which engenders the love of God is most properly adorned in experience and construct which may best be described and attained through the finest resultants of aesthetic doctrine.

CHAPTER IV

RITUAL, SACRAMENT, AND MYTH

The tangible form of worship occurs in the ritual which is established either by tradition or priestly prescription. Accordingly, ritual becomes a necessary component of the religious life. It is through ritual that worship acquires its place as a social function. Without ritual, the cult fails to embody, make permanent, and exalt its own common creed and aspiration. It is through ritual, further, that a cult externalizes and, thus, makes more available the essential qualities of its particular system of beliefs. In the ritual display, the cult attains a level of spiritual self-consciousness which would otherwise be unattainable. The conduct of ritual is the necessary foundation for the religious life of a community. Ross states:

> The other necessary element in religion, in many ways the basic one, is ritual, the prescribed and formal acting out of a ceremony, usually repeated in exactly the same way on specified occasions. A system of belief, even one that has a place for God, is a philosophy, not a religion, unless it explains, or is expressed in a ritual. But a ritual without a system of belief may still be a religion. And it is in ritual--especially in

> ritual as symbolic--that much of the social function of religion can be found.[1]

The highest wisdom, truth, and experience of a cult is embodied in the ritual. It is a means for making permanent the accumulated knowledge and aspiration of the cult. In the ritual form is permified the spiritual doctrine of a society. The ritual attains a level of significance in the religious life which must not be underestimated. According to E. O. James:

> All the deepest emotions, experiences and evaluations of human beings in every state of culture and in all religions find expression in actions, objects and external rites believed to be the vehicles conveying spiritual benefits to the recipients, so that 'inward' and 'outward' experience meet in a higher unity.[2]

Underhill renders a precise and noteworthy definition of the religious ritual. She states:

> A religious ritual is an agreed pattern of ceremonial movements, sounds, and verbal formulas, creating a framework within which corporate religious action can take place. If human worship is to be other than a series of solitary undertakings, some such device is plainly essential to it. We cannot do things together without some general agreement as to what is going to be done; and some willing subordination to accepted routing . . . . Its greatest creations--e.g., the Eucharistic liturgy--are sacred dramas, in which the mystery of salvation is re-enacted and re-experienced by the worshipping groups.[3]

---

[1]Ralph Ross, Symbols and Civilization (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1963), p. 183.

[2]E. O. James, Sacrifice and . . . , p. 233.

[3]Underhill, op. cit., p. 32.

What is presented in the ritual is a set of coordinated and vital symbols. These symbols are laden with implications for the cult. They are quite firmly preserved by their inclusion and repeated performance in the ritual form and are transmitted to all the members of a cult and their succeeding generations. The nature of the symbol and its advantages over the conceptual mode of presentation will eventually be considered. However, let it suffice to emphasize at this point that the vital function of the ritual finds its means in the symbolic mode of presentation. Klapp asserts:

> The central function of ritual socially is to give living immediacy to certain vital ideas on which society is based. The means for this are mostly symbolic. Perhaps the most effective way to evoke a living idea is to dramatize or personify it, as does the priest at mass or the genial gentleman who plays Santa Claus.[4]

Ross, in Symbols and Civilization, makes this point also:

> In ritual something of significance to the communicants is performed, like an act in a play; sometimes the event is imitated directly, sometimes it is symbolized by a dramatic action that is not imitative, sometimes it is a little of both.[5]

The implications of the symbols included with the ritual form are usually restricted to the understanding of

---

[4]Klapp, op. cit., p. 12.

[5]Ross, op. cit., p. 184.

the cult and its members who have been initiated. The symbols arouse meaning and understanding within this loyal and indoctrinated body. The symbol-bearing ritual addresses the members of the aligned cult. Klapp, again, states:

> Whatever else it may seem, all ritual is symbolic and inherently communicative. It speaks to those who know how to listen.[6]

The significant ritual--the religious ritual--achieves its ultimate fulfillment in the acknowledgement of God. Ritual embodies the permanent and abiding faith of man in a universe which is orderly and ordered. As divinity exists, ritual becomes necessary. As ritual symbolizes divinity, it becomes religious and significant. Underhill indicates the same:

> Here we obtain a clue to the real significance of those rituals and ceremonies common to almost every creed, which expresses the deep human conviction that none of the serial events and experiences of human life are rightly met, unless brought into relation with the Transcendent--that all have more than a natural meaning, and must be sanctified by reference to the unseen Powers.[7]

Underhill elaborates with greater cogence:

> Ritual weaves speech, gesture, rhythm and agreed ceremonial into the worshipping action of man; and thus at its best can unite his physical, mental and emotional being in a single response to the Unseen. The use of symbols and images--which is, in some form or degree, a feature of every cultus--is again forced on him by his own

---

[6]Klapp, op. cit., p. 7.

[7]Underhill, op. cit., p. 11.

> psychological peculiarities; the fact that all his thinking and feeling is intimately related to that world of things in which he lives. It is to the apprehension of these that his mind and senses are trained--it is by the responses they wake up in him that he becomes aware of an external world, independent of himself and imposing its conditions upon him . . . . It is only by recourse to our image-making faculty or by some reference--direct, or oblique--to the things that are seen, that we can ever give concrete form to our intuition of that which is unseen.[8]

Another major dimension of the ritual has, thus, been revealed and deserves further elaboration--namely, the emotional dimension of the ritual. Man responds more readily to felt or emotional experience rather than to thought or intellectual experience. A committment to an idea can only be a shallow one unless emotion accompanies this committment. The strength of the ritual resides in the fact that it cloaks its idea in a manner designed to arouse the utmost of feeling within the members of a cult, who respond to the particular ritual. Ritual engages the entire man--not merely the intellectual faculty of man. Ritual engenders thought which is also felt and by the greatest possible number, thereby, achieving its profound social significance. Ross states.

> Ritual action has the same richness of ambiguity and evokes intensity of emotion in the same way as objects that are social symbols. . . . We may, in a given ritual, dedicate ourselves to the service of our country, and the

---

[8]Ibid., p. 37.

> idea of what we are doing may move us emotionally, but the familiarity of the ritual, the others who perform it at the same time, the feeling that we are connected with something larger than ourselves, that we are accepted, that we have a place where we belong--these concomitants of ritual are in some ways the most important things about them.[9]

That ritual operates primarily on a "non-rational" level within the human psyche has been reiterated by Klapp. He states:

> In short, a goal must be intellectually in view for behavior to be rational; yet it can be highly functional without an end in view. Indeed, one ought not think too much in an intellectual way to appreciate a ghost-seance, magic, or a play at the theatre. The idea is to identify with the thing, not sit back and analyze it. Thus, ritual functions typically at the non-rational level.[10]

It is due to this characteristic of the ritual that it becomes dependent upon and intertwined with aesthetic experience. It is only in aesthetic experience that cognition can be bypassed and yet, paradoxically, still encompassed and maintained. In aesthetic experience, truth is met with beauty. Such a broader encounter is within the capability of art and the artist. Thus, ritual resorts to art in order to fulfill a special task and achieve its unique status. Underhill makes the point also:

---

[9]Ross, op. cit., p. 169.

[10]Klapp, op. cit., p. 16.

> Nor must we be too quick in assuming that improvement in the ritual of worship always consists in the triumph of words over tune; for we are concerned with an action and an experience which transcend the logical levels of the mind, and demand an artistic rather than an intellectual form of expression.[11]

She illuminates the point further:

> Liturgical worship shares with all ritual action the character of a work of art. Entering upon it, we leave the lower realism of daily life for the higher realism of a successive action which expresses and interprets eternal truth by the deliberate use of poetic and symbolic material. A liturgical service should therefore possess a structural unity; its general form and movement, and each of its parts, being determined by the significance of the whole. By its successive presentation of all the phases of the soul's response to the Holy, its alternative use of history and oratory, drama and rhythm, its appeals to feeling, thought, and will, the individual is educated and gathered into the great movement of the Church. Here intellect as well as emotion has its part to play in stirring to activity the deeper levels of the soul; for liturgy, being in its nature a corporate and stylized acknowledgment of the most august realities of our experience, must be informed by disciplined thought--again in this exhibiting its likeness to great art.[12]

To participate in the religious ritual is to partake of a sacrament. If ritual provides a means for directing and solidifying the worship which is directed toward God, then sacrament--or participation in the holy which is made concrete and rewarding--becomes the tangible medium by which the cult acquires the temporal benefit of this contact with God. Through sacrament, the cult acquires strength

---

[11] Underhill, op. cit., p. 33.

[12] Ibid., p. 111.

and sanctification. The element of the ritual or, possibly, the whole of the ritual as it focuses upon the exaltation of the cult member rather than the exaltation of God is to be regarded as sacramental. Further, sacrament does not occur outside of religious ritual. The two are inextricable. Ritual is sacramental and sacrament is ritualistic. Piault, speaking from the Christian context, states the relation:

> A sacrament is a tangible sign for men, for their union and sanctification. It is a rite to be understood by faith, faith which awakens and initiates us into the manifold aspects of the mystery which is Christ. When it bestows the grade it signifies it sets us forth on a new way of life in Christ.[13]

Underhill renders a specific and authoritative definition of the sacrament. She states:

> A sacrament is a significant deed, a particular use of temporal things, which gives to them the value of eternal things and thus incorporates and conveys spiritual reality. Hence sacraments involve an incarnational philosophy; a belief that the Supernatural draws near to man in and through the natural.[14]

Piault presents a similar definition:

> A sacrament is a mystery, not in the sense of something unintelligible but a sacred reality, a sign in the physical world that points to God and in pointing unites . . . . A sacrament makes use of some created reality; there is nothing in that reality which blocks God's passage.[15]

---

[13]Bernard Piault, What is a Sacrament? (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1963), p. 62.

[14]Underhill, op. cit., p. 42.

[15]Piault, op. cit., p. 170.

And E. O. James, in an epitomization of Thomistic doctrine, concurs as follows:

> Thus, St. Thomas Aquinas says that anything that is called sacred may be called sacramentum. From being that which is made sacred by consecration, a sacrament may readily become an 'effective sign' of that which has been sanctified and made efficacious by virtue of Dominical institution, becoming the bearer of supernatural power or divine grace and thus a bond of union between God and man. With such natural actions as eating, drinking, lustration, nuptial intercourse, and ritual techniques regarded as 'means of grace' and the pledge of a covenant relationship with the sacred order, the two worlds can be brought into conjunction. In this way the material becomes the vehicle of the spiritual through the agency of 'outward and visible signs.'[16]

The sacrament has, thus, been termed a "bearer of supernatural power or divine grace." This is the purpose, effect, and essence of sacramental participation. This salient and noteworthy characteristic has, also, been claimed by Underhill. She asserts:

> A valid sacrament, therefore, always leaves the situation different from what it was before. By means of the natural needs and actions of men, it effects a communication of the Wholly Other, over against men; and it is a fundamental part of worship, because it is an acknowledgment of the presence and priority of the divine, and is directed towards the sanctification of life.[17]

However, to state that a sacrament focuses on the exaltation of the cult member and that a ritual, in its part or entirety, may be considered sacramental is not to

---

[16]E. O. James, Sacrifice and . . . , p. 15.

[17]Underhill, op. cit., p. 43.

conclude that sacrament is the sole or primary purpose of ritual. Indeed, whenever the alternatives, as in ritual, are the exaltation of God or man--then God must prevail. Nevertheless, ritual is still characterized by its exaltation of both the spiritual and temporal--of God and man. However, the ritual concern with God is prior to whatever welfare may, finally, accrue to man. Thus, the ritual as a vehicle for the religious myth must be considered. It is through the religious use of myth, ultimately, that the cult designates and venerates God. Ritual embodies such myth and myth points toward God or the greater reality. Ritual concerns itself firstly with God--then man. Loew designates the connection between ritual and myth. He states:

> . . . the mythical forces in a culture are expressed on archaic level in rites that are symbolic actions.[18]

But Bronislow Malinowski, the noted anthropologist, makes the point in a more cogent and knowledgeable manner. He states:

> . . . I maintain that there exists a special class of stories, regarded as sacred, embodied in rituals, morals, and social organization, and which form an integral and active part of primitive culture. These stories live not by idle interest, not as fictitious or even as true narratives; but are to the natives a statement of a primeval, greater, and more relevant reality by which the present life, fates, and activities of mankind are determined, the knowledge of which

---

[18]Cornelius Loew, Myth, Sacred History, and Philosophy (Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1967), p. 270.

> supplies man with the motive for ritual and moral actions, as well as with indications as to how to perform them.[19]

The connection between ritual and myth has been drawn. It is, accordingly, appropriate to consider the nature of myth in a more thorough manner. In order to do so properly, it is first necessary to consider the nature of the symbol--the element which in combination goes to constitute the myth. Coomaraswamy states:

> Symbols in combination form an iconography or myth. Symbols are the universal language of art; an international language with merely dialectic variations, current once in all milieus and always intrinsically intelligible, though now no longer understood by educated men, and only to be seen or heard in the art of peasants. The content of symbols is metaphysical.[20]

That symbols in a dramatized association yield the myth is restated by May, also, who concludes:

> The story of Oedipus is a myth rather than a symbol, but the two are very closely related. Symbols are specific acts or figures, . . . while myths develop and elaborate these symbols into a story which contains characters and several episodes. The myth is thus more inclusive. But both symbol and myth have the same function psychologically; they are man's way of expressing the quintessence of his experience--his way of seeing his life, his self-image and his relations to the world of his fellow men and of nature--in a total figure which at the same moment carries the vital meaning of this experience.[21]

---

[19] As quoted by Loew, Ibid., p. 43.

[20] Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 78.

[21] Rollo May, "The Significance of Symbols," in Symbolism in Religion and Literature, ed. by R. May (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960), p. 34.

The characteristics which distinguish the symbol have been designated by Tillich:

> The first and basic characteristic of the symbol is its figurative quality. This implies that the inner attitude which is oriented to the symbol does not have the symbol itself in view but rather that which is symbolized in it. . . . The second characteristic of the symbol is its perceptibility. This implies that something that is intrinsically invisible, ideal, or transcendent is made perceptible in the symbol and is in this way given objectivity . . . . The third characteristic of the symbol is its innate power. This implies that the symbol has a power inherent within it that distinguishes it from the mere sign which is impotent in itself. This characteristic is the most important one. . . . The fourth characteristic of the symbol is its acceptability as such. This implies that the symbol is socially rooted and socially supported.[22]

At this point one may ask what distinguishes the symbol from the concept. Are not concepts symbolic also? On the contrary, the concept is apprehended by the intellect initially and then implications are gathered. The symbol, however, is apprehended by the senses initially and then implications are gathered. Goethe defines symbolism accordingly:

> We may speak of true symbolism, when the particular represents the more general not as a dream, or shadow, but as a living instantaneous revelation of the inscrutable.[23]

---

[22]Paul Tillich, "The Religious Symbol," Ibid., pp. 75-77.

[23]As quoted by E. Kohler, "The Nature of the Symbol," Ibid., p. 71.

And Coleridge states essentially the same:

> . . . a symbol is nothing but an abstraction from objects of the senses . . . a symbol is characterized by a translucence of the special (the species) in the individual, or of the general (genus) in the special . . . ; above all by the translucence of the eternal through and in the temporal.[24]

The symbol allows for the eternal to manifest itself in the temporal, thereby, elevating the concrete to the sphere of the metaphysical--or the sphere wherein ultimate reality is discerned. The symbol is the focal point wherein the physical and metaphysical are joined. Underhill, referring to the symbol, states also:

> In a general, not a technical sense, it has become a "sensible means of grace"; and the first step has been taken on the road to sacramental worship. For the symbol, or significant image, is not, as its unfriendly critics suppose, a substitute for spiritual worship. It is rather the point where physical and metaphysical meet--a half-way house, where the world of things and world of spirit unite, and produce a new thing possessed of sensible and supra-sensible reality. And man, who partakes himself of this double character, finds in it the natural means of access to God.[25]

And Eliade concurs in designating the metaphysical dimension of the symbol:

> For it is through symbols that man finds his way out of his particular situation and "opens himself" to the general and the universal.

---

[24] Ibid.

[25] Underhill, op. cit., p. 40.

> Symbols awaken individual experience and transmute it into a spiritual act, into metaphysical comprehension of the world.[26]

Bachofen, as a final but necessary point pertaining to the nature of the symbol, states the advantage and efficacy of the symbol in contrast with the bland "language of abstraction" or concept. He states:

> The symbol (i.e. mythological symbolism) awakens intuition where the language of abstraction can only offer rational explanation. The symbol addresses every side of the human spirit, whereas the language of abstraction is bound to confine itself to a single thought. The symbol strikes a chord in the very depths of the soul, whereas the language of abstraction touches only the surface of the mind like a passing breeze. The one is directed inwards, the other outwards. Only the symbol can combine a wide variety of notions into a single total impression; the language of abstraction, on the other hand, arranges them in succession and presents them to the mind piecemeal, whereas they ought to be presented to the soul at a single glance. Words reduce the infinite to finitude, symbols lead the spirit beyond the bounds of the finite into the infinite world of abiding truth.[27]

Now the nature of the myth may be considered directly. Bultmann describes myth:

> Myth is an expression of man's conviction that the origin and purpose of the world in which he lives are to be sought not within it but beyond it--that is, beyond the realm of known and tangiblerality--and that this realm is perpetually dominated and menaced by those mysterious powers which are its source and limit. Myth is also an expression of

---

[26] Eliade, op. cit., p. 211.

[27] As quoted by H. Thielicke, "The Restatement of New Testament Theology," in Kerygma and Myth, ed. by H. Bartsch (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 159.

> man's awareness that he is not lord of his own being. It expresses his sense of dependence not only within the visible world, but more especially on those forces which hold sway beyond the confines of the known. Finally, myth expresses man's belief that in this state of dependence he can be delivered from the forces within the visible world.[28]

Weisinger designates the characteristics of the myth. He presents the following:

> Myth is the product of a mode of thought which has the following characteristics. It is, first of all, analogical in its mode of operation; it proceeds by the perception, not of quantities as in mathematics, but of likenesses. In consequence, it is metaphoric, that is, it concretizes perception into image; the likeness of things to each other gives them a value and meaning to the things related far greater than the things separated and in themselves; they relate in the deepest signification of that term. Mythopoeic thought is emotional in that it involves the fundamental feelings and needs of the individual; the drama of myth is enacted by him and for him and for the purposes of his ultimate concern; in myth, he is projected into and immersed in the action on a level below, around, and outside the logic of reason and language and he is thus forced to express himself in the mode of metaphor and symbol. Yet, at the same time, it is social in nature, that is, it demands an interdependence of responsibility between the individual and the group both in conviction and in operation; the welfare of the group is no less dependent on the efficacy with which the group performs its assigned part than on the efficacy of the individual performing his. And finally, it is dramatistic, that is, it is action at whose end there is achieved a victory not guaranteed at its beginning; it is, par excellence, a process which must be gone through.[29]

---

[28] R. Bultmann, "Kerygma and Myth," Ibid., p. 110.

[29] Herbert Weisinger, "The Proper Study of Myth," The Centennial Review, XII, No. 3 (Summer, 1968), p. 247.

However, the most exhaustive and descriptive definition of myth has been formulated by Murray. He states:

1. Formal, descriptive definition. A myth manifestly consists of the essential features of an important, more or less natural/preternatural situation or event (that has a basic theme) in which at least one extraordinary, more or less natural/preternatural psychic entity is involved--all this is as sensibly represented in one channel or another.

2. Referential definition.

   2.1. Phenomenal reference. The manifest components of a myth--the represented situations, events, and actors--may mean what they literally appear to mean or may stand for anything else that is conceivable by man.

   2.2 Temporal reference. Myths are the essential features of imagined situations or events (a) that occurred once upon a time in the past, (b) that are destined to occur in the future, or (c) that are now recurring, or have recurred and will continue to recur at regular intervals or in chronological order.

3. Functional definition. A myth is an influential representation whose powers may be estimated in terms of the social scope, the temporal span, and the average intensity of its effects, these effects being of five classes: (a) cynosural - emotional - memorable - inspirational, (b) convictional, (c) evaluational, (d) conational, and (e) integrational.

4. Conditional definition. A ritual myth is an imagined event represented in words spoken by an appointed agent (e.g. shaman, priest, medicine man) during the event's ceremonial enaction at a prescribed place and time. Not all veritable myths are of this type.

> 5. Causal definition. A myth is a product of imaginations oriented and sustained by one or more basic needs and feelings (dynamic psychic determinants) in response to a critical situation (instigational determinant) which is experienced, consciously or unconsciously, by the society as a whole, by members of a certain class, or by numerous individuals as persons.[30]

Eventually. this study will establish the relation between the playwright and the priest. If the priest leads a cult through its participation in a mythic presentation--then, the playwright leads an audience through its participation in a dramatic presentation. Sacred drama--the possible creation of the playwright who assumes the priestly role--must attain the quality and stature of the myth. That myth may provide a pattern and criterion for dramatic composition is indicated by Weisinger:

> Such, then, is the paradigmatic nature of myth; it provides a pattern or, if you will, a metaphor in the shape of an action, which is to say, a drama of reaffirmation secured at the expense of suffering. And it is precisely because it is able to assume new forms that the myth pattern is capable of transforming itself from primitive belief to religious ritual to Christian faith to its secular use in tragedy, for as I argued, tragedy owes to the myth and ritual pattern a double heritage: its structure, from the succession of acts in the movement of the myth and ritual drama: and its content, from the purpose of the myth and ritual pattern, the triumph of life through suffering over death, the two being fused into a single shape.[31]

---

[30]Henry Murray, "Definitions of Myth," in The Making of Myth, ed. by H. Ohmann (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962), pp. 7-37.

[31]Weisinger, op. cit., p. 241.

Indeed, Weisinger goes further--he would apply the myth paradigm to the whole of literature as a standard of analysis and a norm for imaginative achievement. This would certainly encompass the drama which is the concern of this study. He states:

> I should argue that the architecture of a work of imagination, taken, as I said before, in its widest sense, reproduces the scenario of the drama of the myth and ritual pattern. In parallel fashion, I should say that the ideology of a work of imagination, again as just defined, likewise reproduces the ideology of the drama of the myth and ritual pattern. And if these propositions are viable, I should finally propose that our response to works of imagination, that is, the ultimate reason they have the power to grip and to hold us at what we feel to be the deepest levels of our being, often in spite of ourselves, is our recognition of and response to the architecture and ideology of the myth and ritual pattern taken together. I dare not argue, however, that the myth and ritual pattern is omnipresent, nor dare I argue--fatal admission--that its presence is a necessary guarantee of artistic value. Nevertheless, this much can surely be said, that the myth and ritual pattern provides a constant, a norm, a shape of significance, against which works of imagination can be placed and thereby examined and evaluated.[32]

Weisinger, significantly, states that adherance to this standard is not a guarantee of artistic excellence. It is the important recognition of this study, also, that the artist as playwright is not merely a priest or seeker and describer of the eternal through mythic participation.

---

[32] Ibid., p. 251.

Where the artist as priest is engaged with the source of good--the artist in his entire role is engaged with the source of evil as well. Accordingly, it was the earlier contention of this study that the priestly function of the artist is merely a facet of the total artistic task. An artist who merely emulates the priest is not capable of achieving the standard of great art as already designated herein.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, tangible worship occurs within the ritual framework. Such ritual is an agreed pattern of ceremonial movements and sounds within which corporate religious action may take place. Ritual embodies, objectivizes and exalts the finest aspirations of a cult grouping. The ritual form permifies the spiritual doctrine of a society. A ritual is a composition of symbols unified by a design in space and time. Such symbols cloak ideas in a manner contrived to arouse the utmost of feeling within the membership of a cult. To participate in ritual is to partake of a sacrament which is the holy made concrete and rewarding. Such a sacrament yields strength and sanctification in the participant through its transmission of supernatural power or divine grace. Such a sacrament is the vehicle of the spiritual through the agency of the material.

A ritual is sacramental and a sacrament is ritualistic. The symbols of ritual when considered in their entirety constitute a myth. Where a symbol is a species pointing to the general or the spiritual through means of significant images, the mythic resultant of a combination of integrated symbols is that ultimate category of conception wherein the physical and metaphysical meet in the completest and most revealing manner. Such mythic construction is a necessary paradigm for the most significant products of literary art--however, such a paradigm does not solely constitute a sufficient basis for such products.

CHAPTER V

THE RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DRAMATIC ART

Repeating the Hegelian premise of this study--art, religion, and philosophy concern themselves with the depiction of God or the Absolute. However, each discipline does so in its own unique and special manner--art depicts God in an intuitive manner, religion in a symbolic manner, and philosophy in a conceptual manner. Here the concern is with the relation between religion and art or, specifically, dramatic art. Van der Leeuw, also, assumes the position that the ultimate referent of religion and art is God. He states:

> In silence, religion and art meet and interpenetrate. Religion and art are parallel lines which intersect only at infinity, and meet in God.[1]

Vogt takes a similar position also:

> Art and Religion belong together by identities of Origin, Subject Matter, and Inner Experience.[2]

Vogt continues and emphasizes that the creation and perception of beauty is to attain an intimate relationship with Divinity. He asserts:

---

[1]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 333.

[2]Vogt, Art . . . , p. 18.

> The unity of religion and art is more profoundly discovered in our own consciousness. It is the unity of experience itself . . . . To perceive beauty is to be moved by something of the same emotional course as attends on the perception of Divinity. And to create beauty is in some sense to participate in the character of Divinity.[3]

Paul Green, the distinguished American playwright, reiterates the position that a great work of art conveys the participant to an ennobling confrontation with the goodness of the absolute. He states:

> In an honest search of ourselves we will find the old truth--that a good or noble work of art heightens our pleasure in and adherance to the Good; that is, each one under its appeal re-affirms in himself the desire and finer purpose of his life, and stands even stronger in the gripping certainty of an absolute reality and meaning to his existence and that of others like him and in the determination--in Aeschylean phrase--that the right shall prevail. In this, art and religion are one and stand opposed to the pessimisms of any science whatsoever.[4]

Art and religion both embody the "invisible realities." The objects of sense become the medium for conveying the apparently indiscernible to the otherwise incapable group of mankind. Religion must resort to art in order to fulfill its task and, thus, religion and art become inextricable and necessary to each other. The use of art in religious worship is to facilitate the task and revelation of God

---

[3] Ibid., p. 21.

[4] Paul Green, Drama and the Weather (New York: Samuel French, Inc., 1958), p. 151.

and, also, to pay homage to this God. Underhill, speaking from the Christian context, states:

> Because the historic Incarnation assures us that the most mysterious of invisible facts can become sensible to the soul, man is called to continue the divine work of translating into artistic and other symbols the mystery of the transcendental. Therefore the use of art in worship is not a mere imitation of the creative work of God, nor is it only a homage rendered to Christ; by giving an embodiment to invisible realities, it continues the Incarnation of the Word.[5]

Dramatic art is capable of attaining the stature of the "holy object" which makes visible and apprehensible the quality and nature of the divine. Dramatic art becomes a means for the achievement and participation in what man has referred to as religion. Van der Leeuw states:

> When we ask ourselves what men, from the primitive to the most "modern" have meant by "religion," we find it again and again brought into conjunction with the visible. What conveys the power that is sought for is a holy object, holy food, a holy action, a holy man. I can neither write poetry nor preach without addressing myself to the whole, bodily man. I can produce no drama, administer no sacrament, without depending on hearing and sight. In this respect, religion and art are fully alike.[6]

To state the matter more succinctly, consider the contention of Jane Ellen Harrison who states:

---

[5]Underhill, op. cit., p. 71

[6]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 180.

> It is at the outset one and the same impulse that sends a man to church and to the theatre.[7]

And, again, Van der Leeuw from the Christian vantage point:

> From the Christian point of view, the movements and countermovements from which drama grows have their origin in the movement and counter-movement of man to God, in the holy encounter.[8]

The drama of man has encompassed his religious inclination from the very beginnings of significant theatre in the time of the Greeks and, ironically, into the apparently secular and profane theatre of the present twentieth century. Ross describes the theatre of the Greeks:

> Of course, the art and literature of ancient peoples, their public ceremonies, and their special customs set them off from each other as members of individual cultures. Yet all these things were either religious in themselves or were connected with religion. The content of Greek tragedy in the classical period, for example, was religious. Religion, then, permeated the entire culture of a nation and gave it its special character.[9]

The other highpoints in the intervening history of the theatre also characterize themselves by the intimate relationship between religion and drama.[10] Even in the

---

[7]Harrison, op. cit., p. 9.

[8]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 110.

[9]Ross, op. cit., p. 177.

[10]Richard Rosenheim, in the already cited volume The Eternal Drama, presents a history of the theatre with the successful intention of emphasizing and elaborating upon this very point.

apparently secular and "Godless" drama of the Twentieth Century, the sacred continues to reveal itself in spite of whatever may be the stated aims of various dramatic artists. Successful drama, regardless of the intention of the dramatic artist, must necessarily participate to some extent in the nature of divinity. Watts, describing the contemporary theatre, notes:

> At least, the current plunge into the depths harbored by comedy and tragedy may indicate that the sacred resembles proverbial truth--crushed to earth at a particular point, it rises vigorously elsewhere. But what would St. Augustine and other foes of secular spectacle think if they were to learn that a quasi-sacred light shines behind the theatrical proscenium?[11]

And Watts again:

> And some of us find that the real sacred (if indeed it does exist) flourishes in an activity that men used confidently to regard as secular; we find the sacred in music or art or--as here--the drama with its power to light up our existence, to criticize or transform our secular boredom . . . . The traditional sacred is gone or--we suspect with varying emotions--is on the point of leaving us. We discover with relief that what we are about to lose is "really" available to us elsewhere--in the drama, for example.[12]

Ehrensperger, a modern critic, defines the religious drama which embodies the sacred thus:

> Drama is truly religious when it shows meanings and purposes in life that grow from the revelation

---

[11] Harold Watts, "Myth and Drama," ed. by L. Michel and R. Sewall, op. cit., p. 88.

[12] Ibid., p. 85.

> of the highest values conceivable. It seeks to relate man to the totality of his being. When these values are translated into living situations which cause conflicts with lesser meanings and purposes, then religiously effective drama may occur. When life situations are filtered through dramatic imagination they may be presented in terms of the perspective of the ultimate concerns and purposes of men or they may be presented merely as experiences in a laboratory of life. The former is likely to be the framework of religious drama, the latter that of realism which may or may not have religious meaning.[13]

Another manner in which the foregoing may be stated is in the assertion that religion and art, finally, present the knowledge of absolute reality which is also apprehended by philosophy or, specifically, with the ultimate discipline of philosophy designated as metaphysics--that branch of philosophy which deals with essential, ultimate, and permanent reality. Art, in presenting metaphysical knowledge, fulfills its highest purpose. Art enriches society and man by indicating the eternal. Art, as metaphysics, orientates man by directing his attention to God. Lawler indicates:

> If we must assign some social end to the arts, this would be the place to do it; they put man in his proper metaphysical stance, they perfect him as person.[14]

Among the other philosophers already cited who harbor such a viewpoint, let this description and elaboration upon the

---

[13]Ehrensperger, op. cit., p. 67.

[14]Justus Lawler, The Christian Image (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1966), p. 77.



position of Schopenhauer by Gardiner suffice to reemphasize the point for the sake of the immediate discussion. Gardiner states:

> And, however this may be, it is anyway true that the idea of there being important connexions between philosophy and art was one that from the first pressed itself upon him. In the early notebooks which he kept, he suggested that the reason philosophy had so often in the past appeared to engage in fruitless endeavour lay in its having been pursued in the manner of a science rather than as a form of art, the philosopher being in one way a kind of artist; and somewhat similar notions, though expressed in a more qualified and guarded fashion, are to be found in his main work. The view that in some--though not all--of its aspects the metaphysicians' activity may fruitfully be compared with that of the artist has been put forward on a number of occasions in more recent times, and is consequently now a fairly familiar one.[15]

Art makes its final and end appeal to the intellect and though it may do so through means of the emotions--the means should not be confused in primacy or significance with the end. Art "surveys the world" with the object of viewing that which is above the particular and the individual. Arnett concludes:

> Art, it seems, differs from these activities essentially in the fact that it is intellectual, reflective, cognitive; it is burdened with meanings, not with feelings; it is once removed from the spontaneous, non-purposive, effusive overflowing that is properly called the expression of emotion. A painting does not suggest simply that someone felt like painting and consequently applied the brush to canvas and got interesting

---

[15]P. Gardiner, Schopenhauer (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963), p. 31.

> results. It suggests rather that here is something to be seen, to be intellectually grasped, to be contemplated for what it reveals about the nature of the universe of which man is part. Therefore, the work of art is not to be understood in terms of the internal processes or motivations which in the artist give rise to it, nor in terms of a stimulus to, or process of making, certain adjustments to a world which the artist finds hateful or distasteful. Rather, like a work of science, a work of art is to be understood in terms of what it is, in terms of an objective context, in terms of what and how well it enables the spectator to see and know that which is essentially external to both artist and spectator. Art is a perspective, not a stimulant; it is a view of things, an interpretation, not an intoxication. Art is a product of the intellect which surveys the world from whatever heights or depths the emotional involvements of the subjects may create or demand. Emotion is perhaps necessary for art, but art is not primarily emotional. The emotion modifies the art in the way light modifies for a camera; it illuminates, intensifies, even distorts. But it is not light that is intensified or illuminated or distorted. It is the object.[16]

Science does not perform the same task as art since the conclusions of science are subject to refutation. The ultimate task of religion, philosophy, and art differs from science in that the conclusions which are finally attained are neither provable nor refutable.

Harrison draws the following connection between the philosopher and the artist:

> Still, the philosopher, like the artist, lives in a world of his own, with a spell of its own near akin to beauty, and the secret of that spell is

---

[16]Willard E. Arnett, "Poetry and Science," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV (June, 1956), p. 448.

> the same detachment from the tyranny of practical life. The essence of art, says Santayana, is "the steady contemplation of things in their order and worth." He might have been defining philosophy.[17]

That which has the most order and the most worth is God. The essence of art and philosophy becomes the contemplation of God--the ground of the "eternal realities." Man contemplates the most worthy and orderly of objects through the power of intellect. Coomaraswamy emphasizes this assertion:

> The imitation of anything and everything is despicable; it is the actions of Gods and Heroes, not the artist's feelings or the natures of men who are all too human like himself, that are the legitimate theme of art. If a poet cannot imitate the eternal realities, but only the vagaries of human character, there can be no place for him in an ideal society, however true or intriguing his representations may be. The Assyriologist Andrae is speaking in perfect accord with Plato when he says, in connection with pottery, that "It is the business of art to grasp the primordial truth, to make the inaudible audible, to enunciate the primordial word, to reproduce the primordial images--or it is not art." In other words, a real art is one of symbolic and significant representation; a representation of things that cannot be seen except by the intellect.[18]

Where Coomaraswamy has spoken of the artistic task as an enunciation of the primordial word, Santayana directs the poet to speak in the language of the gods. Santayana states:

---

[17]Harrison, op. cit., p. 220.

[18]Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 11.

> As in a supreme dramatic crisis all our life seems to be focused in the present, and used in colouring our consciousness and shaping our decisions, so for each philosophic poet the whole world of man is gathered together; and he is never so much a poet as when, in a single cry, he summons all that has affinity to him in the universe, and salutes his ultimate destiny. It is the acme of life to understand life. The height of poetry is to speak the language of the gods.19

And where Coomaraswamy, the philosopher, has directed the artist to imitate the "eternal realities"; Michelangelo, the artist, accedes in advocating the "copy of the perfections of God" which are the only eternal realities. He states:

> . . . for fine painting is nothing other than a copy of the perfections of God and a remembrance of his painting, and lastly a music and melody which only the intelletto is capable of hearing, with great difficulty.[20]

The same music and melody which the painter describes as heard by the intellect is the source and inspiration of poetic art also. Carlyle contends:

> Poetry, therefore, we will call musical thought. The Poet is he who thinks in that manner. At bottom, it turns still on power of intellect; it is a man's sincerity and depth of vision that makes him a Poet. See deep enough, and you see musically; the heart of Nature being everywhere music; if you can only reach it.[21]

---

[19]George Santayana, Three Philosophical Poets (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1910), p. 20.

[20]As quoted by Robert J. Clements, Michelangelo's Theory of Art (New York: Gramercy Publishing Co., 1961), p. 18.

[21]Thomas Carlyle, Heroes and Hero Worship (Chicago: The Henneberry Co., n.p., n.d.), p. 18.

The "ideal world" as apprehended by the intellect and referred to, also, by Coleridge determines the task of the inspired storyteller. According to Coleridge, the task is one:

> . . . of spreading the tone, the atmosphere, and with it the depth and height of the ideal world around forms, incidents and situations, of which, for the common view, custom had bedimmed all the lustre, had dried up the sparkle and the dew drops.[22]

This ideal world which Coleridge refers to as "bedimmed" by custom and, following, Hegel describes as relegated to "obscurity" and "confusion" determines the task and obligation of the dramatic artist also. The dramatic artist must "unfold" the "eternal" and "essential" and clarify its "vital truth." Kaminsky cites Hegel accordingly:

> Furthermore, he (the artist) must have a sense of the order that is often implicit in what to ordinary vision is "the ascendency of obscurity, chance, and confusion." In short, the dramatic poet "must in the profoundest sense make himself master of the essential significance of human action and the divine order of the world and along with this of a power to unfold this eternal and essential foundation of all human characters, passions, and destinies in its clarity as also in its vital truth."[23]

As with religion, the history of the theatre is characterized by a similar relationship with philosophy.

---

[22]Nathan Scott, "The Broken Center," ed. by May, op. cit., p. 189.

[23]Kaminsky, op. cit., p. 159.

However, if philosophy, religion, and dramatic art are each concerned, finally, with a knowledge of God--are not their activities either redundant or superfluous? Definitely not--for though their ends are identical, their means and the advantages which accrue to a respective set of means are different. In religious worship and ritual the imagery is fixed and constant and, after long and repeated exposure before an audience, become tedious and commonplace. The dramatic event has the advantage of freshness and change and the capability of renewing the interest of an audience by resort to different plays and, thereby, a constantly changing and stimulating imagery which may still have the same eternal referent as the religious ritual. Philosophy, in turn, approaches the knowledge of God by the apprehension of the loftiest concepts. But relatively few human beings are capable of arriving at such a knowledge which requires the attainment and possession of a well-developed intellect. However, they may apprehend such knowledge in an intuitive manner through the medium of dramatic art which resorts to the use of symbols which are grounded in the concrete and, thus, more readily perceived by a greater number of human beings.

Nevertheless, the task of the significant dramatic artist is inextricable from the concerns and conclusions of philosophy. That drama presents the insights of

philosophy, in addition to those of religion, has been one of its added qualities and functions from the time of the Greeks to the present day. Kitto describes Aeschylus and Sophocles thus:

> . . . Aeschylus and Sophocles were considerable philosophers, but philosophers who gave out the results, not the processes, of thought, and expressed them in their art.[24]

And Kitto again:

> In the first place, both these poets were philosophers enough to believe in a world order--even though Sophocles at least knew that it is not given to man to understand it fully. Both poets "believed in the gods"; and though this does not mean--though it certainly does not exclude--that they were endowed with a personal piety, it does mean that they believed in a universe which is ultimately rational.[25]

Such descriptions of dramatic artists as being heavily reliant upon philosophical doctrine and finding such doctrine necessary for the success of their art is not the mere groundless conjecture of the literary critic. Indeed, the dramatic artist, also, repeatedly engages in comparable assertions. From the modern theatre, consider this description of Shaw by Albert who states:

> Certainly Shaw took the "singing" of his philosophy seriously. He regarded himself as an "artist philosopher" and contended that "the artist philosophers are the only sort of artist I take quite seriously." Moreover, not the least among his

---

[24]H. D. F. Kitto, "Religious Drama and Its Interpretation," ed. by Michel and Sewall, op. cit., p. 154.

[25]Ibid., p. 152.

> accomplishments was the demonstration that--formalistic aesthetic doctrines to the contrary notwithstanding--a considerable amount of philosophical content may be so skillfully incorporated in a drama as to enhance, rather than to impair, its dramatic interest. He fully exploited the drama, and comedy, of ideas. His work includes dramatic philosophy as well as philosophical drama.[26]

And a final elaborating description of Shaw:

> For he is a philosopher with a mission, a moral and religious mission, and art is for him its means of implementation. To consider his ends merely, ignoring their integral and essential connection with the means he employed, is to misunderstand his artistic function, if not his actual meaning. His speculation, however metaphysical, reconnoiters for changes in a factual world. "The philosopher," he tells us, "is Nature's pilot." And when Shaw contemplates a universal, he recognizes that it may look different from opposing points of view; in other words, he contemplates it dramatically. A case can be made for the fact that his best philosophy is in his plays, not his prefaces. For there he puts his philosophy to work in human situations--however fanciful--and the working is the important thing.[27]

As mentioned, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Shaw are but three of the several great dramatists who have adhered to the standard of great art as described herein. The quality and intent of their creations justify the contention that these playwrights assumed the priestly role in the practice of their art. The priestly role as assumed by the playwright now warrants closer attention.

---

[26]Sidney P. Albert, "Bernard Shaw: The Artist as Philosopher," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV (June, 1956), p. 419.

[27]Ibid., p. 420.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, philosophy, religion, and art concern themselves with the depiction of God or the Absolute. However, each discipline does so in its own unique and special manner--philosophy depicts God in a conceptual manner, religion depicts God in a symbolic manner, and art in an intuitive manner. Each discipline, in comparison with another, has its own unique advantages and disadvantages in regard to the common goal. Art and religion both embody the "invisible realities." The objects of sense become the medium for conveying the apparently indiscernible to the otherwise incapable group of mankind. Religion must resort to art in order to fulfill its task and, thus, religion and art become inextricable and necessary to each other. It is the same aspiration which sends a man to a church or theatre. Art, as religion, is "the steady contemplation of things in their order and worth." Further, the task of the significant dramatic artist is inextricable from the concerns and conclusions of philosophy. That drama presents the insights of philosophy, in addition to those of religion, has been one of its added qualities and functions from the time of the Greeks, and even earlier, to the present day. Dramatic artists remain heavily reliant upon philosophical doctrine and find such doctrine necessary for the success of their art. The quality and manner of the works created by the greatest dramatic artists

justifies the contention that these artists assumed the priestly role in the practice of their art.

CHAPTER VI

THE PLAYWRIGHT AS PRIEST

The playwright who assumes the priestly role commits himself to the task of revealing the divine to mankind. His successful creation and performance is an incitation to the life of religion. Through his art, such a playwright-priest stimulates and engenders the vision of God and succeeds in the exaltation of humanity. The theatre, under the guidance of this playwright-priest, becomes "a cathedral of the spirit" and a place where mankind attains the capacity and strength for achieving the level and stature of spirit. The theatre, under the aegis of such an artist, presents both a call and a challenge to the attainment of the holy life--thereby, inspiring the nobility and sanctity of men and the purification of life and environment. Maxwell Anderson professes:

> I believe with Goethe that dramatic poetry is man's greatest achievement on his earth so far, and I believe with the early Bernard Shaw that the theatre is essentially a cathedral of the spirit, devoted to the exaltation of men, and boasting an apostolic succession of inspired high priests which extends further into the past than the Christian line founded by Saint Peter.[1]

---

[1]Maxwell Anderson, "Poetry in the Theatre," in American Playwrights on Drama, ed. by Horst Frenz (New York: Hill and Wang, 1965), p. 17.

Such ideas are not the special bias of a particular breed of dramatic artist nor are they merely the archaic residue of bygone days. Even in the twentieth century--a century wherein such approaches to literature have been disfavored--principal aestheticians and philosophers still strive to remind the public of the validity of such an outlook. For instance, Santayana asserts:

> Such is poetry as a literary form; but if we drop the limitation to verbal expression, and think of poetry as that subtle fire and inward light which seems at times to shine through the world and to touch the images in our minds with ineffable beauty, then poetry is a momentary harmony in the soul amid stagnation or conflict,--a glimpse of the divine and an incitation to a religious life.[2]

And Heidegger, as described by Will, refers to the poet in a similar manner. Will describes as follows:

> This paradox takes us far into Heidegger's thought. Already in Sein und Zeit he made it clear that he believes Being, or the lasting, must be revealed in order to exist. One way to understand--if not necessarily to agree with--this point is to see that Being has no past. It is only the revealed. "What remains will therefore never be drawn from the transitory." It is the job of the poet, particularly, to "found" the lasting over and over again. Poetry, consequently, is "real" in the highest sense, and the poet is the priest of the real.[3]

In fact, Heidegger goes so far as to pursue his own significant philosophical endeavor in a manner which does

---

[2]George Santayana, Interpretations of Poetry and Religion (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957), p. 289.

[3]Frederic Will, Literature Inside Out (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966), p. 27.

no less than emulate the endeavor of the dramatic artist. Ironically, as in the cited example of Schopenhauer, Heidegger adopts the method and goal of the artist. Versenyi describes and cites Heidegger thus:

> It is in this manner that Heidegger now understands his own mission as hermeneus--the mission consists in "making manifest that which is Wholly Other, and is only darkly, if not confusedly, divined" by man. This is what the Greek poets engaged in in the theatre of Dionysus--it was in their "saying itself that the approach of the god came to pass. The saying itself made manifest what the sayers beheld (and they beheld it) because it had beforehand already cast an eye upon them." If Heidegger occasionally succeeds in this mission, so that traces of that which is Wholly Other can be discerned in his writing, this is not his accomplishment; he merely finds these traces--"I merely find them, for they do not stem from me and are but seldom perceptible, like the scattered echoes of a far-away call." "All I did was to follow the indefinite traces of a road; but (at least) I followed." Erring on this road "through the realm of the Word" is the errand of the thinker and sayer --soothsayer in the literal sense of the word. Following the "call that wakens the saying; the sayer of truth is moved by the "spirit whose gentle breath insinuates itself into the soul." Like the apostles (literally--messengers), on whose heads tongues of flame descended so that they spoke "in another tongue," i.e. with the voice of the "Holy Spirit", Heidegger now brings us the Word. "Thinking is thanking", a prayer as it were, whose source and destination remain a mystery. With this last metamorphosis of the meaning of hermeneutic, Heidegger has finally yielded to Heidegger the prophet, apostle, and soothsayer, the ecstatic bearer of the Word, the enthusiastic, inspired--possessed instrument, the occasional, temporary dwelling--place and fleeting incarnation of the Voice of Being.[4]

---

[4]Versenyi, op. cit., p. 135.

Again emphasizing the special mission of the theatre; consider Ibsen, a playwright rarely thought of in terms of religion, whose work is rightfully depicted as an inroad to "the drama of God." Van der Leeuw describes Ibsen thus:

> Today's generation maintains that Ibsen's age is past. But he can wait; he does not belong to a particular period. His genius was able to express general and symbolic truth, not only typologically, but through the finest psychological analyses of character. He anticipated Freud and Adler, but he did not remain stuck in psychology; he understood how to create from it and with its help a series of eternal symbols. Since he could serve, he belongs among the greatest geniuses of all. The religious meaning of Ibsen's work does not reside in religious or philosophical generalities, certainly not in the so-called "Christian" element of the oldest portions of his work. It is in the overwhelming power, in the disconcerting pathos of his plots, which make us realize that here there is something quite ordinary happening, something which could also take place in our own lives; but here it is simultaneously the bearer of world-wide significance, eternal powers. And to us it seems as though, with the help of Ibsen's dramas, we might cast an eye upon the drama of God.[5]

And Van der Leeuw continues:

> As long as drama springs from the unity of life, remaining sacer ludus, it does not represent the movement of individuals, but of types, the ideal representatives of the movement of life. To this extent drama is always a marionette theatre. A man who can breathe the life of movement and countermovement into ideal types fascinates, indeed terrifies, his audience. It is not unusual to see yourself in a mirror; but to see your own spirit, your own representative, in a strange world, that is extraordinarily absorbing. This has immediate

---

[5]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 109.

> significance for our relationship with religion. The holy does not stand in a relationship with humans who speak for themselves, but only representatives. The holy demands priests, servants, and therefore can be expressed only by an art which demands the same.[6]

In the novel Broome Stages, Clarence Dane renders the precise and sought attitude in a salient manner when the fictional theatre artist admonishes:

> You are the priests of a temple--and likewise--for this is a unique ancient office--the prostitutes of a temple, and you serve God both with your body and with your soul. Your duty is undivided service; and I warn you now that if you turn aside from this service, either out of ambition or for the sake of money or in a love affair, God will punish you . . . we, the priests of the most ancient temple, do we not have our God and our divine, holy book? I say holy . . . we of the theatre are a peculiar people. The world comes to us to see itself, but we do not go out into the world to see ourselves. We have no selves, we are only the mouth of God . . . . For me there shall be no other God.[7]

Nearer still, America's greatest playwright envisions drama as an establishment and depiction of the relationship between man and God. It is Eugene O'Neill's mission and the mission of his drama to establish and clarify this relationship--whether God is, finally, merely a reflection of "the laws of his own being" or whether God is "the universe itself." O'Neill states:

---

[6] Ibid., p. 86.

[7] As quoted by Van der Leeuw, ibid., p. 108.

> Most modern plays are concerned with the relation between man and man, but that does not interest me at all. I am interested only in the relation between man and God: that is to say: to something outside himself, whether this something is the universe itself or merely the laws of his own being which is independent of local or temporary conditions. But the would be writer of tragedy today labors under an almost insuperable difficulty. He lives in a society most of whose members are either confused and uncertain or explicitly deny that any such relationship between man and God exists: that there are any problems to solve except problems to be faced by men so entirely the product of temporary conditions, that even their past is no more to them than a ghost which it is their business to lead astray as promptly as possible.[8]

Tyrone Guthrie, foremost of theatrical directors, asserts:

> When you are there, when you "assist", as the French so rightly express it, as a violinist gives a great account of a masterpiece or as an actor transforms himself into Hamlet, Harpagon, Faust or Peer Gynt, it is as though you were there when God said, "Let there be light." Indeed God, through his minister, is saying, "Let there be light."[9]

The principle "minister" in the theatre is the playwright. And the greatest playwright of all times, Shakespeare, was no less than a priest and bearer of the holy--a bearer of the light and vision of God. Carlyle describes Shakespeare accordingly:

---

[8]As quoted by Rosenheim, op. cit., p. 217.

[9]Tyrone Guthrie, "So Long as the Theatre Can Do Miracles," in Edge of Awareness, ed. by N. Hoopes (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1966), p. 163.

> But call it worship, call it what you will, is it not a right glorious thing, and set of things, this that Shakespeare has brought us? For myself, I feel that there is actually a kind of sacredness in the fact of such a man being sent into this earth. Is he not an eye to us all; a blessed heaven--sent Bringer of Light?[10]

Such have been the broader depictions of the priestly role of the dramatic artist by philosophers, religious thinkers, and artists themselves. Specifically, the role of the playwright will now be considered in terms of the three facets of this priestly role--namely the sacrificial, the prophetic, and the pastoral.

The act of sacrifice is the crucial obligation of the playwright-priest. It is a necessary condition in the creation of the drama which is designated as sacred. In sacrifice, the artist relinquishes that which is apparently of most value--namely, the self. There is no personal claim, no elevation of self, no regard for personal interest and gain--what is important to such an artist is the glorification of God. Whatever earthly benefit may be derived is incidental to the artistic endeavor. The artist through means of his creation becomes a "way." In the manner of the priest, he renders an object to be used as an aid and route to divinity. The material content of such an aid nullifies itself and its claim to prolonged attention by indicating the realm of the spirit. The

---

[10]Carlyle, op. cit., p. 157.

establishment and indication of such a realm is the primary purpose of an art object. In comparison with God, all else is insignificant. In the same order of discussion, the artist as individual, rather than as reflection and participant in the divine, may make no claim to eminence. The artist, the playwright-priest, negates all personal claim--he engages in the ultimate sacrifice for the sake of God. Coomaraswamy refers to the traditional artist who did not hesitate to exercise such proper humility. He states:

> In all respects the traditional artist devotes himself to the good of the work to be done. The operation is a rite, the celebrant neither intentionally nor even consciously expressing himself. It is by no accident of time, but in accordance with a governing concept of the meaning of life, of which the goal is implied in St. Paul's Vino autem jam non ego, that works of traditional art, whether Christian, Oriental or folk art, are hardly ever signed; the artist is anonymous, or if a name has survived, we know little or nothing of the man. This is true as much for literary as for plastic artefacts. In traditional arts it is never Who said? but only What was said? that concerns us; for "all that is true, by whomsoever it has been said, has its origin in the Spirit."[11]

Such is the position of the playwright-priest who worships God properly. The dramatist who creates in such a manner engages in an act of worship just as does the participant or audience for the resultant dramatic creation. The playwright-priest, in addition to the audience member,

---

[11]Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 39.

seeks to, finally, "be rid of the world" in order to achieve communion with God. It is even in the manner of the worshipper described by Vogt:

> One brings all his goods to the temple, but there is a door of leaving behind, where he must be rid of his many goods as he desires to be rid of his many loads, if he is to find the one supreme Good. Is the temple stuffed with all his worldly goods? Yes, and with the goods of all other men, and the immeasurable goods that are where no man is. Here are the corded bales of every man's good and the shards and ashes of every man's bad. Here is all in the world that he has loved and all that he has ignored. He comes to be rid of the world and to find God. But here he finds all the world he has left behind--and behold! it is God.[12]

Or in the manner described by the modern mystic, Thomas Merton:

> Day after day I am more and more conscious of being nothing but that self I find every day at the altar--this awareness is in reality a sense of substitution. I am replaced by a Being in whom I am fully real. Another has taken my identity or has revealed it to me, and this Other is a terrible infancy. I am at the altar (forgive my language, these words should not be extraordinary), I am at the altar with my eyes raised in the light that is eternity, and I become one who is reborn, never to grow old again.[13]

There is only the slightest distance between such an attitude and that of the knowledgeable theatre practitioner who, also, seeks to be "reborn" through the loss of self. Jean-Louis Barrault, the former manager of the Theatre de France, states:

---

[12]Vogt, Modern . . . , p. 28.

[13]As quoted by Montini, op. cit., p. 25.

> The "bourgeois spirit" at every level of society consists in looking into the mirror, striking a pose to confirm one's social personality and thereby to keep what one has. Our aim, in front of that same mirror, is to obliterate ourselves daily in order to be reborn, to recover our virginity in order to be able to give more.[14]

Great art is a release from the self. If, finally, it leads to contemplation--it can only be the contemplation of God. Harrison indicates thus:

> When an artist claims that expression is the aim of art he is too apt to mean self-expression only--utterance of individual emotion. Utterance of individual emotion is very closely neighboured by, is almost identical with, self-enhancement. What should be a generous, and in part altruistic, exaltation becomes mere megalomania. This egotism is, of course, a danger inherent in all art. . . . Art, said Zola, is "the world seen through a temperament." But this suspension is, not that he should turn inward to feed on his own vitals, but rather to free him for comtemplation. All great art releases from self.[15]

Kazantzakis, also, seeks to go beyond the mere self. For this great novelist and dramatist, matter must be routed and an end which transcends the individual must be sought. In other writings, notably The Saviours of God, he refers to such an end as God or the One even while admitting that this God or One is only a formulation of the human mind. In the manner of a Shaftesbury or an O'Neill, the existence or non-existence of God becomes

---

[14]Jean-Louis Barrault, "What Makes Men Free," Atlas Magazine, XVI (December, 1968), p. 57.

[15]Harrison, op. cit., p. 241.

irrelevant. Whether God is real or unreal, they deem God worthy of worship even to the point of relinquishing any claim to personal consideration. The self is constantly subordinated to God. Kazantzakis states:

> When I read Cervantes, still later, his hero Don Quixote seemed to me a great saint and martyr who had left amidst jeering and laughter to discover, beyond our humble everyday life, the essence which hides in back of appearances. What essence? I did not know at the time; I learned later. There is only one essence, always the same. As yet, man has found no other means to elevate himself--none but the routing of matter and the submission of the individual to an end which transcends the individual, even though that end be chimerical. When the heart believes and loves, nothing chimerical exists; nothing exists but courage, trust, and fruitful action.
>
> Years have passed. I tried to establish order over the chaos of my imagination, but this essence, the same that presented itself to me still hazily when I was a child, has always struck me as the very heart of truth. It is our duty to set ourselves an end beyond our individual concerns, beyond our convenient, agreeable habits, higher than our own selves and disdaining laughter, hunger, even death, to toil night and day to attain that end. No, not to attain it. The self-respecting soul as soon as he reaches his goal, places it still further away. Not to attain it, but never to halt in the ascent. Only thus does life acquire nobility and oneness.[16]

Undergirding all such sacrificial notions is a profound mystic doctrine and aspiration. There is an ever-imposing sense of the eternal and the divine. In the individual, there is a feeling of participation or an opportunity for participation in such a divine reality. With the playwright-priest, the feeling becomes a

---

[16]Kazantzakis, op. cit., p. 73.

compulsive motive leading to the incessant creation of newer and finer dramas--each one, hopefully, a step further toward the attainment of an eternal sphere and ground. As with the Dante of the Paradiso, the ultimate attainment entails the loss of self in and through the love of God. The ultimate accomplishment is personal surrender and sacrifice to the vision of God. It is the quest of the genuine artist. One aesthetician has stated that all aesthetic theory finally reduces to mysticism.[17] This is another way of stating that all aesthetic theory reduces to mystery. Art itself reduces to mystery, thus, it is not surprising that the doctrine which attempts to comprehend art should reach the same end. And the drama, especially, dissolves in such mystery. Underhill concurs and cites Nietzsche. She states:

> Drama itself, as Nietzsche showed, "hankers after dissolution into mystery. Shakespeare would occasionally knock the back out of the stage with a window opening on the 'cloud-capp'd towers.'"18

The playwright-priest, further, assumes the role of a prophet. Within the context of the drama for which he bears responsibility is heralded a vision of the future. Within this dramatic context, also, is an admonition for

---

[17]The aesthetic experience as a mystic experience is discussed, for example, by Vogt on page 127 of the already cited volume, Cult and Culture.

[18]Harrison, op. cit., p. 201.

the audience to render their share in converting such a vision to an actuality. The most significant truths and insights are rendered by this prophet. The ultimate of these truths being that vision of God and the sphere of ideals in so far as they may be apprehended through conceptualization. In a manner, the vision of the idealized future is no less than a vision of God toward which mankind must move. The earthly environment must be elevated and spiritualized through and beneath the light of such a Godly vision. The prophet demands endeavor and effort from his audience. His presentation is a call and challenge--even a demand. What exists is imperfect and to be recognized as such. Perfection is the emulation of God and his truth. The prophet commands his audience to move nearer and nearer to God. Art as prophetic activity is an illuminated depiction of what mankind "ought to become." Kaminsky, in discussing Hegel, depicts art thus:

> Science describes what nature is: the artist seeks to present what nature is a sign of. The scientist describes mankind; the artist depicts what mankind is trying to become. For this reason the aim of the artist is never one of imitation of existential entities. Art, according to Hegel, is superior to nature. It tries to indicate the goals at which nature is aiming. Art is the instrument by which insight is attained into what it means to be a man. The artist can shape for us the kind of human being we ought to become. In short, the artist tries to show men what kind of man would be the fullest expression of the Idea.[19]

---

[19]Kaminsky, op. cit., p. 30.

Art, according to De Rougemont, is the recovery of a "lost harmony." To the extent that man has moved away from God, he must strive to reestablish himself in the presence of God. Art becomes a reminder and a view of the Godly kingdom. Art becomes a prayer which reminds and reestablishes the future in the mind of an audience. Art becomes the prophetic vision which seeks to reactualize itself throughout the whole of life. It is a prayer and struggle for the perfection of eternity. De Rougemont states:

> Art is an exercise of the whole being of man, not to compete with God, but to coincide better with the order of creation, to love it better, and to reestablish ourselves in it. Thus art would appear to be like an invocation (more often than not unconscious) to the lost harmony, like a prayer (more often than not confused), corresponding to the second petition of the Lord's prayer--"Thy Kingdom come."[20]

For many members of an audience, the vision of the future is a new one of which they were previously unaware. They had no real understanding or feeling of their loss and predicament. The artist expands the consciousness of an audience. He reveals the nature and character of the loss. In arousing this needed sense of loss, he thereby fosters a movement toward recovery and fulfillment by and in behalf of the audience. The experience and awareness of men becomes greater and, thus, men themselves

---

[20]De Rougemont, op. cit., p. 186.

become greater and more powerful. Men, after the manner of the artist, become "conquistadors" and move beyond the relative imperfection of the present toward the future of God and spirit. Read asserts:

> In our time we have had great painters and sculptors, great poets and musicians, and they are precious witnesses to the continued development of human consciousness. I believe that such artists have been representative, and that a Wordsworth, a Proust, a Cezanne, a Klee, a Mondrian, a Schoenberg, and a Stravinsky do make conquests of consciousness that are afterwards occupied by the mind in widest commonalty. Perhaps that was always the way--perhaps great artists like Phidras and Praxiteles were also lonely pioneers. But I prefer to regard artists as great conquistadors who lead their people into new dimensions of reality . . . .[21]

Santayana, also, in treating of literature, asserts that the advantage of encountering such great works is in the ability they have to help men "become" something--to capture the enhanced future. Santayana states:

> The sole advantage in possessing great works of literature lies in what they can help us to become. In themselves, as feats performed by their authors, they would have forfeited none of their truth or greatness if they had perished before our day . . . . It is this continual digestion of the substance supplied by the poet that alone renders the insights of the past still potent in the present and for the future.[22]

Further, Santayana evaluates the prophetic role of the artist. He refers to the prophetic function as the "ultimate function" or the "highest mission" of the poet:

---

[21]Read, op. cit., p. 138.

[22]Santayana, Three . . . , p. 11.

> In this same manner, where poetry rises from its elementary and detached expressions in rhythm, euphuism, characterization, and story-telling, and comes to the consciousness of its highest function, that of portraying the ideals of experience and destiny, then the poet becomes aware that he is essentially a prophet, and either devotes himself, like Homer or Dante, to the loving expression of the religion that exists, or like Lucretius or Wordsworth, to the heralding of one which he believes to be possible. Such poets are aware of their highest mission; others, whatever the energy of their genius, have not conceived their ultimate function as poets.[23]

Blake, too, assumed the disparity between the earthly state of man and his divine one. For Blake, the artistic task entailed the destruction of the finite sphere of existence for the sake of an eternal one. Spiritual forms which have fallen into materiality must be elevated. The realm of materiality must be uplifted also. Art is a disclosure of the true structure of human life--and a prophetic and religious call for a repatterning of life in accord with such a structure. Adams, in an essay entitled "The Blakean Aesthetic," indicates accordingly:

> In Blake's Edenic realm God and Man were one. And they still are, except that corporeal illusion now often prevents us from the realization of that Unity. The visionary instinctively knows the fact of Unity, and the great works of art are assertions of it. The Poetic Genius may overthrow the bonds of "finite organical perception." The artist in society strives to regain Eden for all men to leave behind that state of delusion characterized by Lockeian nature and spiritual forms fallen into material. Art is thus prophetic in the religious sense. It does not predict, but it does disclose the true central form, the pattern of human life.

---

[23]Santayana, Interpretations . . . , p. 286.

> And it does this not by viewing the grain of sand, and then by means of abstract reason considering its relation to a greater controlling deity, but by visualizing that grain of sand as symbol of the deity itself, as the central form in microcosm.[24]

Kazantzakis, in more recent times, assumed the prophetic responsibility in his life and literature also. Literary activity becomes the proclamation of a "state of mobilization" and a command and challenge for men to "surpass the beast" of the present condition and to move forward to an idealized future. He states:

> Writing may have been a game in other ages, in times of equilibrium. Today it is a grave duty. Its purpose is not to entertain the mind with fairy tales and make it forget, but to proclaim a state of mobilization to all the luminous forces still surviving in our age of transition, and to urge men to do their utmost to surpass the beast.[25]

And again the artist, in his life and work, subordinates or rejects the present for the sake of an ennobled future. Further, Kazantzakis states:

> One morning I got up and the bird's name gleamed unforeseen and terrible in the air. It was not a bird, it was a cry from innumerable mouths. All at once I recognized it. This cry was what I had been hunting--the Cry of the future. I was tormenting myself and making war for its sake, I had been born for its sake. All the rest--my joys and sorrows, my journeys, my virtues and vices--were nothing more than my progress toward this Cry.[26]

---

[24] Adams, op. cit., p. 240.

[25] Kazantzakis, op. cit., p. 435.

[26] Ibid., p. 453.

Great drama is a call to similar conduct and responsibility. Such drama, too, presents a vision of the future and a command to the audience to transcend present imperfection for the state of future perfection. Ehrensperger asserts:

> Drama shows us what ought to be. It is on the move toward perfection of the individual and the social order. It presents the will of man in conflict with the yet-to-be-created or the already-created which is destroying man. This is also its miracle. By way of dramatic experience we can have a sense of fulfillment and delight. It can be so powerful and so wonderful we are jolted when the curtain comes down and the spell is broken. This hypnotic experience of how life could be or what it is yet to be, despite its being made today frequently in negative statements, can carry us off into constructive or destructive fantasy-making. Drama can fill or empty us. No other art form can so bewitch or inspire us.[27]

Maxwell Anderson, most cogently and significantly, cites the responsibility of the playwright-priest to assume the prophetic stance. The theatre, through the prophetic voice of the great dramatic artist determines what mankind will and must become. Anderson declares:

> Unless I am greatly mistaken, many members of the theatre audience have anticipated this conclusion by one of those intuitional short-cuts which confound the devotees of pure reason, and are not only ready but impatient for plays which will take up again the consideration of man's place and destiny in prophetic rather than prosaic terms. It is incumbent on the poet to be prophet, dreamer, and interpreter of the social dream. Men have come a long way from the salt water in the millions of years that lie behind them, and have a long way to

---

[27]Ehrensperger, op. cit., p. 22.

> go in the millions of years that lie ahead. We shall not always be as we are--but what we are to become depends on what we dream and desire. The theatre, more than any other art, has the power to weld and determine what the race dreams into what the race will become.[28]

Thus, drama becomes a public dream--a communal wish--through which an audience, through the effort of a playwright-priest, achieves a vision and consciousness of its deepest and sometimes hidden aspirations. The drama becomes a vital vehicle for the progression of mankind.

The playwright-priest, finally, assumes the role of a pastor within his community. He is a spokesman and advocate of those moral truths and a revealer of those errors in conduct which impinge upon the daily and practical life of man. The stage becomes a place wherein living examples are encountered. Love, affection, grief, anguish, and hatred--all of those emotions which beset the daily life of man are encountered within a context which comprehends and reveals the motives and norms and actions which yielded these emotions. The stage yields understanding for utilization in common affairs. When human beings are benefitted--the norms which yielded such benefits are discernible. When human beings are mistreated, the norms which led to such mistreatment are also discernible. Man attains a consciousness of the reasons behind

---

[28]Anderson, op. cit., p. 19.

his joys and sorrows. Made aware with such an enhanced consciousness, man acquires a precondition for the palliation of these same sorrows. The pastor voices the grief of his audience--even before they themselves have acquired a consciousness of the reasons behind such grief. The pastor shares in this same grief. The playwright-priest who assumes the role of the pastor gives the audience hope and consolation and strength by depicting those behavioral examples which lead to the dissipation of such grief. Pastoral knowledge becomes knowledge about the ordinary situations of life--man leaves the theatre after such an encounter with the ability to understand the grief of his fellow-man and, further, in possession of a set of norms and examples by which to abide in order to refrain from contributing to this toll of grief. Man is, as Aristotle discerned, purged of his pity and fear and granted the possession of compassion and courage. Man, through the salient exemplars of the drama, prepares and strengthens and ennobles himself for the conduct of his normal and earthly existence. In accord, Santayana, in referring to the "great dramatists," concludes:

> They have also known how to select and reconstruct their mythology so as to make it a true interpretation of moral life. When we read the maxims of Iago, Falstaff, or Hamlet, we are delighted if the thought strikes us as true, but we are not less delighted if it strikes us as false. These characters are not presented to us in order to enlarge our capacities of passion nor in order to justify themselves as processes of redemption; they

> are there, clothed in poetry and imbedded in plot, to entertain us with their imaginable feelings and their interesting errors. The poet, without being especially a philosopher, stands by virtue of his superlative genius on the plane of universal reason, far above the passionate experience which he overlooks and on which he reflects; and he raises us for the moment to his own level, to send us back again, if not better endowed for practical life, at least not unacquainted with speculation.[29]

Art is the presentation of the consciousness and spirit of the time through the utilization of a material medium. As the individual requires self-awareness and self-knowledge in order to give purpose and direction to his activity so, also, does a society require the same for its activity. Artistic expression is a primary method by which a society acquires such a description of itself. Vogt states:

> The arts constitute the description of the world as an age or a people apprehends it. The spiritual life of a time is depicted with unescapable exactness in its artistry. A spiritual movement that does not find expression in the arts cannot attain self-consciousness or dominance or survival.[30]

Art, importantly, lends voice to the sorrow of the time. The playwright-priest as pastor must voice and expose such sorrow before there is any possibility for the alleviation of this sorrow. Indeed, the sorrow of the artist and the society which he reflects and the subsequent

---

[29]Santayana, Interpretations . . . , p. 192.

[30]Vogt, Art . . . , p. 9.

need to vent such sorrow is a principle factor and motive in the creative act. Van der Leeuw asserts:

> Schopenhauer once made the following malicious remark about this connection between poetry and life: "If Petrarch's passion had been satisfied, from that moment on his song would have fallen silent, like that of a bird which has just laid its eggs." But that turns the story of man unjustly into the story of nature. The man who is a true poet sings because he is never satisfied, even when the eggs have been laid. His song is more powerful than he himself. This is beautifully clear in a prototype of Goethe's poem which is found among the Ewe of West Africa. There, when something happens to a person that is too terrible to remain hidden within the heart, he says: "Sing me my suffering." He then goes to people "to whom song speaks," who can express what we vainly try to clothe with words. Upon them "song has fallen." And they sing:
>
> > Not of myself did I become a singer,
> > What is too heavy to be borne--
> > That is the singer.[31]

The following is a fuller passage from the poem of Goethe to which Van der Leeuw refers:

> And when the man fell silent in his pain, a god gave words to tell my suffering.[32]

Unanuno, the great Spanish philosopher novelist, and playwright, reiterates the need for sorrowful expression. The theatre, certainly, is a "temple" such as the one to which Unamuno refers:

---

[31]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 125.

[32]As quoted by Van der Leeuw, ibid., p. 125.

> And I am convinced that we should solve many things if we all went out into the streets and uncovered our griefs, which perhaps would prove to be but one sole common grief, and joined together in beweeping them and crying aloud to the heavens and calling upon God. And this, even though God should hear us not; but He would hear us. The chiefest sanctity of a temple is that it is a place to which men go to weep in common. A miserere sung in common by a multitude tormented by destiny has as much value as a philosophy. It is not enough to cure the plague--we must learn to weep for it. Yes, we must learn to weep. Perhaps that is the supreme Wisdom.[33]

In the temple of the theatre, it is the voice of the playwright-priest acting in the pastoral role which lends exposure and articulation to the suffering of mankind, thus, rendering the possibility of palliation. The dramatic presentation or the "ceremony of the priest" allows men to express the innermost passions. Vogt emphasizes this task of the priest as pastor:

> A ceremony of the priest is precisely like a poem or other work of art in that it enables us to say to each other what we should otherwise leave unsaid or conceal. . . . The form of the verse is a cloak partly concealing the passion beneath, yet enabling its release and expression. So are we all reticent, bearing in silence what we cannot speak save with tears, not wishing to wear our hearts upon our sleeves. The ceremony speaks for us. We cannot utter all or a part of that majesty of respect we feel for a human life that has left its house of clay, or that solicitude and love with which we would follow lives newly wedded, nor can we willingly keep silence. The ceremony speaks for us, its cloak of form at once concealing and expressing our inner passion.[34]

---

[33]Miguel de Unamuno, "The Man of Flesh and Bone," in L. Michel and R. Sewall, eds., op. cit., p. 4.

[34]Vogt, Art . . . , p. 84.

Moral truth and moral action incorporated into the lives of those who encounter the sacred art-object is the certain path by which human misery may be dissipated. The strength of noble truth and the incitement to proper conduct is the legacy of an encounter with such an art-object. In the broader field of literature, Wayne Booth in The Rhetoric of Fiction refers to the art of the novelist:

> What I am saying here may seem like mere tautology: interesting narrators are interesting. But there is much more to it than that: some interesting narrators perform a kind of function in their works that nothing else could perform. They are not simply appropriate to a context, though that is essential. They originally succeeded and still succeed by persuading the reader to accept them as living oracles. They are reliable guides not only to the world of the novels in which they appear but also to the moral truths of the world outside the book.[35]

Again, dealing directly with the theatre and the playwright, such pastoral functions as mentioned have been clearly stated and acknowledged. Ernst Toller, the great German playwright, refers to the mission and obligation of the theatre to "create examples." He states:

> Art reaches further than reason, it firmly establishes the emotion. It supplies the established emotion with rational legitimacy. I believe, therefore, that the artist should not prove a thesis but create examples. Art belongs among those rare spiritual means of stirring up buried instincts, of training brave attitudes, of deepening spontaneous feeling for humanity, freedom, and beauty.[36]

---

[35]Wayne Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 220.

[36]Ernst Toller, "Hoppla, Such is Life!" ed. by T. Cole, op. cit., p. 226.

And Frederico Garcia Lorca, the great Spanish playwright, refers to the mission and obligation of the theatre to "explain the eternal norms." He states:

> The theatre is a school of weeping and laughter, a rostrum where men are free to expose old and equivocal standards of conduct, and explain with living examples the eternal norms of the heart and feelings of man.[37]

And August Strindberg, the great Swedish playwright, refers, finally, to the playwright as a "lay preacher" presenting "the ideas of his time." He states:

> Theatre has long seemed to me--in common with much other art--a Biblia Pauperum, a Bible in pictures for those who cannot read what is written or printed; and I see the playwright as a lay preacher peddling the ideas of his time in popular form, popular enough for the middle classes, mainstay of theatre audiences, to grasp the gist of the matter without troubling their brains too much.[38]

The theatre is no less than a Bible in pictures and the playwright-priest bears the full burden and responsibility for its authorship--with the help and permission of God.

---

[37]Frederico Garcia Lorca, "The Authority of the Theatre," ibid., p. 59.

[38]August Strindberg, "Miss Julie," ibid., p. 171.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, the playwright who assumes the priestly role commits himself to the task of revealing the divine to mankind. His successful creation and performance is an invitation to the life of religion. Through his art, such a playwright-priest stimulates and engenders the vision of God and succeeds in the exaltation of humanity. The theatre, under the guidance of this playwright-priest, becomes "a cathedral of the spirit" and a place where mankind attains the capacity and strength for achieving the level and stature of spirit. The theatre under the aegis of such an artist, presents both a call and a challenge to the attainment of the holy life--thereby inspiring the nobility and sanctity of men and the purification of life and environment. The act of sacrifice is a crucial obligation of the playwright-priest. It is a necessary condition in the creation of the drama which is designated as sacred. In sacrifice, the artist relinquishes that which is apparently of most value--namely, the self. Such an artist through the means of his creation becomes a "way." In the manner of the priest, he renders an object to be used as an aid and route to divinity. The material content of such an aid nullifies itself and its claim to prolonged attention by indicating the realm of spirit. The playwright-priest, further, assumes the role of a prophet. Within the context of the drama for which he bears responsibility is heralded a vision of the future.

Within this dramatic context, also, is an admonition for the audience to render their share in converting such a vision to an actuality. The prophet demands endeavor and effort from his audience. His presentation is a call and challenge--even a demand. What exists is imperfect and to be recognized as such. Perfection is the emulation of God and his truth. The prophet commands his audience to move nearer and nearer to God. The playwright-priest, finally, assumes the role of a pastor within his community. He is a spokesman and advocate of those moral truths and a revealer of those errors in conduct which impinge upon the daily and practical life of man. The stage becomes a place whereupon living examples are encountered. Love, affection, grief, anguish, and hatred--all of those emotions which beset the daily life of man are encountered within a context which comprehends and reveals the motives and norms and actions which yielded these emotions. The stage, thus, yields understanding for utilization in common affairs. Man, through the salient exemplars of the drama, prepares and strengthens and ennobles himself for the most proper conduct of his normal and earthly existence.

CHAPTER VII

RELIGIOUS RITUAL AND DRAMATIC PERFORMANCE

In the foregoing chapters, issues and implications have been raised which now bear consideration in order to complete and fulfill the major assertions of this study. The playwright as priest creates and employs a special sort of language occurring in a special sort of place and time. The language employed is sacred language--as opposed to profane language--and it occurs in a sacred place and time--as opposed to a profane place and time. Further, such a playwright-priest regards a theatre audience as a worshipping cult which participates in the conduct of a ritual performance and, also, derives the special benefits that such participation entails.

It is profane language which focuses upon those matters which originate and are resolved within the spatio-temporal environment. The commerce of everyday life, practical affairs, are administered and designated by such language. Men participate in the ordinary through the usage of profane language. In contrast, there is a body of language regarded as sacred which is grounded in a transnatural realm and which seeks to describe this same realm. Through the usage of such

language men participate in the extraordinary. It is this language which describes or indicates the external or the sphere of "things which do not exist." The poet--certainly to include the dramatic poet--becomes the medium for the presentation and usage of such language. The poet, as the voice of God, becomes the bearer and principal spokesman of such sacred language. Van der Leeuw asserts:

> A word is sound, rhythm, and image. It drags everything along, but also sets boundaries; it constrains and it frees. By fencing off a portion of the world, giving form to a little bit of reality, it creates; by being rhythm and sound, it arouses. The poet calls into being things which do not exist. Therein lies his divine mission. And when he becomes aware that God stands behind him and breathes into him his creative spirit, he turns and sings his most beautiful song in God's presence, and in praise of him who put it into his mouth.[1]

Men cannot live the truly human life without an awareness of the eternal. Men cannot recognize what is beautiful and good without the message of language which is sacred. Men require the poet--the witness of the spirit--to attain the fullest fruition of their lives. According to Maritain writing in The Responsibility of the Artist:

> Man cannot live a genuine human life except by participating to some extent in the supra-human life of the spirit, or of what is eternal in him. He needs all the more desperately poets and poetry as they keep aloof from the sad business and standards of the rational animal's maintenance and guidance, and give testimony to the freedom of the spirit. It is precisely to the extent to which poetry is useless and disengaged that poetry is necessary,

---

[1]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 149.

> because it brings to men a vision of reality--beyond--reality, an experience of the secret meanings of things, an obscure insight into the universe of beauty, without which men could neither live nor live morally.[2]

Men encounter the being of God through poetry. Whatever is essential is brought to the consciousness of the human mind through that poetry which is the manifestation of the divine poetry or Logos of God. Heidegger states:

> Poetry is the establishment of being by means of the word. . . poetry is the inaugural meaning given to being. . . not just any speech, but that particular kind which for the first time brings into the open (into consciousness, that is to say) the essence of things--all that we can then discuss and deal with in everyday language.[3]

Underhill, in specific elaboration states the three functions of the sacred poetic word:

1. It is the carrying-medium of something which otherwise wholly eludes representation, the soul's deep and awestruck apprehension of the numinous.

2. It can universalize particulars; giving an eternal reference to those things of time in and through which God speaks to men.

3. It is a powerful stimulant of the transcendental sense--a function in which the ancient hymns embodied in the Greek liturgy excel.[4]

The sacred word deals with the essence of reality--that in reality which partakes of God and the eternal. The sacred word deals with what "is"--or that which is permanent and entails the significant which endures. Watts, in a discussion of the drama, asserts accordingly:

---

[2]Jacques Maritain, The Responsibility of the Artist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960), p. 85.

[3]As quoted by Read, op. cit., p. 18.

[4]Underhill, op. cit., p. 112.

> What is the sacred if we define it (as we now try to) not in terms of a church or a lapsed tradition? One ought to be able to define the sacred in terms of human action, or at least attempt to. The sacred is "created"--exists for us and probably becomes available to other persons who are in any way like us--by any gesture or word which makes a total assertion. Any word or gesture which offers, to our own awareness and the awarenesses that we are able to reach, some insight about what existence collectively is--this is a sacred word or announcement rather than a secular one. In contrast, a secular utterance concerns itself with some smaller portion of experience; neither actually nor by implication does it describe some aspect of the total act of existing. It is concerned with conveying facts, practical procedures under certain explicit circumstances, or--at its most ambitious--short-range predictions.[5]

Within the bounds of such a conceptual frame--a frame and description in accord with those other cited authorities--Watts continues and designates the drama as an art which "abounds" in the usage of language rightfully designated as being sacred. He concludes:

> Drama, let us concede, abounds in the sacred as here defined; it is indeed a sacred that can be studied in relation to the sacred of rite and myth.[6]

Not only is the drama a vehicle for the revelation of sacred language, but the place wherein such language reveals itself becomes sacred also. Religious man not only distinguishes between sacred and profane language, but between sacred and profane place or space. That place as on the theatre stage where the mystery or sacred drama unfolds

---

[5]Watts, op. cit., p. 86.

[6]Ibid., p. 89.

itself to reveal "an absolute reality" is rightfully designated as sacred. Wherever God reveals himself is sacred and holy ground. Eliade states:

> For religious man, space is not homogeneous; he experiences interruptions, breaks in it; some parts of space are qualitatively different from others. "Draw not nigh bitter," says the Lord to Moses; "put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Exodus, 3,5). There is, then, a sacred space, and hence a strong, significant space; there are other spaces that are not sacred and so are without structure or consistency, amorphous. . . When the sacred manifests itself in any hierophany, there is not only a break in the homogeneity of space; there is also revelation of an absolute reality, opposed to the nonreality of the vast surrounding expanse.[7]

On such "holy ground," man acquires a relationship and orientation toward the absolute. At such a place, man is elevated and removed from the sphere of the ordinary and granted the possession of a "revelation" pertaining to the extraordinary reality or God. Holy and sacred place provides the ground for man's access to God. Eliade continues:

> Revelation of a sacred space makes it possible to obtain a fixed point and hence to acquire orientation in the chaos of homogeneity, to "found the world" and to live in a real sense. The profane experience, on the contrary, maintains the homogeneity and hence the relativity of space. No true orientation is now possible, for the fixed point no longer enjoys a unique ontological status; it appears and disappears in accordance with the needs of the day.
>
> . . . Even for the most frankly nonreligious man, all these places still retain an exceptional, a unique quality; they are the "holy places" of his private universe, as if it were in such spots that he had

---

[7]Eliade, op. cit., p. 20.

> received the revelation of a reality other than that in which he participates through his ordinary daily life.[8]

Eliade, further, summarizes the notion of sacred space:

> If we should attempt to summarize the result of the descriptions that have been presented . . . we could say that the experience of sacred space makes possible the "founding of the world": where the sacred manifests itself in space, the real unveils itself, the world comes into existence. But the irruption of the sacred does not only project a fixed point into the formless fluidity of profane space, a center into chaos; it also effects a break in plane, that is, it opens communication between the cosmic planes (between earth and heaven) and makes possible ontological passage from one mode of being to another. It is such a break in the heterogeneity of profane space that creates the center through which communication with the transmundane is established, that, consequently, founds the world, for the center renders orientation possible.[9]

The theatre as ministered by the playwright-priest becomes such a sacred bearing place. The theatre, too, opens communication between earth and heaven. The theatre, too, provides a center and place through which communication with the transmundane is established.

Further, the time in which the dramatic presentation occurs is rightfully designated as sacred also. That time in which eternity reveals itself is sacred. It is a time removed from the ordinary for in it all time or eternity occurs. The drama which is sacred, accordingly, occurs in

---

[8] Ibid., p. 23.

[9] Ibid., p. 63.

such sacred time or the time of "religious festival." Eliade depicts such time:

> For religious man time too, like space, is neither homogeneous nor continuous. On the one hand there are the intervals of sacred time, the time of festivals (by far the greater part of which are periodical); on the other there is profane time, ordinary temporal duration, in which acts without religious meaning have their setting . . . by its very nature sacred time is reversible in the sense that properly speaking, it is a primordial mythical time made present. Every religious festival, any liturgical time, represents the reactualization of a sacred event that took place in a mythical past "in the beginning." Religious participation in a festival implies emerging from ordinary temporal duration and reintegration of the mythical time reactualized by the festival itself. Hence sacred time is indefinitely recoverable, indefinitely repeatable.[10]

Such festivals or dramas occurring in sacred time are "recoverable." The holy conditions may be repeated because what is depicted is ritualized and formulated. By resort to such ritual, man can remove himself from the passage of history and thrust himself into the "mythical present" of the time which is sacred. Eternity, through ritual and drama, is always accessible. Man preserves a ready and appropriate means for returning to God. Eliade further states:

> Hence religious man lives in two kinds of time, of which the more important, sacred time, appears under the paradoxical aspect of a circular time, reversible and recoverable, a sort of eternal mythical present that is periodically reintegrated by means of rites. This attitude in regard to time suffices to distinguish religious from nonreligious man; the former

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 68-69.

> refuses to live solely in what, in modern terms, is called the historical present; he attempts to regain a sacred time that, from one point of view, can be homologized to eternity.[11]

Schiller, in discussing the formal or aesthetic impulse, depicts the art-object as a medium through which man can transcend time and harbor the completed and infinite time which is sacred eternity. The particularity of the individual is diminished and the universality of God is approached. Schiller asserts:

> When therefore the formal impulse holds sway, and the pure object acts within us, there is the highest expansion of being, all barriers disappear, and from being the unit of magnitude to which the needy sense confined him, Man has risen to a unit of idea embracing the whole realm of phenomena. By this operation we are no more in time, but time, with its complete and infinite succession, is in us. We are no longer individuals, but species; the judgment of all spirits is expressed by our own, the choice of all hearts is represented by our action.[12]

Art--especially dramatic art--becomes a form which embodies the worship of God. The audience forms a society gathered together to render homage and devotion to the divine. Drama which is sacred and holy becomes as the religious ritual dedicated to the enhancement of God and the worshipper. Drama, as it symbolizes divinity, yields a significant mode of worship for a theatre audience. That art, generally, is utilized in such a manner has been indicated by Freemantle:

---

[11] Ibid., p. 70.

[12] Schiller, op. cit., p. 67.

> Art becomes a binding link between men and draws them together toward God. It forms a society which must properly be called a Church. Its yearning toward the ideal is worship, a prayer. The sharing in artistic impressions is a genuine form of worship. It is destined to occupy no mean place in the full redemption of human life.[13]

The point has been reemphasized by Vogt:

> Moreover, forms in worship have always been used to vivify ideas and to rekindle ideals. They are vehicles of truth, vessels of communication, channels of deliverance. They have served not only as direct appeals to the senses, assisting the mind to develop its own thoughts, but also as symbols for the conveyance of thoughts. The idea without form is a timid topping that does not rouse the sleepy householder; clad in good form it blows a bugle at the gates of the soul. Religion has always used abstract forms, proportions, shapes, colors, sounds, for the direct appeal to the senses. It has also set forth definite conceptions clothed in many kinds of symbolic forms.[14]

Man does worship the absolute in the theatre. It is a point of mutual function and interaction between the church and the theatre. Whether the essential appeal of the theatre is recognized as conducive to a recognition and homage directed toward the absolute by the audience is not so important. Instinctively or intuitively or consciously, the theatre audience, in confrontation with great dramatic art or sacred dramatic art, finds within the theatre an opportunity for rendering worship and homage to whatever is revealed in the drama and which, also, participates in eternity. The theatre is a place of worship, whether

---

[13]As quoted by Vogt, Art . . ., p. 25.

[14]Vogt, Modern . . . , p. 18.

recognized as such or not, and the audience is drawn to the theatre in order to participate in this worship. Such was true in the past as it is still true in the present. Referring especially to the art of the theatre, Van der Leeuw elaborates on the writings of Hoffmann:

> Ernst Theodor Hoffmann has said much of importance about this in a little-known article. Young cultures, he asserts, bind man directly to the absolute. In more ancient cultures, on the other hand, man seeks the absolute, the background to his life, in the theater. Thus is explained the mutual interaction of Church and theater, their natural affinity and their enmity. "In the Church, from the very beginning, there lives much of the theater." In the theater, on the other hand, there still reside many relics of the Church. Even in the worst trash there is still a "faltering breath which reminds one of the absolute." In great dramatic art this absolute comes clearly to light.[15]

Engaged in such worship, the audience becomes as a community or cult. Such sacred drama is created in order to engender a common devotional attitude toward the divine and to bind the audience by a common love for the divine. Sacred drama is inspired by the love of God and is successful to the extent that it arouses and preserves, within the members of the audience-cult, such a love of God. Recently, the Religious Drama Project of the American Educational Theatre Association formulated the following definition:

> Religious drama includes not only a literature but also a body of acts and skills religiously inspired and motivated. Religious drama, as literature, is based upon a centrally religious theme and has a

---

[15]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 101.

> religious impact upon its participants and witnesses. This may include experiences of worship, plays for entertainment, educational drama, and creative dramatics. It is not concerned exclusively with propaganda and/or edification. It is not limited to acts of worship and chancel drama, although it may be of these things. Religious drama is written, produced, and performed in a spirit of reverence and with concern for the enrichment of its participants, church, and community.[16]

Indeed, Greek drama was established as a cult institution. It was a community endeavor focused upon the divine and conceived so as to arouse a common acknowledgment of divinity. Loew indicates:

> From its beginning, tragedy was established as a cult institution of the people . . . The dramatists who competed with one another in teaching the Athenians "who they were" resurrected the rich tradition of myth that all the people held in common and through a free manipulation of familiar themes they contributed more than any other group to the Great Awakening.[17]

This is not merely the esoteric stance of an ancient society, but a living attitude existing in contemporary society also. Klapp, in a recent study entitled Ritual and Cult, emphasizes this matter. He states:

> In symbolizing ritual ideas for society, the priest or magician, like the stage-player, acts "for" others, i.e., plays a part with which they can identify. His role, thus, is dramatic because it is performed for an audience--if only an audience of one . . . The people who watch are part of the audience and of the ritual, to the extent that they understand it. Even though not physically acting, they are members, one might say, of the cult.[18]

---

[16]As quoted by Ehrensperger, op. cit., p. 69

[17]Loew, op. cit., p. 239.

[18]Klapp, op. cit., p. 12.

The performance of a sacred or mystery play--the play written by the playwright-priest--is ritualistic. Its design in space and time and its broad conception is patterned after the ritual presentation of religion. The sacred drama is a dynamic passage in time of those symbolic images founded upon the concrete reality of existence and designating a transmundane sphere of eternal reality. Dramatic art is not merely the depiction of nature but a guidepost designating the eternal. It is a ritual created in time and pointing to God. Van der Leeuw indicates the ritual character of the drama. He states:

> The actor does not play the role of a man, but the role of a role. Art is not imitation, but reduction of everything to a single principle. Dramatic art is ritual.[19]

Historically, the theatre has been characterized by its ritual nature. Ross, a philosopher, has described the Greek theatre thus:

> The drama of ancient Greece was occasional art which contained the ritual forms but developed them in original ways. It was performed at religious festivals which included the entire community, but new plays were written every year; Greek drama was like a ritual created afresh annually by individual artists. The dramatic poet was highly individuated, but he had a function in the community, which was for the sake of the community. Even if he was critical of his own land, like the tragic poet Euripedes or the comic poet Aristophanes, it was to instruct the community, of which he felt himself fully a member.[20]

---

[19]Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 89.

[20]Ross, op. cit., p. 232.

And Maxwell Anderson, the playwright, testifies that the ritual character of the drama is essential and intrinsic to the nature of dramatic art--irrespective of epoch or milieu. Anderson states:

> The forms of both tragedy and comedy have changed a good deal in nonessentials, but in essentials--and especially in the core of meaning which they must have for audiences--they are in the main the same religious rites which grew up around the altars of Attica long ago.[21]

Paradoxically, even an atheist such as Jean Paul Sartre presents similar testimony:

> To us a play should not seem too familiar. Its greatness derives from its social and, in a certain sense, religious functions: it must remain a rite. . . [22]

It has been shown earlier that ritual is an affirmation and, further, a sacrament for the participant. So, also, is the dramatic presentation a sacrament for the participant. Participation in dramatic ritual is an acknowledgment of the absolute and a source of strength and hope. Man renews his confidence and character through the theatre and acquires understanding and orientation for his life. Through the sacrament of theatre and sacred drama, man is purified and strengthened. Through such participation and attendance, man acquires a vision of the future and the motive power requisite for altering his present self and environment in

---

[21]Anderson, op. cit., p. 49.

[22]Jean Paul Sartre, "Forgers of Myths." T. Cole (ed.), op. cit., p. 123.

order to attain such a future. The theatre as sacrament is a basis for the rejuvenation of mankind. It is acknowledged that art in general has such a power. Vogt states:

> And the artist not only creates new forms of material beauty but also new persons. The very essence of the thing that happens to people when they are impressed by beauty, either of nature or of art, is increased vitality. They are literally remade, increased in strength of body and strength of mind.[23]

And it is recognized that theatre art has such a function also. Anderson, again, states:

> They are evidence to me that the theatre at its best is a religious affirmation, an age-old rite restating and reassuring man's belief in his own destiny and his ultimate hope. The theatre is much older than the doctrine of evolution, but its one faith, asseverated again and again for every age and every year, is a faith in evolution, in the reaching and the climb of men toward distant goals, glimpsed but never seen, perhaps never achieved, or achieved only to be passed impatiently on the way to a more distant horizon.[24]

Indeed, the cathartic power of the theatre was the great dramatic insight of Aristotle. Man divests himself of pity and fear and replaces them with compassion and courage--each of these last two qualities being contingent upon an enhanced understanding. Kitto refers to the religious drama and comments on Aristotle. Kitto states:

> In fact, what this religious drama gives us is rather Awe and Understanding. Its true Catharsis arises from this, that when we have seen terrible things happening in the play, we understand, as we

---

[23]Vogt, Art . . . , p. 26.

[24]Anderson, op. cit., p. 50.

> cannot always do in life, why they have happened; or, if not so much as that, at least we see that they have not happened by chance, without any significance. We are given the feeling that the Universe is coherent, even though we may not understand it completely.[25]

And Ehrensperger emphasizes the rejuvenating and sacramental nature of the drama. He asserts:

> The efficacy of the play is derived from the depth and extent of the sharing of the performance. The member of the audience leaves the theater as a re-created human being. Because of the creative work of the dramatist and performers the audience becomes changed human beings. Participants have been re-created, and the power and permanence of this re-creation is the yardstick for the measurement of the greatness of the dramatic experience.[26]

It is drama which orients man in its own special manner. It is drama which cautions man about his mistakes so that man can avoid such mistakes in the future. It is drama which redeems human life. Ehrensperger, again, indicates:

> Drama then, like other arts, is that which keeps us from wasting our minds, energies, and lives. It shows us a way to a better way and puts us to work saving what is worthy of being saved that we and others possess. Because the dramatic experience has shown how the redemption of life takes place we are saved from the stupidities and losses of our past selves. Drama, both in and out of the theater, can lay its stern and uncompromising reality upon us, irritating and arousing us to the realization of the way we must go in doing our duty to fulfill our destinies. This is a religious experience.[27]

---

[25]H. D. F. Kitto, Form and Meaning in Drama (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960), p. 235.

[26]Ehrensperger, op. cit., p. 18.

[27]Ibid., p. 21.

The ritual of the sacred drama is a pathway through which human destiny is fulfilled. In any finer sense of the word, drama is rightfully termed a religious experience. In the broader realm of art, it is the paradigmatic form of the religious experience. And, finally, it is the playwright as priest who makes such an experience possible.

Summary

To summarize the chapter, the playwright as priest creates and employs a special sort of language occurring in a special sort of place and time. The language employed is sacred language--as opposed to profane language--and it occurs in a sacred place and time--as opposed to a profane place and time. Further, such a playwright-priest regards a theatre audience as a worshipping cult which participates in the conduct of a ritual performance and, also, derives the special benefits that such participation entails. Again, there is a body of language regarded as sacred which is grounded in a transnatural realm and which seeks to describe this same realm. Through the usage of such language men participate in the extraordinary. It is this language which describes or indicates the eternal or the sphere of "things which do not exist." Not only is the drama a vehicle for the revelation of sacred language, but the place wherein such language reveals itself becomes sacred also. Religious man not only distinguishes between sacred and profane language, but between sacred and profane place or space. That place

as on the theatre stage where the mystery or sacred drama unfolds itself to reveal "an absolute reality" is rightfully designated as sacred. Wherever God reveals himself is sacred and holy ground. Further, the time in which such a dramatic presentation occurs is rightfully designated as sacred also. That time in which eternity reveals itself is sacred. It is a time removed from the ordinary for in it all time or eternity occurs. The audience at such a theatrical presentation forms a society gathered together to render homage and devotion to the divine. Drama which is sacred and holy becomes as the religious ritual dedicated to the enhancement of God and the worshipper. Drama, as it symbolizes divinity, yields a significant mode of worship for a theatre audience. Engaged in such worship, the audience becomes as a community or cult. The performance of a sacred or mystery play--the play written by the playwright-priest--is ritualistic. Its design in space and time and its broad conception is patterned after the ritual presentation of religion. Such ritual is an affirmation and, further, a sacrament for the participant. Participation in a dramatic ritual is an acknowledgment of the absolute and a source of strength and hope. Man renews his confidence and character through the theatre and acquires understanding and orientation for his life. Through the sacrament of theatre and sacred drama, man is purified and strengthened. The theatre as sacrament becomes

a basis for the rejuvenation of mankind. The playwright as priest makes such a sacrament and experience possible.

PART II

CALDERÓN: A PLAYWRIGHT-PRIEST

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In this second section, the dramatic work of Pedro Calderón de la Barca will be considered in order to exemplify and analyze the actual artistic practice and tangible literary production of the playwright who assumes the priestly role. In this introduction, the historical context will be reviewed in order to establish the physical, psychological and spiritual background of the playwright with special emphasis being directed toward the relationship of Calderón to the aesthetic doctrine of the time.[1]

The Golden Age of Spain is generally conceded to span the period from 1479, with the union of Ferdinand

---

[1]The following historical and biographical material is drawn from the following: Martin Hume, Court of Philip IV (London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, Limited, No Publication date); John A. Crow, Spain: The Root and The Flower (New York: Harper and Row Co., 1963); R. Trevor Davies, Spain In Decline: 1621-1700 (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1957); J. H. Elliott, Imperial Spain: 1469-1716 (New York: The New American Library, 1966); R. Trevor Davies, The Golden Century of Spain: 1501-1621 (New York: Harper and Row Co., 1965); Everett W. Hesse, Calderón de la Barca (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc. 1967); George Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature (New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1849, Republished 1965), Vol. II; and Richard E. Chandler and Kessel Schwartz, A New History of Spanish Literature (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1961).

of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, to the year 1681 and the assumption of the Spanish crown by Philip IV. Thereafter, and to the end of the Seventeenth Century, Spain suffered a steady and lasting decline in its national and international power and prosperity. Noteworthy occurences during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella were the discovery of America in 1492 and, in the same year, the conquest of Granada ending the Moorish presence in Spain (711-1492). Also, in the same year, Spanish pride, envy and excessive ethnocentrism resulted in the expulsion of the Jews from the country. In 1504, Spain conquered Naples, thus, extending its influence and dominion to Italy. In this same year, Isabella died leaving the country under the regency of King Ferdinand who died, himself, in 1516. This period of solitary rule is marked by the founding of the University of Alcala--one of the foremost universities during the period of the Golden Age. In 1516 and until 1556, Charles I held the Spanish throne. Under his rulership and in accord with the impetus originally engendered by Ferdinand and Isabella, exploration and conquest resulting in enormous sources of gold and wealth for Spain was fostered. In 1519, Cortes entered Mexico and by 1521 had conquered the country. In 1531, Pizarro entered Peru and by 1532 had conquered this country also. The enormous store of wealth derived for Spain by these conquests was rapidly diminished by

inflation, corruption and the profligacy of the Spanish ruling class. In this same period, Luther in Germany was advocating reform within the Catholic Church leading to his excommunication from the Church in 1521. The most significant opposition to the power of the Catholic Church within a period of over a thousand years had taken place. The opposition was to grow in power, influence and success until its effects were even felt in distant Spain. Catholicism was forced into a defensive and self-justifying stance. In Spain, the most notable reaction was the founding of the Society of Jesus or the Jesuits by Ignatius Loyola, thus, lending the Church a militant force with which to combat the new radicalism and heresy. Dogma had been successfully challenged and the first inroads into the confidence and assurance of Catholic nations such as Spain, which were heretofore spiritually and psychologically unimpaired, were surely being made. In 1556, Charles V who was also beset with political and economic problems abdicated the throne. Philip II assumed the throne until 1598, but could not restore the troubled economy to stability or placate the growing hostilities of other European powers. Political reaction and recrimination were commonplace as exemplified by a law promulgated in 1559 forbidding Spaniards to study at foreign universities. In 1562, Lope de Vega, another great playwright of the period, was born. The tremulous international

situation had not abated itself and in 1568 the Inquisition in a grave gesture and for religious and economic reasons condemned all the people of Flanders to death. In 1571, Don John of Austria defeated the Turks, longtime enemies of Spain, in a naval battle at Lepanto thereby granting the Spaniards a long sought bit of good fortune amidst the constant dismay of the time. In 1588, however, the "Invincible Armada" suffered defeat and disaster during a conflict with England. Spain lost its former stature as an international power and was forced to curb its slighted ambitions to the bounds of its own borders. In 1598, and until 1621, Philip III was King of Spain. In 1599, Velazquez, the greatest painter of the period, was born. In 1605, Cervantes wrote the first part of Don Quixote. Calderón was born on January 17 of the year 1600. In 1608, and until 1613, Calderón attended the Colegio Imperial, a Jesuit school in Madrid. From 1614 to 1620, he divided his time between the University of Alcala and the University of Salamanca where he received a degree in canonical law, which along with theology, scholastic philosophy and logic, was his favorite subject. It was during this period in the year 1616 that both Cervantes and Shakespeare died. In the year 1620, Calderón entered a literary competition held at Madrid in honor of the canonization of San Isidro and won prizes for his poetry and praise from the judge Lope de Vega. In the year 1621 and until 1665, Philip IV

was the King of Spain. In 1623, Calderón wrote his first play, Love, Honor and Power, which was performed during the same year in Madrid. The years from 1630 to 1650 were those of his most productive dramatic output. Under the reign of Philip IV, a great theatre was established in the Palace of the Buen Retiro at the Spanish court in Madrid. Here, Lope de Vega was a prominent playwright until 1635 when he died. The position was then assumed by Calderón who remained a part of the insulated and ornamented court life until his death. In 1651, Calderón was ordained a priest following the death of two brothers and a mistress. He then served as a royal chaplain to the King. In 1665, Philip IV died and left the kingdom to his son, Charles II, who ruled until 1700. Spain had already seen its best days. Elliott has described the state of the country which was bequeathed to Charles II. He states:

> The Castile bequeathed by Philip IV to his four-year-old son was a nation awaiting a saviour. It had suffered defeat and humiliation at the hands of its traditional enemies, the French. It had lost the last vestiges of its political hegemony over Europe, and seen some of its most valuable overseas possessions fall into the hands of the heretical English and Dutch. Its currency was chaotic, its industry in ruins, its population demoralized and diminished. Burgos and Seville, formerly the twin motors of the Castilian economy, had both fallen on evil times: the population of Burgos, which had been about 13,000 in the 1590's, was down to a mere 3,000 by 1646, and Seville lost 60,000 inhabitants--half its population--in the terrible plague of 1649. While the rival city of Cadiz gradually arrogated to itself the position in the American trade previously enjoyed by Seville, the trade itself was now largely controlled by foreign merchants, who had secured numerous concessions

> from the Spanish Crown. Castile was dying, both economically and politically; and as the hopeful foreign mourners gathered at the death-bed, their agents rifled the house.[2]

From the vantage point of the art historian and most relevant to the purpose of this study, the period has best been described by Emile Male in his study entitled Religious Art. Male States:

> We must endeavor to conceive what took place in the minds and hearts of a Spanish nun or an Italian mendicant friar when they were told by travelers from the North that Protestants were demolishing statues of the Virgin, burning crucifixes, transpiercing with their swords the images of saints. In a picture of the Crucifixion Christ had been torn to shreds, while with diabolical irony the figure of the bad thief had been left intact. In a reredos devoted to Saint Michael, the archangel had been destroyed while the demon at his feet was spared.
> In Germany and Switzerland Holy Mass was derided, the Real Presence denied, the Virgin defamed. Brentius said: "She was not without sin"; "Nor was she a virgin," declared Lucas Sternberg. Another repeated a sarcastic remark of Constantine Copronymus: "When she bore Christ within her womb, she was like a purse filled with gold. But after giving birth she was no more than an empty purse." "Those who recite the Ave Maria in her honor," said Weygandus, "commit the crime of idolatry, for they make a goddess of a woman." And Luther: "If you believe in Christ, you are as holy as she.". . .
> Ignatius Loyola, unable to convince one of his traveling companions of Mary's virginity, was tempted to make use of his dagger. A few days later he hung the weapon in the Church of Montserrat and dedicated it to the Virgin.
> The same dismay which gripped the hearts of a soldier on the roads of Spain and of a nun in her cell took possession of the entire Catholic Church. From the height of the Castel Sant'Angelo Clement VII, most unfortunate of popes, saw Rome ravaged and plundered by roving bands of Lutherans. Denmark, Norway, Sweden, England all broke away from the Church. The Turks invaded the Christian kingdom of Hungary and Solyman appeared before the walls

---

[2]Elliott, op. cit., p. 355.

> of Vienna. A medal which Clement ordered struck at the time shows Christ bound to the column, and underneath the somber device: Post multa, plurima restant. The profound sadness of the time was echoed by Michelangelo in the tombs of the Medici; all hope seems lost for these figures as they contemplate life with scorn or turn from it to sleep. Clement believed that the dreadful prophecies of the Apocalypse were about to come true, that the end of the world was at hand. Accordingly, shortly before his death, he asked Michelangelo to paint the Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel. The great work was conceived in these tragic years.
>
> It is not our place here to tell how the Church found within herself the saving faith and love; how she affirmed her dogmas at the Council of Trent; how she reformed herself and undertook, with the aid of the religious orders, the Jesuits in particular, to reconquer Europe. We can only say that for a century and a half the struggle against Protestantism was her constant preoccupation. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries not only theology but, as we shall see, art itself was affected by the controversy and sometimes even became one of the forms assumed by the controversy. Thus the art of the Counter Reformation defends all the dogmas attacked by the Protestants.

The term Baroque is commonly used in designating such art of the Counter Reformation. Baroque art is characterized by high measures of emotion, passion and vitality both in its content and manner of expression. Such art, further, seems to strive toward the infinite and eternal using asymetrical design with an excessive reliance upon curved configuration and almost ceaseless ornamentation. Baroque art stands in reactive opposition to the Classicism of the early Sixteenth Century Renaissance.[4] Benét, in The Reader's Encyclopedia, defines

---

[3]Emile Male, Religious Art (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1949), pp. 167-168.

[4]A most significant study establishing five sets of descriptive categories for the distinguishing of Renais-

the term Baroque as follows:

> A term applied to certain tendencies in European art in the latter 16th, the 17th, and the first half of the 18th centuries. Initially, and still primarily, the term referred to a free, exuberant style of architecture which supplanted the restrained and balanced style of the earlier Renaissance, but it was later applied to similar tendencies in painting, music, sculpture, and literature. The baroque style was dramatic, grandiose, ornate, full of motifs and forms expressive of conflict and energy. Originating in Italy and Spain, it spread throughout Europe, but is closely identified, especially in architecture, with Catholic Europe and was virtually the official style of the Counter Reformation. In literature the baroque spirit manifested itself in such movements as MARINISM in Italy, GONGORISM in Spain, and EUPHUISM in England.5

The Baroque style, often considered as merely a designation for the plastic arts, had its definite manifestation and influence within the literature of the period.[6] Such a Baroque style in literature has

---

sance from Baroque Art is contained in the book by Heinrich Wolfflin entitled Principles of Art History (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1932).

[5]William Rose Benét, The Reader's Encyclopedia (New York: Thomas Growell Co., 1965), pp. 80-81.

[6]The parallel influence and relationship between Baroque painting and Baroque literature has been established in many studies. The most authoritative nexus between the two has been established by René Wellek in an article entitled "The Concept of Baroque in Literary Scholarship," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, V (1946), 80 ff. The study analyzes the usage of the term Baroque and the fact of its proper reference to literature. In a lengthy appendix to the study, Wellek lists dozens of volumes and articles wherein the term has been applied to literature. Two noteworthy studies relate the drama of Calderón, specifically, to the painting of the period. First, Everett W. Hesse, in an article entitled "Calderón and Velazquez," Hispania, XXV (1952), 74-82, establishes "the similarity of certain aspects of theme, style, technique, and attitudes in the works of Calderón and Velazquez." Second, Eunice Gates, in an article entitled "Calderón's Interest in Art," Philological Quarterly, XL (1961), 53-67, concludes that "It is evident then that Calderón's interest in

been described by Richard Alewyn, the noted German critic. Writing in The Dictionary of World Literature, he states:

> Baroque style in literature is one that deliberately rejects the finite for the infinite and the indefinite, that sacrifices harmony and proportion to dynamism, that chooses the antithetical and the explosive, the playful and the obscure. This dualism inherent in baroque thought renews late medievalism and contrasts violently with the monism of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. Baroque man accordingly is characterized as unbalanced, staggering between sensuality and spirituality, driven by violent impulses, inextricably caught between lust and death.[7]

Elliott, as Alewyn, designates this same "dualism" and notes it as "the most striking characteristic" of the period. Elliott, in a reference to Cervantes, states:

> . . . he illustrates what was to be the most striking characteristic of seventeenth-century literary and artistic production--that deep cleavage between the two worlds of the spirit and the flesh, which co-exist and yet are for ever separate. This constant dualism between the spirit and the flesh, the dream and the reality, belonged very much to seventeenth-century European civilization as a whole, but it seems to have attained an intensity in Spain that it rarely achieved elsewhere. It is apparent in the writings of Calderon and the portraits of Velazquez, and it prompted the bitter satires of Quevedo.[8]

The Spanish Baroque theatre was one committed to the unquestioning and uncritical promulgation of

---

art was an abiding one. It became an integral part of his drama, and it reflects not only his personal feelings but also the taste of his time--both in religious art and in portrait painting."

[7]Joseph T. Shipley (ed.,) Dictionary of World Literature (Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1960), p. 35.

[8]Elliott, op. cit., pp. 315-316.

the sophisticated philosophy of the Catholic Church.[9] Roaten and Sánchez y Escribano, in discussing a play by Calderón, state:

> But, like the majority of the serious plays of seventeenth century Spain, it is essentially a sermon on Catholic theology and morals. The Spanish Baroque theater, like the plastic arts, exists as a continuous polemic on the Catholic way of life, which was in many ways a mixture of the ideals of the Middle Ages and those of the Renaissance.10

Though there are some who favor Lope de Vega, the consensus of scholarly opinion designates Calderón as the outstanding dramatist of the Spanish Golden Age. Crow, for example, states:

> Calderón is the Baroque dramatist par excellence. He brought the Golden Age to its conclusion in a contorted blaze of words and symbols. He was the poet of Spanish Catholicism. Besides his longer plays Calderón was the author of numerous "starry autos," to use Shelley's phrase, symbolic religious pieces of great poetic beauty. The Counter Reformation had by this time clamped down on all free thought in Spain, leaving room only for straight dogma plus endless embellishment. Character analysis and fundamental questioning are lacking in the dramas.

---

[9]Werner Weisbach, in Baroque as The Art of The Counter Reformation (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1921), emphasizes the propagandistic and polemic character of Baroque art. Mention should be made, also, of the volume by Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuit Order which led the thrust of the Counter Reformation in Spain, entitled Spiritual Exercises. Loyola advocates the usage of highly detailed and elaborated imagery as an aid in the religious life. The artists of the day were dutiful in following such advice. Weisbach, also, refers to the art of the Baroque as "Jesuit art."

[10]Darnell H. Roaten and F. Sánchez y Escribano, Wolfflin's Principles in Spanish Drama: 1500-1700 (New York: Hispanic Institute in The United States, 1952), pp. 168-169.

> of the Golden Age. This is the true meaning of the Baroque in literature, which has its counterpart in the other arts as well, particularly in architecture.[11]

The lack of "free thought" and "fundamental questioning" which characterizes the conclusions of the dramas of the Spanish Golden Age is definitely and explicitly descriptive of the drama of Calderón. Hesse describes Calderón thus:

> At first glance Calderón's racionalismo (rationalism) seems to possess the quality of a never-ending search for new truth, but a closer scrutiny reveals that there is always a truth in his mind which is fixed and complete for all eternity. The dialectical method is in no way investigatory; it is an Aristotelian device which in Calderón's theater draws the consequences from truths already acknowledged through the teachings of the Church, rather than through seeking new truths. The convolutions of controlled arguments do no more than simulate the search for truth; their real value lies in the dramatic conflict they depict and the emotional impact they produce on the audience and reader.[12]

The artistic characteristics and extravagances of Baroque architecture and painting were designated in the sphere of literature by a set of aesthetic principles which have variously been referred to as "Gongorismo"

---

[11] Crow, op. cit., pp. 204-205. Further, Bruce W. Wardropper (ed.) in Critical Essays on The Theatre of Calderón (New York: New York University Press, 1965,) p. 3, states "that Calderón must unquestionably rank as the greatest theological dramatist that Catholicism has yet produced." Alexander A. Parker in The Allegorical Drama of Calderón (London: Dolphin Book Co. Ltd., 1943,) p. 69, states that Calderón was "the dramatist of Scholasticism in general, as Dante was the poet of Thomism in particular."

[12] Hesse, op. cit., p. 41.

and "Culteranismo."[13] A brief consideration of these principles and characteristics is in order as Calderón was one of the major conveyors of such qualities in the drama of the time. Chandler and Schwartz, in discussing Calderón, state:

> He was a formal and Baroque writer, quite susceptible to the exaggerations, distortions, and rotund style of Gongorism and was its chief exponent in the theater.[14]

Hesse, further, discusses Calderón and defines "Gongorismo" and "Conceptismo." He states:

> Calderón's plays include much Gongorism and conceptism. The term Gongorism (gongorismo), which derives from the name of the leading poet of the era, Gongora, means a deliberate ornamentation and obscurity of style through the excessive use of mythological allusions, archaic words and neologisms, hyperboles and their accumulation, a highly Latinized syntax, rhetorical devices and figures of speech and a general striving for effect. Conceptism (conceptismo), found chiefly in prose, refers to cultivated subtlety, play on words, and the use of dialectics and casuistry. Quevedo and Gracian were the principal cultivators of conceptism.[15]

Colford, in an introduction to the play Life Is a Dream, discusses "Culteranismo" and its frequent practice in the dramas of Calderón. Colford describes it thus:

> . . . culteranismo was the ostentation of "culture": an affected erudition calculated to lend artificial brilliance to literary style by the excessive use

---

[13] A complete study of Gongorism, the major stylistic device in Spanish Golden Age literature, is contained in a volume by Elisha K. Kane entitled Gongorism and The Golden Age (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1928).

[14] Chandler and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 93.

[15] Hesse, op. cit., p. 17.

> of classical allusions and mythological references, extravagant metaphors and strained imagery; the use of archaic words, and the introduction of neologisms, or the use of standard words with deliberately obscure meanings; and a strongly latinized syntax which often did violence to the Spanish language by the suppression of articles and conjunctions, the twisting of the word order, and the abuse of rhetorical devices.[16]

So much for the principles of verbal stylization which constitute such an integral part of the drama of Calderón. As for the broader dramaturgy or formula which yielded the concrete framework of the Golden Age drama, Calderón contributed little that was innovative. Lope de Vega had already established the framework and Calderón chose to remain within its bounds. The best scholarship has remained consistent in regard to this point. Ticknor, the great Harvard student of Spanish literature, writing in 1849 stated:

> Calderón has added to the stage no new form of dramatic composition. Nor has he much modified those forms which had been already arranged and settled by Lope de Vega.[17]

And, Hesse, in recent times states:

> Lope de Vega founded the national theater of seventeenth century Spain and set the basic formula of the comedia--three acts in verse--which Calderón inherited and perfected. Calderón invented little that was new . . .[18]

And, Hesse, again:

---

[16] Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Life Is A Dream, trans. William E. Colford (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1958), p. iii.

[17] Ticknor, op. cit., p. 370.

[18] Hesse, op. cit., p. 160.

> When Calderón began writing for the theater, the dramatic formula had already been moulded. His predecessor, Lope de Vega (1562-1635), had developed what came to be called the comedia ("drama" rather than "comedy"), a three-act play in verse. In his The New Art of Play Writing (El arte nuevo de hacer comedias, 1609), Lope set forth some rules for composing plays. The first act is to concern itself with explanation, the second with complication and the third with the resolution of the plot, but the denouement is left to the last scene to discourage the spectators from vacating the theater before the play ends.[19]

Such is the concrete structure of the drama of Calderón and the Golden Age. Now consider the broad speculative view within which this same drama was constructed. Art was wrought within the purview of a religious outlook toward life. The unquestioned religion of the time was Catholicism. This Catholicism, as manifested in Scholastic Philosophy or the "philosophia perennia," engendered its own necessary and consistent aesthetic system such as the one which has already been considered.[20] Art was symbolic and

---

[19] Ibid., p. 16. A complete version of Lope de Vega's essay entitled "The New Art of Writing Plays in This Age" is included in Barrett H. Clark (ed.,) European Theories of The Drama (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965,) pp. 63-67. The staging practices of the period have been described well and briefly by Crow, op. cit., pp. 206-207. An extensive and most authoritative description of the staging techniques of the period is to be found in the volume by Hugo A. Rennert entitled The Spanish Stage in The Time of Lope de Vega (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963).

[20] See Frederic C. Copleston, the famous Jesuit philosopher, in his work entitled A History of Philosophy (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1947,) Vol. I, p. 2, for a usage of the term "philosophia perennis"

indicative of the paradigm or "primal idea" within the eternal mind of God. Participation by the artist through his own glimpse of such a paradigm granted art its worth and durable quality. Calderón was undoubtedly such an artist. Calderón bore the great and broader vision of the playwright who assumes the role of priest. Curtius describes him accordingly:

> Like Dante, Calderón is a Christian poet, in the highest and most definite sense of the term. This means: his picture of man and the world has as its center belief in God as postulated by the Church. But Lope too is to the highest degree a "religious poet" and "believing priest." The dogma, the ceremonial, and the mysticism of Catholicism are so essentially and intimately connected with the culture of the Spanish siglo de oro that they are everywhere perceptible as the vital basis of the age. This historical fact--whose establishment has nothing to do with a romanticizing apotheosis of Spain--allows us to understand the necessity for also fitting into the theocentric world picture of Christianity the secular cultural forces of the period: monarchy, national conciousness, politics, together with the theater, the arts, the sciences. An art theory founded in Christian speculation was not only preserved as part of the patristic and scholastic stock of ideas; in great poets it could also become living again as a creative and organizing principle. This is the final basis of Calderón's concept of painting too. Painting received its highest nobility from the fact that God used it in his work of creation. But in Calderón, as we saw, the divine Logos is not only a painter, but also architect, musician, poet. In him all arts have their common origin and their primal idea.[21]

---

to describe Scholastic Philosophy. Further, the most precise formulation of the aesthetic doctrine engendered by Medieval Catholicism and Scholastic Philosophy which is quite in accord with the aesthetic doctrine formulated in this study is to be found in the volume by Jacques Maritain entitled Art and Scholasticism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.)

[21] Ernst R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963,) p. 568.

Accordingly, Calderón saw life as a product of the divine art of God and, finally, the drama as an artistic configuration of signs and symbols indicative of an eternal and transcendent realm beyond. Parker, also, describes Calderón thus and states that his works are:

> . . . essentially a poetry of the invisible beauty which can be vaguely yearned for on earth but never found, and which is not accessible to the senses apart from symbols; and all true poetry is an allegorical symbol of transcendent truth and beauty. Calderón has seized on the perfect method of conveying the mysterious and incomprehensible through the senses. Eternal truth should not be presented in the cold formulae of metaphysical abstractions: they should be fused with the poetic form in such a way that the allegory comes to life, and allegorical characters do not only mean something but become real living beings. And it is precisely this that Calderón is able to achieve.[22]

But Calderón, directly, makes an exact statement to this effect. The character of the Author or God in The Great Theatre of The World, a play to be discussed, states a belief which Calderón, himself, can hardly be expected to disbelieve. He states:

> If men might choose to be or not to be, no man would choose to bear life's heavy yoke unless he might be ruler and director of all other men--and all forgetful that what he thinks is life is only drama, the signs and symbols and reflections of some other life to come.[23]

It is to be expected, therefore, that Calderón, who has already been called "the Baroque dramatist par

---

[22]Parker, op. cit., p. 28.

[23]Pedro Calderón de la Barca, "The Great Theatre of The World," Masterpieces of the Spanish Golden Age, ed. Angel Flores (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957,) p. 372.

excellence," should fulfill the "Baroque ideal" as described by Roaten and Sánchez y Escribano who state:

> The Baroque ideal . . . a complete syntheses of all the elements of form and idealogy into an ecstatic vision that points to the ultimate end of Baroque thought and ambition and of Baroque art, that is, to God.[24]

Accordingly, this study will proceed by considering the manner in which Calderón, a playwright-priest, accomplishes and fulfills the priestly obligation and quest toward this eternal God through the concrete and visible activity of playwriting and dramatic presentation.

---

[24] Roaten and Sánchez y Escribano, op. cit., p. 107. The great French playwright, Jean Giraudoux, in Cole, op. cit., p. 63, states that "Calderón is humanity confessing its thirst for eternity . . ."

CHAPTER II

THREE PLAYS

Three plays by Calderón will now be considered in order to demonstrate the concrete practice and the resultant drama created by the playwright who assumes the priestly role. In such a capacity, the playwright is responsible for the promulgation of three modes of doctrine and, directly or indirectly, the advocacy of adherance to the same. These modes of doctrine correspond to the three facets of the priestly task which have already been considered; namely, the sacrificial, prophetic, and pastoral. The aim here is to consider three major and characteristic dramas by Calderón and to show that such modes of doctrine are essential and intrinsic to these dramas. This is to assert that the presentation and reception of such doctrine constitutes the major intent of the artist. Such doctrine, whatever other satisfaction may be derived, constitutes the theme of the drama and is the basis for its creation. In order to exemplify the playwright-priest in his role as the promulgator and advocator of sacrificial doctrine, Life is a Dream will be analyzed and interpreted. The Mayor of Zalamea will exemplify the prophetic task of the playwright-priest

and The Great Theatre of The World, finally, will exemplify the pastoral task of the playwright-priest.[1]

The curtain rises on the play Life is a Dream with the entrance of Rosaura, dressed as a man for the sake of safety on the long journey from Russia to Poland in which the action of the play occurs, and Clarin, her comic man-servant. They appear on the side of a rugged and remote mountain which is at one side of the stage and which is faced by a prison-like palace at the other side. Rosaura and Clarin are lost and each bemoan their present misfortune. They spy the prison which is:

> So small it shrinks to look up at the sun.
> Its form and size are such that at the foot
> Of sun-tipped crags and cliffs all circling 'round
> It's like a boulder toppled to the ground (p. 2).

In curiosity, they draw closer to the door of the tower and become frightened at the clanking of chains from within. They observe Segismundo who is the son of Basilio, the king of Poland, chained as a prisoner inside the tower. They overcome their fright and initial tendency to flee and draw nearer to overhear Segismundo bemoan his cruel fate. Segismundo, dressed in animal skins and unaware of his identity and relationship to the king, decries his loss of physical freedom. Segismundo

---

[1]The versions of the three dramas by Pedro Calderón de la Barca utilized in this chapter are as follow: Life is a Dream, trans. William E. Colford (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1958). The Mayor of Zalamea, trans. William E. Colford (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1959). The Great Theatre of the World, trans. Mack Hendricks Singleton, in Angel Flores (ed.), Masterpieces of the Spanish Golden Age (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957).

considers the freedom of the bird and beast and questions Heaven as to the reason for his burdensome fate:

> And what of Me?
> Should I, with greater free will, be less free?
> . . .
> And as I reach this angry pitch I burn
> With Etna's fierce volcanic fires, and want
> To tear my heart in pieces from my breast.
> What law, what reason can deny to man
> That gift so sweet, so natural, that God
> Has giv'n a stream, a fish, a beast, a bird (p. 5)?

Rosaura overhears and feels great pity for Segismundo. She addresses her compassion to Segismundo whose response is to seize Rosaura and threaten her with death for having been witness to his moment of self-pitying weakness. Clarin is too weak and fearful to intercede but the gentleness of Rosaura's plaintive voice halts Segismundo who is not aware that he is clutching a woman. Segismundo states:

> Thy voice has moved me, thy appearance stays
> My hand, and the respect I feel for thee
> Disturbs me. Who art thou? Although in here
> I know so little of the world, because
> This tow'r has been my cradle and my tomb;
> And though since birth (if this is what birth is)
> I only know this desert region where
> I'm living like a living skeleton,
> A dead man who's alive; and though I've seen
> And talked to just one person here who feels
> Compassion for my sorrows, and through who
> I have some notion of Heav'n and earth;
> And though thou may'st be more amazed and call
> Me human monster in thy stunned surprise,
> I am a man among wild beasts, a wild
> Beast among men; and though amid such grave
> Misfortunes I have studied politics.
> Informed by animals and taught by birds,
> And I have traced the paths of pallid stars;
> 'Tis thou alone hast brought such passion to
> My anger, admiration to my eyes,
> And wonder to my ears (p. 6).

The "one person" to whom Segismundo refers is Clotaldo, his aged tutor, who has been appointed by Basilio to tend to the care and upbringing of the disowned and abused prince. Rosaura replies:

> I look at thee with wonder, and I hear
> Thee with astonishment, and do not know
> What I can say to thee, nor what to ask.
> I'll only say that to this place today
> Heaven has guided me to be consoled,
> If it can be the consolation of
> A wretch to see one who's more wretched still (p. 7).

She is interrupted by Clotaldo who, accompanied by soldiers and armed with a pistol, denounces and threatens her and Clarin for their intrusion into the private and secluded tower. Segismundo pleads in their behalf but is chastened by Clotaldo. Segismundo sighs to Heaven for besetting him with such unending misfortune. Segismundo is removed and locked in a cell while Clotaldo questions Rosaura and Clarin as to their identity and purpose. Rosaura states that she has traveled to Poland in quest of revenge for a misdeed committed against herself. At this point, Rosaura relinquishes her sword to Clotaldo who recognizes it as one he had left many years earlier with his mistress, Violante, while on a mission to Russia. Violante had given the sword to Rosaura so that she would be able to have it witnessed by nobles at the court of Poland and, thereby, acquire a protector while away from her Russian home. Violante, however, did not reveal the name of the potential protector in the event that he had passed away during the interim of years.

Clotaldo recognizes the sword and assumes that Rosaura is his "son" but chooses not to reveal his identity. As he is torn between his loyalty to "son" and king and, at the moment, feeling a stronger allegiance to the king and the necessity to report the trespass, Clotaldo does not reveal his identity so that the "son" will not feel that the father is responsible for whatever punishment the king chooses to administer. Clotaldo, after re-establishing the security of the tower departs for the court of Poland with his two prisoners. At the court, Astolfo, the Duke of Moscovy is wooing his cousin Estrella. They are nephew and niece to the king who is preparing for retirement due to age and fatigue. Neither knows of the existence of Segismundo and both regard themselves as potential and immediate heirs to the throne. They have met in order to avert a possible civil war. It is Astolfo's plan to marry Estrella and resolve the situation in such a peaceful manner. Estrella voices her skepticism as to the sincerity of his love for her as Astolfo still wears a pendant about his neck with the picture of another woman who is obviously his true love. The picture is that of Roasura and Astolfo is the one upon whom Rosaura seeks revenge. Astolfo, while in Russia, seduced Rosaura using the pretext of imminent marriage as a justification. They are interrupted by the entrance of the king, Basilio, who is hailed as a great sage and astrologer. He greets his niece and nephew with courtesy

and esteem but shocks them with the revelation that Segismundo still lives and that the announcement that Segismundo had died at birth was merely a ruse. Basilio, at the time of Segismundo's birth interpreted the stars as they referred to his son and was frightened at the result. Basilio explains:

> I hastened to
> My books and in them, and in every sign,
> I saw that Segismundo would turn out
> To be a man most bold, a prince most cruel,
> A monarch most ungodly, due to whom
> The kingdom would divide against itself
> And be a school for treason, an academy
> Of vice (p. 21).

In order to avert such calamity, Basilio announced the death and had Segismundo locked away in the secret tower under the care of Clotaldo who:

> Has taught him science and the Christian faith,
> And he alone has been a witness to
> His sufferings (p. 22).

Basilio reconsidered his action and has decided to give Segismundo a chance to prove his worth. He explains:

> We must consider that if I deny
> To my own son the right that every law,
> Both human and divine, has given him,
> This is not Christian charity; because
> There is no law that says in order to
> Restrain another from becoming harsh
> And autocratic that I may be so
> Myself; that if my son's a tyrant, to
> Prevent him from committing crimes then I
> Should perpetrate these very crimes myself (p. 23).

Basilio states that Segismundo will be drugged and brought to the court where he will be awakened so as to give the impression that he is in the midst of a

dream. At that time, those present will respond to his every whim thereby forcing Segismundo to reveal his own true nature. If Segismundo is noble in his behavior then he will be permitted to retain the throne. If not, Basilio will have the satisfaction of having dealt fairly with his son and will then decree that Astolfo and Estrella marry and assume the throne of Poland. The gathering is dismissed but Clotaldo arrives with his prisoners. The king is not angered for he has already revealed the secret of the hidden prince and, thus, Rosaura and Clarin are incapable of creating any harm. The king pardons them and departs. Clotaldo, still curious about the reason for which his "son" is seeking vengeance, gathers that the perpetrator of the misdeed is Astolfo, Duke of Moscovy. Then he realizes that his "son" is actually a female for the only manner in which a nobleman could render such an affront to a subject was by the act of dishonoring a woman.

The second act finds Clotaldo giving a detailed account to Basilio of the drugging of Segismundo. Basilio explains his reason for such an indirect manner of assessing the real character of Segismundo:

> Thus I have desired to leave
> The door, in case of failure, open to
> Declaring all he saw was just a dream.
> This way two questions are resolved at once:
> The first is his condition, for when he
> Awakes he will reveal himself in all
> His thoughts and fancies, and the second is
> The matter of his consolation, for
> Although he now may find himself obeyed
> And later be returned to jail, he can

Believe he dreamed it all; and he will be
Correct in this, Clotaldo, for on earth
Everyone who lives, lives in a dream (pp. 33-34).

Basilio exits and Clarin arrives to converse with Clotaldo. Clarin reports that Rosaura is now more properly attired in the garb of a woman and resides within the palace as a lady in Estrella's retinue. Now, Segismundo, attired in princely garments, arrives in the throneroom. Segismundo is amazed and baffled by his present experience:

Good Heaven Help me! What do I behold!
Good Heaven help me! What do I observe!
I'm startled by it, but have little fear;
Believe it's true, but yet have many doubts (p. 36).

Clotaldo addresses Segismundo with great courtesy and Segismundo is surprised that one who had treated him so badly while a prisoner now is willing to treat him with such deference. Clotaldo explains:

Thou shouldst know, sire,
Thou art a prince and heir apparent to
The throne of Poland; thou hast been withdrawn
And hidden to abey the harsh decree
Of Fate, which forecasts for this Empire, if
The royal laurel crowns thy noble brow,
A thousand tragedies. But trusting in
Thy prudence to prevail over the stars
(Because a man of iron will can dominate
His destiny), thou hast been brought here to
The palace from the tower where thou wert
Confined, while thou wert fast asleep (pp. 37-38).

Segismundo has now accepted the reality of the situation and asserts his new sense of power. Segismundo threatens Clotaldo with death for the past indignities that he has suffered at his hands but is distracted into inaction by the pleading of a servant. Astolfo arrives and identifies himself to Segismundo as a cousin and equal.

Segismundo is enraged at such a notion of equality and, in response, insults and threatens Astolfo with physical harm. Estrella enters and Segismundo is aroused into boorish behavior by her beauty. He attempts to kiss her but is stopped by a servant. Enraged, Segismundo throws the servant from the balcony and kills him. The king now enters and is angered by Segismundo's conduct. Basilio exclaims:

> It causes me great grief
> That when I come here, Prince, expecting to
> Discover that thou hast been warned about
> Thy horoscope, and find thee conquering
> The stars, instead I see thee in so great
> A rage as this, and find the first thing thou
> Hast done in these new circumstances is
> A frightful act of murder. With what love
> Can I embrace thee if I know thine arms
> Are schooled in dealing death in their fierce
> grasp (pp. 43-44).

Segismundo has nothing but disinterest and contempt for the disappointment he has aroused within his father:

> Well, I can get along without it, just
> As I have done without it up to now.
> A father who can treat me with such great
> Severity, and whose harsh character
> Can keep me from his side and bring me up
> From childhood like an animal, and treats
> Me like a monster, and who seeks my death--
> What difference does it make if such a man
> Denies my right to be embraced, when he
> Denies my right to be a man as such (p. 44)?

Basilio cautions his son to behave with care as he may merely be in the midst of a dream and leaves in great anger. Rosaura enters and Segismundo finds her even more beautiful than Estrella. Rosaura is alarmed at his grossness and asks permission to leave his presence

but Segismundo is so enamored and desperate for her beauty that he has the throneroom cleared and is about to assault Rosaura when Clotaldo, unconcerned for his own safety, intercedes. Segismundo, enraged, draws his dagger and is about to slay Clotaldo when Astolfo steps between the two men. Segismundo and Astolfo duel. Basilio enters and both men sheath their swords. Segismundo leaves the chamber filled with disdain and casting threats of harm at the king. Basilio responds:

> Before that happens thou wilt sleep again
> Where all that has occurred to thee will seem,
> Like all this world's realities, a dream (p. 53).

After such ignoble behavior by the prince, Estrella and Astolfo are assured the throne of Poland. Estrella, however, seeks a final assurance that Astolfo loves only her. She requests the pendant that Astolfo owns which bears the picture of another woman. Astolfo leaves to get the pendant. Rosaura enters and Estrella, to avoid the embarrassing moment of accepting the pendant, bids her to wait and obtain it from Astolfo. Astolfo returns with the pendant only to encounter Rosaura. It is his first encounter with his former love here in Poland. They quarrel and Rosaura snatches her picture from Astolfo. Estrella, who has reentered, witnesses the quarrel and demands an explanation. Rosaura, quick of mind, states that Astolfo wished to retain the pendant bearing the picture of his true love and is attempting to substitute one belonging to Rosaura and with her picture upon it

instead. Estrella is angered at Astolfo's apparent duplicity and angrily leaves before Astolfo can explain the situation. Rosaura is gratified as she has succeeded in thwarting the plans of her seducer for the attainment of success and happiness. In the meanwhile, Segismundo has been returned to his prison and eventually awakes. Segismundo is greatly ashamed at his behavior even though, to his own best knowledge, it has all transpired within a dream. Nevertheless, Segismundo still finds no excuse or extenuation for his shocking conduct.

The final act finds Clarin locked in the same prison as Segismundo. Clarin, it seems, is prone to gossip and now in possession of information that would better be kept a secret. Soldiers enter in search of Segismundo and mistakenly hail Clarin as their prince. Segismundo, in an adjoining cell, hears their voices and rectifies the case of mistaken identity. The soldiers declare that the citizens will not accept Astolfo, a foreigner, as their king when they have a natural heir available in the person of Segismundo. Segismundo is wary of being a dream prince for a second time and of behaving in an unrighteous manner again only to feel shame and remorse afterwards. Nevertheless, dream or not, he decides to commit himself to the venture:

> Let's dream, my soul, let's dream again. But it
> Will be with prior warning that perhaps
> We shall awaken from this joy when least
> Expected; thus our disillusionment
> Will be less harsh, for we shall ease the pain

> By this anticipation. Thus forewarned
> That even though it seems assured, all of
> Our power is just lent, and must return
> Unto the Giver, let's risk everything(p.73)!

They march off to meet the approaching army of Basilio when they encounter Clotaldo. Segismundo, in an unprecedented gesture of magnanimity, spares Clotaldo of any abuse and allows him to return to the service of his king. In anticipation of the battle which is due, Estrella goes to the aid of Basilio and Rosaura, after a meeting with Clotaldo, goes to join Segismundo. Rosaura, upon joining Segismundo, relates the whole tale of her past tragedy and her intent to gain final vengeance by killing Astolfo, and vows loyalty to Segismundo's cause also. Rosaura's manner intensifies the love that Segismundo feels toward her already but, with his newly-acquired self-control, he refrains from any but the most respectful sort of conduct. The armies clash and Segismundo gains the triumph. Clarin, in his anxiousness to avoid death, stumbles unto the battlefield and loses his life. Basilio, relinquishing the opportunity to flee, bravely surrenders to Segismundo expecting the worst. However, Segismundo is a changed man and is now motivated by prudence and understanding. Segismundo spares his father and, further, so that Rosaura, the woman he truly loves may regain her honor, orders Astolfo to fulfill his marriage vow. Astolfo hesitates because of Rosaura's doubtful lineage but Clotaldo identifies Rosaura as his daughter and nobility, thereby, eliminating Astolfo's reluctance.

Finally, Segismundo vows marriage to Estrella so that her life may gain fulfillment also. All hail the marvelous wisdom of Segismundo who concludes the play:

> What is it that surprises all of you?
> What startles you, if my preceptor was
> A dream, and in anxiety I fear
> I shall awake and find myself again
> Imprisoned? Even though this were not so,
> It is sufficient just to dream it is.
> For this is how I learned, so it would seem.
> That all our mortal bliss fades like a dream (p. 101).

Through the situation of the drama, Calderón has raised three distinct but related issues. The first of these deals with the matter of honor and the necessity for its maintenance or the gaining of revenge for its loss as with the focus and implication of the Rosaura-Astolfo subplot. Secondly, there is the matter of free-will, if such a term can be employed clearly or consistently in a Catholic universe, and its relationship to the destiny decreed by fate or God as indicated by the actions and changes in character which constitute the dramatic life of Segismundo. Lastly, and most importantly, is the major concern and implication of the drama; namely, that life is a dream or an occurrence which is ephemeral, transient, and relatively unreal and valueless when eternity is concerned and terminating with a death which is demonstrably inevitable.

The resolution of the honor problem is evident and simple enough Rosaura has been seduced by Astolfo and the recovery of honor dictates that a death or marriage occur. This situation is resolved readily and unambiguously

with victorious Segismundo's decree that Astolfo marry Rosaura in order to restore and preserve her honor. There is no reason to dwell on this issue as it is tangential to the real concern of this study. Let it suffice to state that the preservation of honor is crucial in the Spanish view of life. It will be the purpose of the following discussion to show that honor is best preserved and salvation best attained by the Spanish Christian when he subordinates his own will and self-concern to the ultimate decree or fate bestowed upon him and which is, thus, in the best interest of God. The claim of God is the ultimate and most fruitful claim. This is to assert the orthodox Catholic doctrine that ultimate freedom for the individual is attained through the active subordination of the will and self to the dictate of God--paradoxically, ultimate freedom is captivity or control by God. One subordinates the self, one negates all personal claims upon God, in order to justify the attainment of the eternity which solely endures and is solely important. Such is the ultimate in sacrificial doctrine and such is the theme of this drama by Calderón. The task, hereafter, is to evidence two matters: firstly, that Segismundo attains ultimate freedom and control by subordinating any personal interest to the fate decreed by Heaven or God and, secondly, that life is a dream or an impermanent and valueless state while there is the possibility of a greater reality in a Godly eternity which endures.

Calderón is, of course, a highly trained Catholic Christian and it is very unlikely that any doctrine which does not coincide with the tenets of Spanish Golden Age Catholicism should be considered as indicative of the thought and intent of the playwright. Therefore, in order to avoid equating the random statements of some character with the thought of Calderón, such statements will constantly be evaluated in so far as they correspond to Catholic doctrine. This will provide a measure that will insure adherance to the intent of the playwright in any interpretation of the text rather than to the thought of some dramatic character which may not necessarily correspond to such an intent. Since there is prominent concern with the role of Segismundo, let it be established that Segismundo has been instructed in the Christian faith which in Golden Age Spain could only mean Catholicism. Basilio, when revealing the existence of Segismundo and the manner of his imprisonment, declares:

> I
> Have told you. Segismundo lives there in
> A wretched, poor, imprisoned state, where just
> Clotaldo has had contact with him; he
> Has taught him science and the Christian faith,
> And he alone has been a witness to
> His sufferings (p. 22).

Next, consider the ironic equation of astrology and fate or destiny as manifested in the "stars" with the decree of "Heaven" which constitutes the universe of the play. Basilio states:

> My chief concern and what I most esteem:
> Keen mathematics, through which I can take

From Time and break from Rumor their control
And function of revealing more each day;
For when upon my tablets I behold
As present the events of centuries
To come, I win men's thanks ahead of Time,
When later it reveals what I have said.
Those snow-white orbits, and those canopies
Of glass, illumined by the sun's bright rays
And pierced by the rotations of the moon;
Those spheres of diamonds and those globes
Of crystal that the stars adorn and that
The zodiac signs emblazon, form the great
Inquiry of my later years, and are
The books in which on diamond paper, in
Sapphire bindings, Heaven writes with lines
Of gold in diverse signs our destinies,
Adverse or kind (pp. 19-20).

It is a universe in which destiny, however discerned, is the dictate of Heaven and God. Calderón emphasizes the significance of this point by indicating it in the very opening lines of the play. Rosaura, who with Clarin has wandered into the locale of the hidden palace, declares:

Now wherefore art thou come in headlong plunge
Through twisting trails to reach this barren brink?
Remain upon this crag so beasts may have
Their Phaethon; for I, with no more course
Than destiny decrees, in blind despair
Descend the tangled slope of this harsh hill
That wrinkles to the sun its scowling brow (p. 1).

Basilio, twice, asserts the power of Heaven which can only be the power of God and the irrevocability of destiny which is foreordained. Firstly, in an address to Clotaldo prior to bringing the prisoner, Segismundo, to the throneroom in order to witness his behavior and character. Basilio states:

Thy curiosity, Clotaldo, is
Quite proper, and to thee alone I would
Give satisfaction. Segismundo (this

Thou knowest fully) as my son lives in
Dire danger of untold misfortunes and
Disasters on account of his ill-starred
Predestination; and I want to see
If Heaven--and it cannot possibly
Be wrong, since we have had so many signs
Of violence in his cruel temper--
Has softened or become at least less harsh,
And, swayed by courage and discretion, has
Relented: men are masters of their fate (pp. 32-33).

But Basilio is wrong for Segismundo is merely what Heaven has decreed him to be. Later, witnessing the crude activity of Segismundo upon awakening from the drugged condition, he declares:

Thou art a bold and brash barbarian.
The prophecy of Heaven was correct;
Thus to Heav'n itself I now appeal,
Thou haughty, vain, and insolent young man (p. 45).

The above contradiction by Basilio to the effect that men are masters of their own fate coupled with an earlier assertion by Basilio (p. 23), that the most determined destiny may merely bend the will and not force it has engendered a tremendous number of misreadings of the play. For Calderón, as is evidenced by a most careful reading of the drama, the decree of Heaven and God is not subject to the whims and desires of men regardless of what some character may feel at some time during the course of dramatic events. Indeed, the nature of destiny which corresponds to the Calderónian belief as presented in Life is a Dream is asserted by triumphant Segismundo toward the end of the play as he fulfills his own fate in rendering final judgement upon Basilio. Segismundo states:

> And though my wrath
> (Now heed me) were just like a sleeping beast,
> My fury like a sword restrained, my rage
> As quiet as a calm at sea, one's fate
> Does not yield to injustice and revenge:
> If anything, it is incited more.
> And so, if one expects to overcome
> His fate, it must be done with reason and
> With moderation. Even one who sees
> It coming cannot stave off harm before
> It comes; although he can protect himself,
> Of course, with humble resignation, he
> Can only do this after the event,
> Which in itself cannot be warded off.
> May this extraordinary spectacle,
> This most amazing scene, this horror, this
> Phenomenon, be an example; there
> Is nothing more surprising than to see,
> Despite precautions of so many kinds,
> A father prostrate at my feet, a king
> Trod under foot. For it was Heaven's will.
> No matter how he wanted to prevent
> It, he could not. How then shall I, a man
> Of younger years and not so brave as he,
> Nor yet so learned, counter Heaven's will (pp. 98-99)?

All that one can do, given the way and power of fate, is to accept whatever event is intended to befall and through the power of reason engage in a humble resign-- tion and acceptance of such an event. Calderón, using Segismundo as the spokesman, chooses again to emphasize the error in which Basilio has repeatedly engaged. Segismundo, finally, states:

> Rise up, my lord, and let me clasp thy hand,
> For now that Heaven has enlightened thee
> About the error of thy ways in thine
> Attempt to conquer it, my neck awaits
> Thy vengeance humbly; I am at thy feet (p. 99).

Basilio, who has attempted to thwart the decree of fate by placing Segismundo in prison, is inevitably defeated. Considering the nature of fate in such a world, there is no other alternative. It is the wise man who

recognizes the way of the world and acts in accord with it. The wise man, finally, is Segismundo who is hailed as such by Basilio:

> Thy wisdom is a marvel to us all (p. 101).

And Rosaura:

> And how discreet and prudent he's become (p. 101)!

Segismundo has warranted such adulation for he was the first to recognize fate as the decree of God and to subordinate himself to this fate. It is Segismundo who engages in the self-sacrifice of relinquishing personal claim to consideration and who actively subordinates himself to the decree of God and the Eternal. Segismundo, when removed from the prison by the rebellious soldiers and citizens, asserted this definite committment:

> My subjects, I am grateful to you for
> Your loyalty. In me you follow one
> Who boldly and with skill will free you all
> From foreign slavery. To arms! You soon
> Will see my dauntless valor. I intend
> To take up arms against my father and
> To prove the stars were right concerning me,
> Since I shall see him prostrate at my feet (p. 73) . . .

Several supplementing and corroborating remarks should be made in regard to the matter of freedom as seen in this play. Segismundo has never lost the power of his will unless the loss of physical freedom is to be confused with such. Physical freedom is merely a necessary condition for such power and not a sufficient one. If "free will" has any meaning in this play, it has merely to do with the ability to utilize one's will in

accord with a fate or destiny which has been preordained. Any remark referring to such a free will can only be regarded in such a manner. Certainly when Segismundo is initially encountered by Clotaldo, there is no lack of assertiveness on his part for Clotaldo is forced by Segismundo's boasting to declare:

> If thou dost know that this confinement is
> A leash to hold thy haughty fury back,
> A rein to check it, why then dost thou boast (p. 9)?

Indeed, during this same encounter and before he has undergone the crucial change in character and acquired an awareness of his fate, Segismundo is haughty and aggressive enough to even threaten Heaven itself. He exclaims:

> Oh, Heaven,
> How wise thou art in taking liberty
> From me! Because I'd be a giant against
> Thee, and to break the spheres and crystals of
> The sun, upon foundations formed of stone
> I'd pile mountains of jasper (p. 10).

Even by Segismundo's own awareness, as reported by Clotaldo to Basilio, he declares possession of his free will:

> So even in
> The restless realm of birds there is someone
> To make them swear obedience! As I reach
> This point, my own misfortunes give
> Me consolation, for at least if I
> Am prisoner, I'm forced to be, because
> Of my free will I never would bow down
> To any other man (p. 31).

The real triumph and attainment of Segismundo is not in the acquisition of what is called a free will but in the control and prudent conduct of this will through

a subordination to God. When Segismundo denies his own happiness in order to restore the honor of Rosaura by declaring that Astolfo should marry her, he voices what has been the ultimate attainment:

> My sword must wait to gain great victories,
> So for today my greatest triumph is
> The victory I've won over myself.
> Astolfo, give thy hand in marriage to
> Rosaura right away; it is a debt
> Of honor, and I'll see that it is paid (p. 99).

Finally, for Calderón life is a dream or an impermanent and valueless state when there is the possibility of a greater reality in an eternity which endures. This may be shown rather readily as Calderón, himself, does through the direct and repeated assertions of the major character, Segismundo, to this effect--and this is hardly to ignore the importance and significance of the title which Calderón has chosen for the play. One declaration to this effect occurs when Segismundo is returned to his prison after failing the test which Basilio has prepared for him. Segismundo awakens from his second drugging and states:

> For we are in a world so very strange
> That life is but a dream; experience
> Has taught me that each man who draws a breath
> Dreams what he is until he wakes in death.
> . . .
> What is life? A frenzy. What is life?
> A shadow, an illusion, and a sham.
> The greatest good is small; all life, it seems,
> Is just a dream, and even dreams are dreams (p. 67).

There is no evidence within the play to contradict the essentiality and merit of this doctrine. Again, at

the end of the play in order to still emphasize the point, Segismundo repeats the lesson of the play:

> For this is how I learned, so it would seem,
> That all our mortal bliss fades like a dream (p. 101).

Segismundo has mentioned that the only termination of the dream is when the dreamer awakens in death. Thus, ultimate reality is in the permanent state after death which is eternity. Death is inevitable even as the death of Clarin is intended to dramatize. Wounded Clarin, himself, states:

> I am a man who is
> Unfortunate, because in wanting to
> Protect myself from death, I found it here.
> In fleeing from it, I encountered it,
> Because there is no hiding place from death.
> Whence we conclude that he who flees it most
> Turns out to be the one who finds it first (pp. 94-95).

Beyond the life which is a dream and an illusion is the one condition which endures--namely, the condition of the eternal and God. The only real and lasting life for man is in the eternal presence which is God. Segismundo testifies:

> Well, then,
> If this reveals my disillusionment,
> If I know pleasure is a dazzling flame
> That any passing breeze can change into
> A heap of ashes, let us turn to the
> Eternal, which is glory that endures,
> Where neither happiness nor grandeur die (p. 91).

In presenting the doctrine of self-sacrifice in subordination to the decree of God for the sake of eternal salvation and, further, the reality and lasting worth of the eternal in contrast to the temporality of life, Calderón

has fulfilled the sacrificial obligation of the playwright who assumes the priestly role.

The second play to be considered is The Mayor of Zalamea. It will serve as an example of a drama in which prophetic doctrine is promulgated by the playwright who assumes the priestly role. To be artistic and prophetic is to render a vision of the future in contrast to some present situation or condition. The prophet only maintains a qualified acceptance of the present for he discerns some fuller and nobler future condition which should be the constant goal of mankind. The prophet can only justify the maintenance of such a distant goal because of an optimism and hope based upon a belief in the greater capacity and improvability of mankind. Such a goal may be the broader and fuller image of a heaven or society with a system of superior conditions and ideals or a narrower focus upon some specific superior condition or ideal in contrast to a popular and present one. The promulgation of this latter sort of prophetic doctrine is Calderón's purpose in writing The Mayor of Zalamea. In this play, the current and popular conception of honor maintained and upheld by the aristocracy is contrasted with the truer and nobler Christian conception of honor. The play is an admonishment and command to replace the one with the other and, thereby, enrich and ennoble the life of a whole society.

The play, itself, begins among a group of soldiers in the countryside near Zalamea. Rebolledo, a vocal and wileful soldier, is looking forward to a needed rest in Zalamea but is, also, complaining about the likelihood of a bribe being submitted to the officer of the company by the town mayor so as to have the unit continue its march to another location before resting. Rebolledo threatens to desert in such an event. Another soldier responds:

> Nor will it be the first desertion that
> A wretched soldier's paid for with his life;
> Especially today, I'm sure, because
> The leader of this regiment is Don
> Lope de Figueroa, who is famed
> And praised for his determination and
> His courage. But he's likewise known to be
> The world's most ruthless, swearing, blasphemous
> Campaigner, who'd court martial his best friend
> Without the bother of a formal trial (pp. 20-21).

Rebolledo replies that such is of little concern to him except for the sake of his female follower, Chispa. Chispa states that he should not fret in her behalf for she is ready to withstand any hardship which may be necessary. Rebolledo praises her for such an attitude and as they approach Zalamea they commence a lively song. They are halted by Don Alvaro de Ataide, a captain and the company commander, who gives the welcome news that they will be billeted in the town. Later, in the town, Don Alvaro is given his own billeting assignment by the company Sergeant who gives the reason for the choice:

They say, sir, it's the best house in the town;
To tell the truth, I picked it out for you
Not just because it is, but more because
There is no girl in Zalamea who
Is lovelier than . . . his daughter (p. 25).

The arrogant captain regrets the fact that the girl is a mere peasant but remains anticipant of some "amusement" with the "uncouth peasant girl." They are interrupted by a noise and the Sergeant explains:

A man dismounted from
Some skinny Rocinante just around
That corner there; in face and figure he
Resembles Don Quixote, about whom
Miguel Cervantes wrote adventures (p. 26).

Don Mendo, an impoverished nobleman, and his servant, Nuno, arrive. The nobleman has come to court Isabel, the daughter of the wealthy farmer, Pedro Crespo, to whose home the captain has just been assigned for billeting. In a comic interlude, Nuno suggests that Don Mendo marry the lovely Isabel and, thereby, solve his financial predicament. Don Mendo, without real conviction, responds:

Please, Nuno, speak
No more of that. Is money to debase
Me so, that I'd accept a father-in-law
Of common stock (p. 31)?

Isabel, with her cousin Inés, appear at the window of the Crespo home. Don Mendo seizes the opportunity to utter flowery words of love to Isabel. Her response is disdainful:

I have
Already told you many times that you
Are wasting all your compliments of love,
Don Mendo, all those mad expressions made
Each day before my house and in my street (p. 33).

He persists only to arouse Isabel's further ire:

> Since telling of my grief is not enough,
> Don Mendo, then let showing it this way
> Suffice: Inés, come on inside, and slam
> The window in his face (p. 33).

Pedro Crespo, and his son Juan, enter the street. They are annoyed by the unwanted persistance of the nobleman. Don Mendo and Nuno are aware of this and quickly leave the scene. In the courtyard of the house, Crespo tells of the rich harvest which has been gathered for the year. Juan uses the opportunity of the moment to inform his father of an unpaid gambling debt. Crespo replies:

> Now listen well before
> You speak to me. There are two things that you
> Must never do: to promise what you can't
> Perform, or bet more than you have on hand;
> Hence if perchance you fail, your good name won't (p. 36).

The Sergeant arrives with Don Alvaro's clothing and, also, to inform Crespo that his home has been chosen to billet the officer. Crespo is cordial about the imposition:

> Say
> No more, for that's enough; my home and wealth
> Are at the service of our God and of
> Our King and all his captains (p. 37).

After the Sergeant departs, Juan becomes indignant with his father for he is wealthy and may, by buying a patent of nobility, avoid the obligation of quartering troops which pass through the town. Crespo responds:

> Well, what am I gaining by
> The purchase of a patent from the King
> If I cannot buy noble blood? And will

They say then that I am a better man
Than I am now? That's an absurdity!
What will they say, then? That I have become
A noble in exchange for payment of
Some five or six cool thousands. That is just
My money, it's not honor: no one can
Buy honor (p. 38).

Juan is unconvinced but is unable to continue the topic as Isabel and Inés enter. Crespo informs them of the current situation:

My daughter, our good King and sovereign lord
(May God preserve him many years) is now
En route to Lisbon, for he seeks to gain
The crown as rightful ruler there. To this
Effect the army, in full panoply
Of war, is on the march; down to Castile
Has even come the famous Regiment
Of Flanders, under one Don Lope, who
Is called by everyone the Spanish Mars.
Today some soldiers are to come here, and
They must not see you: that's important; so,
My daughter, you will go at once and stay
Up in the attic room in which I used
To live (p. 39).

Isabel and Inés depart for the attic room. Later, Don Alvaro and the Sergeant arrive to receive a polite welcome from Juan. Juan departs to see whether the captain's room is prepared. Don Alvaro asks the whereabouts of Isabel and the Sergeant replies:

I asked a servant for her, and
She told me that her father had her locked
Upstairs with orders not to come down here
At all; he's quite suspicious (p. 41).

Don Alvaro declares:

Well, is there
A peasant who is not? Perhaps If I
Should see her here I would not pay the least
Attention to her; just because the old
Man has her locked away, he's made me want
To go up where she is, by Heaven (pp. 41-42)!

Don Alvaro decides to contrive some stratagem for entering the attic room. Rebolledo and Chispa enter. Rebolledo asks the captain for an advance in pay as he is without money and wishes to form a gambling game among the soldiers. Don Alvaro says that he will advance the pay if Rebolledo will help him in a little scheme. Don Alvaro explains that he wishes to enter the attic room in a way that does not seem deliberate. Therefore, Rebolledo should feign an argument, thus, forcing Don Alvaro to draw a sword and chase him upstairs to the attic. Robelledo agrees and begins the argument. Don Alvaro, apparently angry and with drawn sword, chases Rebolledo to the attic. In response to the clamor, Crespo and Juan rush to the attic also. There, Rebolledo encounters Isabel and Inés and pleads for their intervention. Don Alvaro and the Sergeant enter and are met by Isabel who wishes to protect Rebolledo. Don Alvaro uses the moment to begin an intended conquest:

> Not only is
> Your beauty one of rare perfection, but
> Your mind is, also; for in you today
> Both grace and wit are pledged to join for aye (p. 48).

Crespo is impressed and deceived by Don Alvaro's action and manner. Juan, however, has seen through the stratagem and begins a quarrel with Don Alvaro. They draw swords to battle but are interrupted by the arrival of an angered regimental commander, Don Lope de Figueroa. He wishes to know the cause of the disturbance and Don Alvaro relates all of the events leading to the moment

excepting the important fact that Rebolledo was told to feign the initial argument. Rebolledo, in order to avoid severe punishment, completes the account. Don Lope, angered at his men, orders them to leave the home hastily before they are punished more harshly. Don Lope then decides to remain at the home himself. Crespo expresses gratitude to Don Lope for "saving me from danger of great loss." Upon inquiry about the full meaning of this remark, Don Lope learns that Crespo was willing to kill the captain were there any risk to his reputation or good name. Don Lope, angered, responds:

> If anyone so much as laid a hand
> Upon the lowest ranking soldier, or
> So much as touched a stitch of his attire,
> As Heaven is my judge, I'd have him hanged (p. 53)!

Crespo replies:

> If anyone so much as dared affront
> One atom of my honor, then I, too,
> As Heaven is my judge, would have him hanged (pp. 53-54)!

Don Lope warns Crespo that because of status he is bound to render such services as may be required by the military. Crespo, in probably the most significant passage of the play, declares:

> With my estate, but not with my good name.
> One's wealth and life are at the King's command,
> But honor is a portion of the soul,
> And one's own soul belongs to God alone (p. 54).

They finish their discussion with mutual caution and respect.

The second act finds a jealous and angry Don Mendo with Nuno in the street discussing the captain and his

repeatedly rebuked attempts to win the love of Isabel. They depart as Don Alvaro, the Sergeant, and Rebolledo enter. The captain is distraught and bewildered:

> To think that in a peasant girl like this
> There should be such patrician haughtiness
> That she has not replied with even one
> Agreeable expression (p. 57).

And struck, also, by love:

> What greater reason to exist exists,
> When once I have seen her, than seeing her?
> All at once a spark flares into flame;
> All at once volcanoes burst from depths;
> All at once a bolt destroys with fire;
> All at once an ancient gun spews death.
> What wonder, then, that love, a fourfold fire--
> A pit, flame, gun and thunderbolt--should all
> At once entrap and sear, affright and hurt (pp. 58-59)?

Rebolledo suggests that Chispa, a fine singer, be brought to serenade the elusive Isabel. At that time, Don Alvaro will get an opportunity to address his heart to Isabel. The captain agrees and they depart to make arrangements. That evening, Don Lope and Crespo ready themselves for supper. They are on far friendlier terms by now. Don Lope asks that Isabel join them for supper. Isabel, arriving with Inés, accepts the offer graciously. Juan is also present for the supper. They are interrupted by the sound of guitars playing at Isabel's window. A serenade is sung and intended for the sake of Isabel. Don Lope and Crespo are angered at this rudeness but conceal their discomfort rather than interrupt the presumed pleasure of the other. Both, however, employ an excuse to leave the table with the private and concealed intent of routing the annoying singers. On the street, Don Lope

and Crespo, both armed and unaware of the other's presence, attack unrecognized Don Alvaro, the Sergeant, Rebolledo, and Chispa. They rout the intrusive group and, unknowingly, duel each other in the darkness. Juan arrives to assist and recognizes and addresses his father. Don Lope, thereby, recognizes Crespo and ceases the duel. Don Alvaro and the routed soldiers return pretending unawareness of what has happened. Don Lope, in order to prevent more violence, orders the captain to remove the troops from the town in the morning. The next morning, the troops leave the town; however, Don Alvaro conspires to return late that evening in order to kidnap Isabel. In the meanwhile, Juan has joined the army in order to serve under the famed Don Lope. Don Lope extends his gratitude to Crespo for the hospitality and new recruit which he has received. He presents a diamond adorned military decoration to Isabel as a token of this gratitude. Don Lope and Crespo depart as excellent friends. Juan stays behind to hear his father's last advice before parting with Don Lope who has gone to prepare himself for the journey. Crespo advises his son:

> My son, while good Don Lope gets himself
> In readiness, give heed to what I say
> To you in front of your own cousin and
> Your sister. Juan, through God's good grace you are
> Of lineage as pure as sunlight is,
> But peasant stock. I tell you both these things:
> The first as that you will not hold your pride
> And your ambition back so much that you
> May fail, through lack of confidence, to strive
> To forge ahead through prudent judgement; and
> The second so that you will not be full
> Of self-importance, and so come to grief (p. 83).

After embracing his father and sister, Juan departs to join Don Lope in the service of the King. That evening, Crespo, Isabel, and Inés are seated at the door of the home pleased that the soldiers have departed. They are discussing the possible outcome of the recent election for the mayor of Zalamea. Don Alvaro, the Sergeant, Rebolledo, Chispa, and several soldiers muffled in cloaks return to the town and attack the seated group. The soldiers restrain Crespo and Inés as Don Alvaro carries a screaming Isabel away. After the kidnappers flee, Crespo obtains a sword and pursues them. Later, Crespo reaches and attacks several of the kidnappers in the open country but is subdued and tied to a tree. Meanwhile, Juan has fallen from his horse and is searching for it among the country thickets when he hears the unrecognized and separate pleading calls of Crespo and Isabel. Juan responds:

> Two urgent calls
> Invoke my valiant aid; They seem to be
> Of equal need, but one is from a man,
> The other from a woman; I shall strive
> To help the latter. Thus I shall obey
> My father in two things he said to me:
> "Fight only with good cause, and pay respect
> To women." Now to them respect I'll pay
> As with good cause I go to join the fray (p. 92).

The third act finds Isabel in the forest. She is weeping:

> May daylight's brilliance never reach my eyes,
> So in its shadows I shall not observe
> The sense of shame I feel about myself.
> Oh thou, fleet harbinger of many stars,
> Do not give way to dawn approaching now
> Beyond thy canopy of blue, nor let

Thy lovely face fade out in smiles and tears;
But since this must take place, may it fade out
With tears and not with smiles (p. 93)!

Amidst her own anguish, Isabel hears Crespo's plea for death:

Come back and kill me now, and you will be
Most merciful in slaying me, because
It is not pity to allow a man
So wretched to exist (p. 95).

Isabel moves through the thick forest and finds her father tied to a tree. Crespo is surprised to see his daughter and asks to be unbound. Isabel refuses for the moment:

I do not dare, for once my hands take off
The bonds that hold you I shall be afraid
To tell you, sir, of my unhappy plight,
Or to recount my woes; for if you find
You have regained your hands but you have lost
Your honor, then your wrath will bring me death.
I'd rather tell my sufferings to you
Than have you learn of them (p. 96).

Isabel relates the terror and struggle of her past experience:

How I implored him! What emotions, first
So humble then so haughty, I displayed (p. 98)!

Isabel continues to tell how Juan encountered them and how she was forced to flee in order to avoid death at her brother's hands as he suspected her of complicity in the whole affair. In the duel which followed, Juan wounded the captain who was saved from death by his returning soldiers. Juan, too, fled for his life into the forest. Now that she has told her painful tale, Isabel releases her father:

I am your daughter, but my honor's gone;
Now you are free to save your own prestige
By killing me, so that it may be said:
"His honor lives because his daughter's dead (p. 101)."

Crespo refuses, however, and aids his daughter back to Zalamea. They are met by the town clerk who informs Crespo that he has been elected the mayor of Zalamea and, also, that the wounded captain has sought aid in Zalamea. Crespo is perplexed:

Good Heavens! Just when I intended to
Avenge my honor, as a magistrate
I find myself a prisoner of fate!
How can I break the law myself if I
Have been elected magistrate to see
That others don't transgress (p. 103)?

Meanwhile, Don Alvaro having had his wound tended is about to flee when he is arrested by Crespo and the townspeople. Don Alvaro is indignant and declares that Crespo has no authority over a soldier. Crespo, however, gives no attention to this defense. Crespo tells the townspeople to wait outside and then implores Don Alvaro:

Since I wish, then, to right a wrong that is
So manifest, to seek a remedy
To my affront is not a remedy--
It's vengeance. As I cast about, I find
But one that suits me well, and also is
Not bad for you: it is that you take all
My property at once. I shall not keep
A cent for my support nor for my son
(Whom I shall bring for pardon to your feet),
But rather we shall beg for alms if there
Is no way else to keep ourselves alive.
And if you wish to brand an "S" on us
This day and sell us both as slaves,
The money gained will be additional,
Above the dowry that I offer you.
Restore the honor that you have defiled;
I do not think the lustre of your own
Will be diminished, for the merits that
Your sons might lose by being my grandsons
They would recoup--and more--as sons of yours.

The saying in Castile (and it is true)
Is that the male transmits nobility.
Behold, I beg you on my knees, here at
Your feet, while weeping on this snowy beard
So much my breast, all white and wet, believes
My beard is melting like a wintry stream.
What do I ask of you? The honor that
You took away from me yourself. Although
It's mine it seems (the way I'm asking you
So humbly) that what I ask is not mine,
But yours. You know I could enforce this by
My office, but prefer that you should give
It willingly to me (pp. 108-109).

Don Alvaro is impassive even when confronted with such a plea:

My patience has
Worn thin, you babbling, tiresome old man.
Be thankful that I do not take your life
Today because of what you and your son
Have done; it is because I want you both
To owe escape from harsher punishment
To Isabel's great beauty. If you have
Recourse to arms to seek revenge and to
Uphold your view, I have small need to fear.
And if it is a matter of the law,
You have no jurisdiction (pp. 109-110).

Crespo is justly angered and has the townspeople take Don Alvaro to the jail. Rebolledo and Chispa have been captured also but Crespo releases them both since Chispa is now pregnant. Juan, by now, has returned home. He finds Isabel and feeling that she was an accomplice to the misdeed, is about to kill her when interrupted and halted by Crespo. Crespo arrests Juan for having dueled Don Alvaro. He will hear no extenuating explanation. Crespo, then, has Isabel sign a letter of complaint against the captain. Soon an enraged Don Lope, informed by another soldier, returns to Zalamea to punish the civilian mayor who has dared to arrest an officer of

the King's army. He learns that Crespo is the defiant and bold mayor. Nevertheless, Crespo will not obey his command to release the prisoner and Don Lope prepares to smash the door of the jail and release the prisoner by force. Don Lope is interrupted by the fortuitous arrival of the King, Philip II, and his attendants. The King demands to know the reason for such an outbreak. Crespo relates the incidents that have gone before and asserts the justice of a death verdict for the captain. The King declares:

> The verdict is a just one; but you do
> Not have authority to execute
> The sentence: that is for another court.
> The punishment lies there, and so you must
> Give up the prisoner (p. 124).

Crespo states that this is impossible as the captain has already been executed. The door to the jail is thrown open and the captain is seen seated in a chair, strangled by a garrote. The King is angered but Crespo responds that the verdict has already been declared a just one. The King states that a military court could have completed the verdict as readily. Crespo replies:

> Sire, all your royal justice is but one
> Great legal body that has many arms.
> If one long arm of justice puts to death
> A man some other arm was to have killed,
> What harm is there? What matter to have erred
> In some detail, if he who carried out
> The law served justice in its broader aims (p. 125)?

The King is won over by this argument and, in further vindication, decrees that Crespo shall be the permanent mayor of Zalamea. The King departs with the gratitude and respect of Crespo and the townspeople.

Juan is released form the jail and proceeds to join the regiment of Don Lope. As for Isabel, Crespo states:

> She's entering a convent, and she has
> Already chosen: she will be the bride
> Of One who does not make distinctions in
> A person's social rank (p. 127).

Calderón has, in The Mayor of Zalamea, wielded a story wherein two contrasting codes of honor are viewed and placed in conflict--namely, the Christian and aristocratic codes. The higher Christian code of honor is best viewed by directing attention to the utterances and behavior of Crespo, the peasant hero of the play. The aristocratic code of honor may be viewed, at its best, by observing Don Lope and, at its worst, by observing Don Alvaro. Honor, as depicted by Calderón, is the sense of self-esteem and pride which is the result of primarily adhering to some divine code as witnessed in the behavior of Crespo or, in contrast, the result of primarily adhering to some earthly code as witnessed in the behavior of Don Lope and Don Alvaro. The conditions of an earthly or aristocratic code in contrast to the Christian one have been described by Dunn:

> Honour can mean the outward dignity conferred by rank; pride in the superiority of birth; public respect, the good name in which a family is held, and which is most easily damaged by any scandal touching its women. All this involved degrees of self-esteem. Honour can also mean integrity, and the recognition of integrity by the world at large. This is an idea which represents honour more as an expression of the moral worth of the individual, but it still implies public consent and is vulnerable to scandal and false report. The world at large is inclined to make easy snap-judgements and can impute dishonour by misunderstanding. The only defence against this oppressive

> force of opinion is an unrelenting watchfulness and a correspondingly arrogant self-assertion. All this is common knowledge to readers of seventeenth-century drama.[2]

When respected, the former or aristocratic code leads to no greater abuse than the smug pompousness and concern with rank and station and comfort displayed by Don Lope. When abused, and Calderón suggests this as commonplace, it leads to the total self-seeking and disdain for less fortunate persons as displayed by Don Alvaro. Such abuse yields contempt of persons for the unessential reasons of birth, appearance, and rank--the presence of a valuable and shared element of eternal soul is denied in others. Such abuses are denounced by Calderón and exposed to others in the blatant actions of Don Alvaro. When being informed by the Sergeant as to his billeting assignment in the Crespo home and the presence of the lovely Isabel, Don Alvaro reveals his character and attitude toward the ordinary citizen:

> Well,
> For all her beauty and her vanity,
> Can she be more than just a peasant with
> A pair of dirty hands and clumsy feet (p. 25)?

And, again, referring to Isabel:

> He who adores
> A beauty says, when he looks at the one
> He loves, "That is my lady love," not "That's
> My peasant love." Well, if one's love is called
> A lady, then the name of lady is
> Betrayed when used upon a peasant (p. 26).

---

[2]P. N. Dunn. "Honour and the Christian Background in Calderon." Wardropper (ed.), op. cit., p. 46.

Later, having chased Rebolledo to the attic room where Isabel and Ines are hidden and having been halted in his actions by Crespo, Don Alvaro reveals his duplicity and hypocrisy. Again, Don Alvaro refers to Isabel:

> He who has from birth
> Had obligations must uphold them: I,
> Out of respect for this young lady, held
> My wrath in check (pp. 48-49).

Quarreling with Juan who detects his treachery and motives in having entered the attic, angered Don Alvaro discards all pretense. Juan, who refers to his "good name", receives an arrogant retort from Don Alvaro:

> And what good name can peasants have (p. 50)?

Finally, Don Alvaro as the symbol of an abusive and contemptible aristocracy, displays his extreme contempt and disdain for the sanctity of other persons by kidnapping and raping Isabel. At no time, does Don Alvaro express or display regret or concern for the grievousness of the act. Indeed, he nearly considers the abuse of Isabel as some sort of right or privilege. In response to Crespo's desperate plea that he marry Isabel and recover and preserve the honor of all concerned, Don Alvaro declares in contempt and disgust:

> My patience has
> Worn thin, you babbling, tiresome old man.
> Be thankful that I do not take your life
> Today because of what you and your son
> Have done; it is because I want you both
> To owe escape from harsher punishment
> To Isabel's great beauty. If you have
> Recourse to arms to seek revenge and to
> Uphold your view, I have small need to fear.
> And if it is a matter of the law,
> You have no jurisdiction(pp. 109-110).

Don Alvaro, a rapist, lacks all compunction for the misdeed. All of the shame is felt by members of the Crespo family. Crespo has fallen upon his knees before an impassive Don Alvaro in the hope of regaining the lost honor of the family. Isabel, an unwilling and innocent participant to the crime, also basks in this feeling of lost honor. She cries to Heaven:

> But woe is me! It seems that thou also
> Art cruelly despotic: though I begged
> Thee not to rise, my eyes behold thy face
> Serenely peering over yonder hills.
> Alas! that thine own wrath should conjure now
> Against my honor, when I am pursued
> And vexed by many ills, anxieties,
> And foul adversities! What shall I do?
> Where shall I go? If my two erring feet
> Take me back home, it means another stain
> Upon my poor old father, who possessed
> No treasure, no great joy, except to bask
> In the reflection of the clean white moon
> Of my chaste honor, which unhappily
> Has been eclipsed today by scandal's stain (p. 94).

And Juan, also, bemoans the deed and loss. Returning to Zalamea after his duel with Don Alvaro, he states:

> Since I slashed that foul villain in the wood,
> And since I turned my back on him (because
> So many others came), I've gone all through
> The forest and I've searched the thickets, but
> I have not found my sister. Hence, I've dared
> To come back to the town and go inside
> My house, where I shall tell my father what
> Is happening; and I'll seek his advice
> (oh, Heav'n above!) concerning what I ought
> To do to save my honor and life (pp. 114-115).

As a solution to his predicament, Juan attempts to kill his sister who can only be considered innocent. It is what the current code of honor demands of him. Juan is halted by Crespo who does not regard such an

action as any solution. Crespo has already considered and relinquished the opportunity to commit the same action. That Isabel's life is not sacrificed to the demand of the current and earthly code of honor--a code imposed by a ruling aristocracy--is a strong, though implicit rejection of it by the playwright. There is a higher code of honor--the one of Christianity--which recognizes innocence and the extenuation of unerring motives irrespective of consequence. After all, Isabel does become a nun and is, thereby, deemed sufficiently worthy to be a spiritual bride of Christ. Where an aristocratic code of honor has demanded her violent death; a Christian code, exalted by Calderón in the person of Crespo, demands the salvation of her soul in eternal life. It is this ignored or demeaned honor which is a "portion of the soul" that the prophetic voice of the playwright is compelled to herald. Crespo, the practicioner of the Christian code, rejects the ordinary code of honor. When confronted by Juan to purchase a patent of nobility and, thereby, avoid the obligation of billeting troops and, further, acquire the external sign of honor, Crespo can only respond:

> Well, what am I gaining by
> The purchase of a patent from the King
> If I cannot buy noble blood? And will
> They say then that I am a better man
> Than I am now? That's an absurdity!
> What will they say, then? That I have become
> A noble in exchange for payment of
> Some five or six cool thousands. That is just
> My money, it's not honor: no one can
> Buy honor (p. 38).

Yet Crespo is certainly the bearer of honor--but honor of another sort. Consider that Crespo, during the course of action, is elected to the position of mayor of Zalamea--thus attesting to the esteem and merit which the townspeople attribute to him. And Crespo is deemed sufficiently meritorious in his conduct and judgment to receive the mayorship permanently by the decree of Philip II--a King and position esteemed by the people and Calderón also. As to the execution of Don Alvaro by Crespo, the attitude of the playwright may be clearly discerned in the fact that the original title of the play was The Best Execution Ever Carried Out or El Garrote Mas Bien Dado. Again, there is Crespo's own significant statement which attests to the nature of his moral committment:

> One's wealth and life are at the King's command,
> But honor is a portion of the soul,
> And one's own soul belongs to God alone (p. 54).

For Crespo, true honor is not primarily derived from adherance to an earthly or partial standard. True honor--the Christian honor exalted by Calderón in the person of Crespo--is contingent upon the integrity of an immortal soul as it is founded in the wisdom of God. The code of honor which is of ultimate significance is the one founded upon the eternal truth of God as revealed to man--given the context of the drama and the creed and devotion of the author, this can only mean the truth and standard of honor promulgated by Christ through the

Catholic Church. In such a code is the truth and condition that is superior to one which already exists. Calderón, as prophet, heralds and cries for the substitution of a demeaned or forgotten Christian ethic in place of one which is grounded upon some transient and particular historical context or situation. Calderón, as prophet, pleads for the eternal and decries the profane. Calderón indicates and demands obligation to a future condition which is nearer the eternal condition of God.

Such is the major purpose of the play but there is another significant though lesser purpose contained within it. As a prophetic artist, Calderón has also chosen to decry a specific abuse of the times--namely the unfair treatment heaped upon the Spanish citizenry by an abusive military. Hesse states:

> Calderón in the Mayor of Zalamea (El Alcalde de Zalamea) . . . aimed to expose the irresponsible conduct of Spanish troops billeted in the homes of the civilian population.[3]

A wider consideration of the play, especially the repulsive conduct of Don Alvaro, is sufficient evidence in this regard. Nevertheless, there are several individual incidents and assertions to this effect which warrant some mention. When the Sergeant informs Don Alvaro that Crespo, in his caution and suspicion, has concealed Isabel in an attic room; Don Alvaro replies:

---

[3]Hesse, op. cit., p. 13.

Well, is there
A peasant who is not (p. 41)?

It is well to assume that the peasantry, owing to past experiences with the military, had grounds for such ready suspicion. Later, after the soldiers depart from Zalamea; Inés, in a feeling of relief, states:

Since we
Are now without the soldiers, let us stay
Here at the door a little and enjoy
The cooling breeze that's blowing now, because
The neighbors all will soon be coming out (p. 87).

The fact that the townspeople chose to remain safely indoors while the troops were in the town is further indication of the maltreatment to which they were usually subjected. Most cogent and to this same point is the manner of Don Alvaro toward Crespo when the anguished father begs marriage and recovered honor for his daughter:

CRESPO:

So you are
Not moved at all by my deep grief?

CAPTAIN:

The tears
Of old men, children, and of women should
Not be believed.

CRESPO:

And so much heartache does
Not move you to have pity?

CAPTAIN:

What more can
You want? I've taken pity on your life!

CRESPO:

Behold me here upon the floor: I beg
You for my honor.

CAPTAIN:

What annoyance!

CRESPO:

I
Am Mayor of Zalamea now, you know.

CAPTAIN:

But over me you have no legal hold;
The military courts will send for me.

CRESPO:

Is that your final word?

CAPTAIN:

It is, you old
Decrepit graybeard.

CRESPO:

There's no other way?

CAPTAIN:

There is: for you the best way is to keep
It quiet.

CRESPO:

And there is no other?

CAPTAIN:

No (p. 110).

In such ways were the peasants of Spain repeatedly abused by the Spanish troops. Calderón exposed and denounced such abuses and demanded an improved treatment of the victims as a future substitute and solution.

Thus Calderón, again, in the same play chose the stance of the dramatic author who utters in the manner of the prophets.

Lastly, The Great Theatre of the World will be considered as an example of drama in which pastoral doctrine is promulgated by the playwright who assumes the priestly role. The concern of such a pastor is with the "here and now." The focus of such an artist is upon the concrete, temporal, and historical life and activity of man. The playwright as pastor is concerned with the fruition of human life within the context of a social community. Pastoral doctrine directs itself to the facilitation and fruition of activity which pertains to the daily and practical life of man existing in such a community. Standards of behavior or norms of conduct pertaining to communal life and vivid examples of men who have successfully abided by such standards and norms are presented as patterns or exemplars for emulation--men are taught to do concretely what they ought to do. The failures of men and the reasons for such failures are made discernible also. The playwright as pastor emphasizes that doctrine which harmonizes the relationship and behavior of man toward man, thereby, elevating the quality of life within a community and, also, diminishing the amount of mistreatment and suffering which may exist therein. With The Great Theatre of the World, Calderón assumes the responsibility and task of the pastor and attempts to present vivid doctrine which serves to enhance

the historical life of an individual and a community. Also, this selection will present an opportunity for considering an auto sacramental, a one-act religious play often allegorical in nature and usually performed on Corpus Christi Day in order to commemorate and honor the Eucharistic presence. Calderón is quite renowned for the authorship of more than eighty such religious plays.

The play, itself, begins with the entry of the Author or God who is adorned in a starry mantle and hat decorated with nine rays of light in groups of three. He surveys the earth and praises its great beauty referring to it as "heaven's fairest masterpiece--the mirror and reflections of heaven's great embroidery." The Author summarizes his praise:

> Oh thou of various aspects, many hued, where Nature all her treasure doth amass, thou art the first rich miracle of time, fashioned most marvellously, and beyond surpass. This happy concourse of the elements, from ashes risen like Phoenix, the immortal bird, shall be confined and limited within a single word. I, then, thou brave new tapestry before my feet unfurled, decree a name to name thee, and thee I name the World. (pp. 368-369)

The World appears at this summons asking the Author's command and is answered:

> Thou art my creation, and my most shadowy desire must produce thy acquiescence immediately. Though Nature for my delight outdoeth herself in daily spectacle, still would I see a work cast in a different mold. Know that Man's life is but a play from cradle to the grave. Prepare, therefore, to perform the Play of Life, whose spectator shall be heaven. Thou, World, shall set the stage, I will the play direct, and men and women (whom I most loved of all created things) shall be the actors in it; and in this quadripartite World's Great Playhouse they shall put on their play with seemly skill and due comportment.

> To each we give the part that he may act most fittingly. Now, therefore, World, order thy stage and the settings place, and gather together appropriate properties. I will then appoint rehearsals, and thou--from first to last-- shall be the Great World's Theater, and Man the cast. (p. 369).

In preparation the World recapitulates history beginning with the Garden of Eden and passing on to the exodus of the Israelites into the promised land and the receiving of the written law by Moses and, finally, to the present or final act of the earth's history which is presently to be performed in anticipation and preparation for the final judgment. The World concludes:

> Now have I briefly outlined the broad action of the World's Great Drama, and we may next proceed directly to the performance we must give. All the basic preparations have been made; but not mine is the task to choose what dress the different actors wear, for in Thy mind, Creator, and in Thy mind alone, a final choice has been prepared, for in the mystery of Thy timeless prescience all men before their entrance on the stage have been assigned the role and station of their lives. The stage is now constructed; and, that men may come from Thy all-knowing Presence into the world and act their parts, and then to Thee return, here have I two doors constructed--the cradle and the grave. . . .
> Now all is ordered and expectant. Come then, ye mortals, and apparel yourselves to play your part in the Great Theater of This World (pp. 371-372).

The Rich Man, King, Peasant, Beggar, Wisdom, Beauty, and a Child enter. The King addresses the Author:

> Mindful of our obedience, though yet unborn, we come to await Thy pleasure; for in our Sovereign Author's mind we have existed forever, though never given form and breath. We have no soul, no sense, no mind, nor any potency. We are but formless dust beneath Thy feet. Breathe Thou upon this dust, and we shall live and act the parts assigned us in the Great Theater of This World.(p. 372)

And Beauty:

> We are but thoughts in Thine imagination--inchoate men and women we and neither animate nor tangible; nor know we aught of good or evil. Choose us our parts to play, for individual choices have we none. (p. 372)

And the Peasant:

> Oh Sovereign Author mine, of whose resplendent Being my shadowy thought is now aware, and aware ever shall be--I am Thy creature, contrived and fashioned by Thy celestial hand--give me, I pray Thee, the part that I shall play; and if I err in it and go astray, the fault shall not with the choice Thou madest be; the blame shall fall alone on me. (p. 372)

The Author responds:

> If men might choose to be or not to be, no man would choose to bear life's heavy yoke unless he might be ruler and director of all other men--and all forgetful that what he thinks is life is only drama, the signs and symbols and reflections of some other life to come. I, therefore, since not all men may play the part of kings and governors, shall in my wisdom choose for each man the role he best can act on earth. Here is the assignment of your work. Be thou the King. (pp. 372-373)

The Author proceeds to assign each character, whether willing or not, a designated role and concludes:

> Thus hath my foreknowledge marked out the designated path each man must follow. I am Distributive Justice, and I, and I alone, foreknow what every man's appointed lot will be. (p. 373)

The Beggar is reluctant in accepting his role. He pleads with the Author:

> Why befalls it me to act the part of Begger in this Play? Shall it for me alone be Tragedy? Have not I the same soul, sense, being, as hath the King? Why must our parts, then, different be? Had I been fashioned from some other clay, then I, in sense deficient, should have been an alien to this our human line. Yet such was not Thy will. Oh, it is harsh and bitter--cruel--to play a part so mean, so vile, when yonder sceptered King's no more a man than I (p. 374).

The Author responds:

> It matters not what part a man doth play in Life's great Drama. What he must do is play the best he can the part that's given him. And when the play is over, Beggar and King shall once again be equals, and shall be judged as equals. So,Beggar, soften thy affliction for the while, for I have willed it that if the Beggar play his part effectively and if the King should do less well, then shall the Beggar have the prize, for when the final curtains close, the actors will receive reward as each one merits. We do not care what part a man has played; we only care how well he played it. And when the final words are spoken then shall I summon those who acted best to sit beside me at my Table, and sup with me in Paradise. And the Beggar and the King shall have like welcome there (p. 374).

Beauty then asks the title of the play and the Author gives the title as "Do Good, for God is God." The actors complain that they have not had any rehearsals. They are concerned lest they may forget their lines during the course of the play but the Author allays their concerns by informing them that he shall arrange for a prompter to be present to guide them through the entire performance. They are calmed and start for the stage in order to commence the play but are halted by the World who equips the players with the properties appropriate to each role. The King receives a purple robe and laurels. Beauty receives a bouquet of flowers. The Rich Man receives gold and silver while Wisdom is given a sackcloth and scourges. The Peasant is given a hoe and the Beggar and Child are given nothing. Now each are prepared to perform their respective role in the play of life. The World states that all is in readiness:

> Now is the stage filled with various estates; a king with wide dominion, beauty that steals the gaze of every eye, the tamed high wielders of power, beggars pressed direly, peasants, and servants of the Church--and all have come to enact their parts in this great play today. I am the theater, and I have given them costumes and properties--outrages, even, and alms. Now, Author Omnipotent, come forth to witness the performance that men will here present before Thee. Let the center of the earth be opened up, for there the scene shall be (p. 377).

At this summons, the Author comes forth and while music plays two globes open up. Within one is the throne of glory upon which sits the Author. In the other there is a stage with two doors--on one side is painted a cradle and on the other is painted a coffin. The Author commences the play:

> This is the play I have devised for my enjoyment. And from this throne eternal will I turn my sight upon my players there below. Oh ye who make your entrance in the cradle and your exit in the coffin, see that you do your parts right well, for your very Author, who sees you moving in your terrestrial vale, marks how ye do succeed, or how ye fail (p. 377).

Here, the Law of Grace enters and delivers the extremely significant Prologue. She goes to a high place above where the World stands and declares:

> I am the Law of Grace, and I shall speak the Prologue to our play. And I shall prompt you with this script, in which Thou'st summarized, oh Lord, the contents of our play:
>
> [*Singing*]
> *Love thy neighbor as thyself,*
> *and Do Good, for God is God* (p. 378).

Now the characters, having received the vital and necessary directions, come forward to perform their given roles. Beauty and Wisdom enter through the cradle door and play their parts. Wisdom speaks:

> It is not unlawful to revere Creation's beauties if we remember us of their Creator ever; but I have chosen the cloister for my part, and I have put away the blinding vanities of this pale world. Thus have I merited Wisdom's name (p. 379).

And Beauty:

> And I have chosen the ways of Beauty--to see, be seen . . .
> Snares shall I lay for chillest hearts and downcast eyes most coyly reticent (p. 379).

The World is not entirely pleased with the reading of these lines and the Prompter, as so often, declares the principle of proper conduct:

> Do Good, for God is God (p. 379).

The Rich Man enters to perform his role:

> Heaven hath beneficently bestowed upon me her countless treasures and powers without earthly bound or bourne. Therefore, I'll spend my lavish gold on mundane pleasures. Whatever I wish--that I shall buy. My table with flesh and fowl shall be oppressed; and when night's gentle slumber steals in to seal my somnolent eyes, it will find me couched beneath the lascivious canopy of Venus' sacred self. And these shall be my guides and my companions: sloth, lust, gluttony, envy, and ambition (p. 379).

And then the Peasant performs:

> Was greater labor ever seen than mine? Dreary was that sentence that made me earn my bread in the sweat of my brow. I daily fight with hoe, ploughshare, and sickle--and stumps and growing grains when May showers and April rains. But I cannot have the spring unless I take the rain that goes with it. When those fellows out there levy taxes they always start first with the peasant. Well, I toil and sweat over my crops, so anyone who wants my grain will have to pay me what I ask him for it. And, believe me, I intend to ask more than the ceiling prices those people have put on things. I won't budge either. Come April, if it doesn't rain (and I pray to God it won't), I am going to make a pile of ducats on the grain I've stored up. And around here I'll be like Nabal in the Old Testament: everybody

> will have to come to me for food. Why shouldn't I profit from their necessity? What else can I do (pp. 379-380)?

They are each admonished by the Prompter's unchanging advice. The Beggar then presents his role:

> Who hath ever seen more misery than is my lot to bear? The earth's my only bed, and heaven itself my only canopy. Frost and the heat descend upon me, and hunger and thirst, they tread me down. Help me, I pray thee, Lord--help me in this dark night of my affliction (p. 380)!

And then the King:

> Far as the farthest horizon that eyes can see and farther still than thought can fly, stretch infinite my teeming realms and territories, prostrate and suppliant before my royal gaze. Is there perchance aught in all the world that is my need (p. 380)?

The Prompter admonishes them in turn. The Beggar then approaches each character for alms. It is the Author's way of testing whether the characters are heeding the advice of the Prompter. Beauty ignores him. The Rich Man is indignant and rejects him. The King refers the Beggar to the royal almoner. The Peasant offers him a hoe with which to earn his living. The Beggar refuses and approaches Wisdom, the devotee of religion, and is given a loaf of bread for assistance. At this moment, Wisdom swoons and is assisted by the King. The Author comments on the performance which has so far been given:

> I might well correct the flaws my actors make; but I have given them all Free Will--Free Choice--to mend their own deficiencies. Free Will is far superior to all other human attributes, and if it be duly exercised, it may govern man's each move and passion. Men I created free, for if not free,

> what proof could they have given me of their integrity? I formed them free, and free they must remain. Thus I permit them all to act their parts according to their will; but when they miss their mark, I send them warnings and correction through my obedient handmaiden's voice, the Law of Grace (pp. 382-383).

And the Law of Grace responds:

> *Do Good, for God is God.* I have counselled you every one; if therefore ye err, ye err. [*Singing*] *Love thy neighbor as thyself, for God is God* (p. 383).

The players, by now, become a bit bored and resolve to entertain each other by revealing their innermost thoughts. The King begins:

> My mind's eye perceiveth my utter majesty, the grandeur and the glory of my imperial sway. On all that I call my own hath Nature lavished numberless perfections, and, in variety, infinite. Obedient to my governance stand lofty fortresses adamant; and Beauty herself is my bondswoman. So hath it been decreed--that some should follow and some should lead. Heaven itself hath lent its hand to aid me in the governance of my wild, unequal brood. And I, to subjugate so many stubborn necks beneath my royal yoke must ever call on heavenly wisdom to direct my steps and lend my will assistance (p. 383).

The World approves this presentation for the King has called upon Heaven's wisdom for direction and assistance. The King is then beckoned by the voice of death and exits by the coffin door. Beauty then reveals her inner thoughts:

> I see my beauty as in a glass before mine eyes, and it is clear and fair and lovable. It hath no envy of the King's once glittering triumphs or his broad empire--teeming, vast--for vaster empire shall I have, and marshalled all 'neath Beauty's gleaming banner. The King was only master of men's flesh and bones, but I shall steal their hearts away. They shall be Beauty's slaves. Mine is the fairer realm in every part, for Beauty reigns eternal in every human heart. And if Philosophy

> in man a little world doth see, then a little heaven shall womanly beauty be (p. 384).

The World is critical of this presentation for Beauty has displayed excessive pride. Beauty is now called by the voice of death and exits as did the King before. The Peasant then speaks:

> When I go out to till and toil in the fields I fear not cold nor heat. I fear not that; for what I really fear is the lukewarm heart I bear within this chilly breast that gives thanks to the fields that bring me again, but not to God who grew the grain (p. 385).

The World is pleased at this for the Peasant has acknowledged himself to be a debtor to God. The Peasant then heeds the voice of death. Now the Rich Man reveals himself:

> Return to our recitations. And to do my share, I too will now recite my piece.--If the life of man is like a rose ephemeral and only lasts from dawn to darkling eve, then let us all rejoice to have at least that brief reprieve. My belly shall be my deity, till death's slow step draw nigh. Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we shall die (p. 386).

The World is angered by this false doctrine. The Beggar then addresses himself:

> I follow next.--Let that day perish, Oh Lord, wherein I was born upon this earth; perish the chill night when I was conceived to bear such woe. May day never dawn to dispel those sombre shades; may darkness reign there, and Stygian night forever. Eternal be that fearful night; let the stars of the twilight thereof be dark--neither let it behold the eyelids of the morn; and let that day have no morning, and let the night be moonless and without stars. Yet make I not my dismal moan for this my outcast state. I would not trouble heaven's ears with mournful din. I only grieve that I was born in deepest sin (pp. 386-387).

The King and Beggar are called by death and leave the stage together. Wisdom is the only actor remaining in "World's Great Theater." The World cites the appropriateness of the situation for it is right that religion is the last to leave. Wisdom replies:

> Religion will never, never end; but now my time is come, for I am not Religion's self--only an humble devotee who chose that path to follow. Now, even before the Voice makes ready to call me hence I find myself prepared to go, and waiting for the grave. Have I in life itself not buried been? Now, last of all our cast today, I too go hence from the play our Author will present again and on the morrow. Oh ye that fail today and end in grief and sorrow, profit from Wisdom's words and mend your faults tomorrow (pp. 387-388)!

The earth's globe closes and the Author who has been watching over all states:

> I have prepared punishments and recompense for those who've acted in this play. Now shall they see what proper guerdon their work hath merited (p. 388).

The characters return and present their properties to the World. No social distinctions are made or allowed for after death there is only equality until the final judgment. Only Wisdom may lay claim to some possession. Wisdom rejects the World's remark that none may retain earthly glory after death:

> That cannot be, for all those pristine glories may now accompany me. Uprightness, sacrifice, and prayer may not be left in this World below (pp. 390-391).

The World acknowledges the propriety of the claim:

> 'Tis true: I never may withhold good works; they, and they alone may all be taken hence (p. 391).

The other characters voice regret for the imperfection of their past lives but the World merely responds:

> It is too late, for when Death's dread summons comes, none shall garner further merits. Now have I heaped together the august trappings of majesty and withered Beauty's fragile bloom. Likewise have I bent the neck of haughty vanity. Now in death's democracy, scepters and plowshares are all one; and the moment is come when ye shall enter the Theater of Truth and leave yon Fiction's Playhouse far behind (p. 391).

The characters decide to ready themselves for the great supper that the Author has prepared for them. The Beggar calls the Author:

> Author of earth and heaven, this company of players that hath performed life's human comedy approacheth now to that Great Supper thou'st prepared before us. Let the curtains forthwith be drawn away, and we shall see Thy throne and canopy, behold Thy Day (p. 392).

The celestial globe is seen again. There is a table within it on which are the chalice and host. The Author is seated there and the World exits as if to emphasize that this is an entirely different realm. The Author speaks:

> This table now awaits you, and this Bread--adored by heaven and reverenced even by hell itself. They who shall sup with me will presently be known; known, too, those who through misjudgment or forgetfulness of my many mercies have erred their parts. First, the Beggar and Saintly Wisdom shall sup with me; and now freed from World's requirements and the need of physical food, they shall forever adore this heavenly Bread and glorify it through all eternity (p. 392).

The Beggar and Wisdom gratefully join the Author at this great meal. The Author, again, speaks:

> Beauty and Power shall likewise to my table ascend, because they sought forgiveness for their grievous sin of pride; but not ascend at present. So shall the Peasant also tarry awhile away, for though he gave the Beggar nothing 'twas not because he did not wish to give. Pious was his intent. He only wished to help the Beggar help himself (p. 393).

Wisdom pleads in behalf of the King:

> Author Divine, I was low-pressed, and the King lent me his hand and lifted me up. Now lend I him mine, and do beseech Thee pardon him (p. 393).

The Author, heeding this plea, allows the King to ascend also. The Child speaks:

> If no mistake I made, great Lord, why grant'st Thou me no guerdon (p. 393)?

And the Author replies:

> Nothing didst thou do for either good or ill. Thou therefore neither reward nor punishment shalt receive. Blind, thou shalt nothing have; thou art a child of sin (p. 393).

The Rich Man addresses the Author in a still arrogant and unremorseful manner and the Author responds:

> With what bold arrogance name'st thou my name? I fashioned thee, and now thou ever shalt shamefast be, and from my company go hence for all eternity. My power casts thee down into a torment that with dreadful fire shall devour thy pride and arrogance forever and forever (p. 394).

The Rich Man falls to eternal damnation for the remorseless failure to heed the directions of the Prompter:

> Oh woe, woe! I fall, in devouring flames enwrapped, dragging my earthly shadow into this fiery pit; and locked and immured forever in adamantine rock, this shape and form I called my own, will through all eternity enterred be (p. 394).

Beauty and the Peasant are finally allowed to ascend and the Author concludes the great play of life:

> The angels in heaven, and men on earth, hell's very demons, even, low kneel before this sacred Bread; now let the joyful sounds of earth, hell, heaven this Bread proclaim in sweet harmonious concord resonant. Let joyful pipes sing out their hymns, bright banners be unfurled, to praise God's holy majesty, the Author of the World (pp. 394-395).

The sounds of hornpipes are heard and the Tantum Ergo, part of a hymn written by Aquinas in praise of the Blessed Sacrament, is sung many times in joy.

In this play, one encounters the best type of moral teachings of the time in Spain. Calderón has fulfilled the pastoral task by promulgating that doctrine best able to enhance and harmonize the life of an individual and a community. Parker, referring to the play, declares:

> It is the poetic restatement of traditional Christian social teaching.[4]

Such social teaching revolves about the law of charity as discerned by the Christian Church--namely, the proper love of God, persons, and things. Each character within the play who requires guidance for the correct performance of a role is lacking in rightly directed attention and love--e.g. Beauty is pre-occupied with physical appearance, the Peasant with earthly possessions,

---

[4]Parker, op. cit., p. 145.

and the King with power and position. Each lacks the sense of proportion and propriety which the law of charity commands. Each is distracted from the higher and more proper love of God and people by an unacceptable pre-occupation with condition, status, or possession. Such pre-occupation is at the expense of the greater priorities dictated by the law of charity. In the hierarchy of consideration dictated by this law, proper regard for the well-being of one's fellowman takes precedence over the mentioned pre-occupations. The directions of the Prompter are constantly voiced so as to orient the performance of each character. The social obligation of man toward man, the loving of one's neighbors, is constantly ignored. All of the characters, except for Wisdom and the actless child, fail the test which the Beggar provides at the behest of the Author. Each of these characters ignore the plight of a fellow human in need for the sake of personal comfort or pre-occupation. They ignore an opportunity to prove that they are heeding the voice of the Prompter who speaks in behalf of the Author or God. They ignore an opportunity to pay proper and necessary homage to God by caring for God's creation as man. Each lacks charity for each has distorted focus and attention by an excessive concern for the self. The law to love thy neighbor as thyself is flaunted and the characters suffer accordingly and to the extent that they continue in their errorful ways.

or refuse to repent for such ways. The prompter declares that they should each do good for God is God--that is God is all-just and all-powerful and shall reward and punish each in accord with the merit of an earthly performance. Men do not exist in isolation. Men do not exist with merely an obligation to care for themselves and their own salvation. Man is a member of a community and has a strong social obligation. What wealth and assets he may possess are for the sake of care and devotion to God and man and, only then, to things and shallow concerns. To fail in fulfilling this social obligation is to engage in sin and merit eternal condemnation as does the Rich Man who by his acts of omission and failure to repent for these, merits eternal damnation. Calderón has presented, by dramatic means, that knowledge which dictates how man should conduct himself upon the earth in order to attain eternal life and salvation. Calderón has presented the law of community--the preservation and sustenance of man in his earthly life. Calderón, as pastor, presents that doctrine which is a pre-condition for the activity of man as it may direct itself toward the palliation of earthly suffering. There is no question that such is the intent and purpose of the play for Calderón cogently summarizes and explicates his intent. Again, the Prompter declares:

> I am the Law of Grace, and I shall speak the Prologue to our play. And I shall prompt you with this script, in which Thou'st summarized, oh Lord, the contents of our play:
>
> [*Singing*]
> *Love thy neighbor as thyself,*
> *and Do Good, for God is God* (p. 378).

There is little ambiguity here. Grace, the free gift of God rendered as strength and wisdom for the sake of overpowering sin and suffering, dictates that man love his neighbor as he loves himself and that he do good. In such love and goodness is found the quality and merit of earthly life. In such love and goodness, the all-powerful and all-just Author or God who views over all discerns the reasons for rewarding his earthly actors with eternal joy or suffering. Men must exercise the law of charity and in such charity is found not only the salvation of the individual but the salvation of the community which is so vital to God. Again, the noted Calderónian scholar Parker concludes:

> The excellence and value of El Gran Teatro del Mundo are to be found, more than in the appeal of its allegory, in the humanity of its social and moral teaching. Its strength lies in its affirmation of the social bond and in its denial that the individual can rightly exist in self-satisfied isolation . . . This affirmation . . . stands out as the noblest message of this play.[5]

The concern with the well-being and salvation of an individual bound to a community and the presentation of whatever knowledge is necessary to fulfill the same

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 151-152.

is the primary concern of the playwright as priest who assumes the pastoral role. In this play, Calderón fulfills this obligation with eminence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Anderson, Maxwell. "Poetry in the Theatre." American Playwrights on Drama. Edited by Horst Frenz. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1965.

Bevan, Edwyn. Sibyls and Seers. London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928.

Booth, Wayne. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Boylan, Eugene. The Spiritual Life of the Priest. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1959.

Bultmann, R. "Kerygma and Myth." Kerygma and Myth. Edited by H. Bartsch. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Carlyle, Thomas. Heroes and Hero Worship. Chicago: The Henneberry Co., n.d.

Chandler, Richard E., and Schwartz, Kessel. A New History of Spanish Literature. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1961.

Clark, Barrett H., ed. European Theories of the Drama. New York: Grown Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Clements, Robert J. Michelangelo's Theory of Art. New York: Gramercy Publishing Co., 1961.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda. Christian and Oriental Philosophy of Art. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956.

Crow, John A. Spain: The Root and the Flower. New York: Harper and Row Co., 1963.

Curtius, Ernst R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.

DeRougemont, Denis. "Religion and the Mission of the Artist." Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature. Edited by S. Hopper. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

DeSmedt, Bishop Emile-Joseph. The Priesthood of the Faithful. New York: Paulist Press, 1962.

Dunn, P. N. "Honour and the Christian Background in Calderón." Critical Essays on the Theatre of Calderón. Edited by Bruce W. Wardropper. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Ehrensperger, Harold. Religious Drama: Ends and Means. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Eliade, Mircea. The Sacred and the Profane. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Elliott, J. H. Imperial Spain: 1469-1716. New York: The New American Library, 1966.

Gardiner, P. Schopenhauer. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963.

Gould, Julius and Kolb, William, eds. A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan Co., 1964.

Green, Paul. Drama and the Weather. New York: Samuel French, Inc., 1958.

Guthrie, Tyrone. "So Long as the Theatre Can Do Miracles." Edge of Awareness. Edited by N. Hoopes. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1966.

Harrison, Jane Ellen. Ancient Art and Ritual. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Hatterer, Lawrence J. The Artist in Society. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966.

Hegel, F. W. Philosophy of Fine Art. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1886.

Hesse, Everett W. Calderón de la Barca. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Hirsch, E. D. Wordsworth and Schelling. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Hubert, Henri and Mauss, Marcel. Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Hume, Martin. Court of Philip IV. London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, n.d.

Ibsen, Henrik. "The Task of the Poet." Playwights on Playwriting. Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960.

James, E. O. "Sacrifice." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, XI (1921), p. 1.

_____. Sacrifice and Sacrament. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1962.

_____. The Nature and Function of Priesthood. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1955.

Kaminsky, Jack. Hegel on Art. New York: University Publishers, Inc., 1962.

Kane, Elisha K. Gongorism and the Golden Age. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1928.

Kazantzakis, Nikos. Report to Greco. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1966.

Kierkegaard, Soren. Crisis in the Life of an Actress. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Kitto, H. D. F. Form and Meaning in Drama. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960.

_____. "Religious Drama and Its Interpretation." Tragedy. Edited by L. Michel and R. Sewall. Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.

Klapp, Orin E. Ritual and Cult. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1956.

Kohler, E. "The Nature of the Symbol." Symbolism in Religion and Literature. Edited by Rollo May. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960

Kung, Hans. The Church. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.

Landtmann, Gunnar. "Priest and Priesthood." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, X (1920), p. 278.

Lawler, Justus. The Christian Image. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1966.

Lings, Martin. Shakespeare in the Light of Sacred Art. New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1966.

Loew, Cornelius. Myth, Sacred History, and Philosophy. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

Lorca, Frederico Garcia. "The Authority of the Theatre." Playwrights on Playwriting. Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960.

MacGregor, Geddes. Aesthetic Experience in Religion. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1947.

Male, Emile. Religious Art. New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1949.

Maritain, Jacques. Art and Scholasticism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

_____. The Responsibility of the Artist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960.

May, Rollo. "The Significance of Symbols." Symbolism in Religion and Literature. Edited by Rollo May, New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960.

Montini, Giovanni Battista, Cardinal. The Priest. Baltimore: Helicon Press, Inc., 1965.

Murray, Henry. "Definitions of Myth." The Making of Myth. Edited by H. Ohmann. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962.

Nahm, Milton. The Artist as Creator. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1956.

Parker, Alexander A. The Allegorical Drama of Calderón. London: Dolphin Book Co., Ltd., 1943.

Piault, Bernard. What is a Sacrament? New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1963.

Rahner, Karl, ed. The Pastoral Mission of the Church. Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965.

Read, Herbert. Icon and Idea. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Rennert, Hugo A. The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963.

Roaten, Darnell H., and Sánchez y Escribano, F. Wolfflin's Principles in Spanish Drama: 1500-1700. New York: Hispanic Institute in the United States, 1952.

Ross, Ralph. Symbols and Civilization. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Santayana, George. Interpretations of Poetry and Religion. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957.

_____. Three Philosophical Poets. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1910.

Sarte, Jean Paul. "Forgers of Myths." Playwrights on Playwriting, Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960.

Savill, A. Alexander the Great and His Time. London: Rockliff Publishing Corp., 1955.

Schiller, F. On the Aesthetic Education of Man. New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1965.

Schuon, Frithjof. The Transcendent Unity of Religions. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1953.

Scott, Nathan. "The Broken Center." Symbolism in Religion and Literature. Edited by Rollo May. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960.

Shipley, Joseph T., ed. Dictionary of World Literature. Patterson, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1960.

Spencer, Theodore. "Man's Spiritual Situation as Reflected in Modern Drama." Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature. Edited by S. Hopper. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Strindberg, August. "Miss Julie." Playwrights on Playwriting. Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960.

Suhard, Emmanual Cardinal. Priests Among Men. Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1951.

Thielicke, H. "The Restatement of New Testament Theology." Kerygma and Myth. Edited by H. Bartsch. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Ticknor, George. History of Spanish Literature. New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1849.

Tillich, Paul. "The Religious Symbol." Symbolism in Religion and Literature. Edited by Rollo May. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960.

Toller, Ernst. "Hoppla, Such is Life!" Playwrights on Playwriting. Edited by Toby Cole. New York: Hill and Wang, Inc., 1960.

Trask, Geraldine, ed. Storytellers and Their Art. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963.

Trevor Davies, R. The Golden Century of Spain: 1501-1621. New York: Harper and Row Co., 1965.

_____. Spain in Decline: 1621-1700. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1957.

Unamuno, Miguel de. "The Man of Flesh and Bone." Tragedy. Edited by L. Michel and R. Sewall. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.

Underhill, Evelyn. Worship. New York: Harper and Row, 1936.

Van der Leeuw, Gerardus. Sacred and Profane Beauty. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Inc., 1963.

Versenyi, L. Heidegger, Being, and Truth. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Vogt, Von Ogden. Art and Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948.

_____. Cult and Culture. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.

_____. Modern Worship. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927.

Wardropper, Bruce W., ed. Critical Essays on the Theatre of Calderón. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Watts, Harold. "Myth and Drama." Tragedy. Edited by L. Michel and R. Sewall. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.

Weisbach, Werner. Baroque as the Art of the Counter Reformation. Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1921.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Science and the Modern World. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Will, Frederic. Literature Inside Out. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1966.

Wise, Carroll A. Pastoral Counseling. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Wolfflin, Heinrich. Principles of Art History. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1932.

Woods, Ralph L., ed. The World Treasury of Religious Quotations. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1966.

Yerkes, Royden Keith. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

Articles and Periodicals

Adams, Hayward. "The Blakean Aesthetic." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIII (December, 1954), 245.

Albert, Sidney P. "Bernard Shaw: The Artist as Philosopher." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV (June, 1956), 419.

Arnett, Willard E. "Poetry and Science." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV (June, 1956), 448.

Barrault, Jean-Louis. "What Makes Men Free." Atlas Magazine, XVI (December, 1968), 57.

Gates, Eunice. "Calderón's Interest in Art." Philological Quarterly, XL (1961), 53-67.

Hesse, Everett. "Calderon and Velazquez." Hispania, XXXV (1952), 74-82.

Weisinger, Herbert. "The Proper Study of Myth." The Centennial Review, XII (Summer, 1968), 247.

Wellek, René. "The Concept of Baroque in Literary Scholarship." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, V (1946), 80 ff.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 03082 4563