Bridging an Internal Divide: The Search for Personal Reconciliation in the Works of Henry Adams

The perspective of the author often is revealed in the way reality is fictionalized. Henry Adams, novelist, freelance political journalist, and the descendant of two U.S. Presidents was internally divided by a "nagging crisis," a dilemma present in two of his early novels; *Democracy*, published in 1880, and *Esther*, published in 1884, provide insight into the mind and conflicted feelings of Adams. While these two novels allowed Adams to explore issues he dealt with in a fictional world, in *The Education of Henry Adams*, which was made publicly available in 1913, and was semi-autobiographical, the internal conflict Adams wrestled with becomes clear. "The bearing of the two seasons on the education of Henry Adams was no fancy; it was the most decisive force he ever knew; it ran through life and made the division between it perplexing, warring, irreconcilable problems, irreducible opposites, with growing emphasis to the last year of study. From the earliest childhood the boy was accustomed to feel that, for him, life was double."[1] Inside of this American with a fine pedigree was the acceptance that he was only a manikin, a figure shaped by external forces, and his "education," or understanding of the world as he reached his final year would be the perspective he would leave life occupying. The "essential lines of this nagging crisis are commonly drawn in the form of contrasts: confidence and doubt, freedom and constraint, liberation and domination."[2] The female characters in *Democracy* and *Esther* emanate from this internal division Adams felt and they embody many symptoms of the neurasthenia that made the writer feel as if he were "just jellyfish, and flabby through...as defunct as the dodo."[3] By looking at the search for understanding and the skepticism such a journey aroused in Adams's female characters, many of the dichotomies he encountered in post-Civil War life become clearer. *Democracy* and *Esther* capture the thoughts of Adams during a tumultuous time in his life, while *Education* provides evidence that the internal struggles of his female characters were not purely fiction, but emerged from the author's own persistent internal crisis.

Published as an anonymous work, *Democracy* wastes little time in pointing out the most important character of the novel, as Mrs. Lightfoot Lee is introduced on the opening page. She is "tortured by ennui" and this feeling is made insufferable in New York, where the circumstance of her daily life forces her to wonder, "What was it all worth, this wilderness of men and women as monotonous as the brown stone houses they lived in?"[4] Feeling her own neurasthenia due to her life in New York, she

realizes she must leave, a departure likely hastened by the death of her husband and child. The condition afflicting Lee was also a problem for Henry Adams, as both were trapped, confined to a particular life because of their wealth and social status. “It has at last become possible for large numbers of people to pass from cradle to grave without having had a pang of genuine fear,” and this overwhelming lack of any threat instilled a state of apathy, or neurasthenia.[5] Mrs. Madeline Lee decides to head south, traveling to the pre-Civil War northern capital of Washington, DC. As the federal government expanded following the Civil War, the will of men was extended into the daily lives of citizens through a centralized, bureaucratic system. Mrs. Madeline Lightfoot Lee finds herself eager to witness how men with differing political ideologies and desires were shaping and administering the modern American democracy. “She wanted to see with her own eyes the action of primary forces; to touch with her own hand the massive machinery of society; to measure with her own mind the capacity of the motive power. She was bent upon getting to the heart of the great American mystery of democracy and government.”[6] It is difficult to assert specifically what Lee expects to find, but she is willing to investigate Capitol Hill herself and witness what forces power the system in person.

It does not take long for Madeline Lee and her companion, younger sister Miss Sybil Ross, to make connections with the elite members of society who hold power in the capital city. They make the transition from the bourgeoisie social scene in New York to Washington quite easily, meeting politicians as well as others with the ability to shape national politics. Madeline was thirty and “not an orthodox member of the church; sermons bored her, and clergymen never failed to irritate every nerve in her excitable system.”[7] Sybil was six years younger and “transparent,” which is the opposite of how Madeline is portrayed. Though the sisters differ significantly, they both share the ability to inspire strong feelings in the chests of local politicians, diplomats, and other high-class men, who are eager to make the acquaintance of the two women. When Madeline meets Mr. Silas P. Ratcliffe, Senator from Illinois, she felt like she could fulfill her search and uncover a deeper understanding of the democratic American political system. “She wanted to understand this man; to turn him inside out; to experiment on him and use him as young physiologists use frogs and kittens.”[8] Madeline is eager to apply scientific reason in order to uncover the mysteries of politics in Washington. Whether she is naive or optimistic, what her inquiry eventually reveals about the American democracy is unsettling.

Henry Adams experienced the death of his wife and sister, events providing him with the insight to create a believable character in Madeline. While Mrs. Lee suffered the loss of her husband and daughter, Henry’s sister, “after ten days of fiendish torture, [she] died in convulsions.”[9] In a time of personal chaos, each of them, real and imagined, desired to find some meaning, a reason to understand their spiritual purpose

in life. While Adams eliminates the twenty years during which he was married to his wife Marian and suffers from depression following her suicide from the work, Madeline's search is the centerpiece of the *Democracy's* story; she is the believer who eventually reveals that the novel's title is a misnomer, a false categorization of the American political system she encounters. A Capitol insider tells her he has "known dozens of senators...and they are all like that. They never think of any one but themselves."[10] It is not long after this warning that she sees the vacuity of Washington's elite for herself. At a public event she sees the President and his wife for the first time, finding them to be so mechanical and lifeless looking that they seem unreal, as if they are made from wood or wax.

No one more perfectly illustrates the innately selfish politicians Madeline is warned about than Silas Ratcliffe. From their encounters on the political social scene to paying visiting her at home, Ratcliffe begins to appreciate the beauty and class of Madeline. He sees in her the chance to change through a union, one with ramifications for his political career, which will always remain his central devotion in life. "He felt that Mrs. Lee was more necessary to him than the Presidency itself; he could not go on without her..."[11] Madeline though remains skeptical, continually reminded that beneath the surface of the District, and Ratcliffe, exists a morally questionable character. Even the Illinois Senator's religious devotions were politically motivated. "He always attended morning service…not wholly on the ground of religious conviction, but because of a large number of his constituents were church-going people and he would not willingly shock their principle so long as he needed their votes."[12] Madeline was in search of understanding American democracy and she was finding that Ratcliffe was proving it to be a corrupt system.

If the conflict Mrs. Lee experienced in Washington created cognitive dissonance in her mind regarding the American political system, her life was complicated by the presence of two suitors. Though not an elected delegate, John Carrington is a former Confederate soldier who works in Washington as a lawyer. Both Carrington and Ratcliffe are equally enamored with Madeline, but hold differing reasons to desire her companionship as a wife. While she was internally feeling "life was double," growing to see the divergence between democracy and the American version of democracy, her external world was split by the attention of two men, one from Illinois and one from Virginia. Eventually finding it impossible to remain silent, Carrington tells Madeline that, "For the first time in my life I have known what it is to forget my own affairs in loving a woman who seems to me without a fault, and for one solitary word from whom I would give all I have in life, and perhaps life itself."[13] Adams offers a male character that is willing to place a woman before himself, to sacrifice dominance or control for a chance to be with a strong, moral female character. Ratcliffe however remains dedicated to his political life, unwilling to devote himself to Madeline,

consider her a useful tool in expanding his Capitol power. The senator is aware of the morally corrupt and vacuous life he has to lead in the political realm, which is another reason why he covets Madeline. “Domestic life is the salvation of many men, but I have for many years been deprived of it.”[14] Both men profess their love for Madeline, explaining why they must capture her fancy. Between the two suitors, her daily experiences with men were divided in two, one man willing to compromise, and another seeing Mrs. Lee as a useful adornment to his career.

The conflict evident in the life of the central character in *Esther* is even more pronounced than in Madeline’s character in *Democracy*. In the four years between the two novels, Adams’s desire to create a fictional conflict that reflected his own two-ness grew in magnitude. Whether it was simply to be more direct, or his ability as a writer evolved in this period, Esther finds herself be exposed to two “educations” at once. Henry Adams’s idea of “education” is not strictly the experience of sitting in a classroom and hearing a lecture, but refers more broadly to a set of thoughts or ideas which provide an interpretive paradigm to view the world. A particular school of thought, such as that of Kantian philosophy or the will to believe of William James, are each an “education” which provides a way to interpret the world. “The surface was ready to take any form that the education should cut into it...”[15] Adams believed in this, which fueled his desire to find an education which satisfied his desire for understanding. The mind of the individual was a “manikin,” a form open to numerous configurations depending upon intellectual experience and perspective, in the opinion of Henry Adams.

Esther finds herself pulled towards an “education” centered in the church. Sitting in St. John’s Cathedral, she listens as a young preacher delivers his sermon. Hearing the words, Esther is in fact more intrigued by the unwavering attention the congregation pays to Reverend Stephen Hazard. “He took possession of his flock with a general advertisement that he owned every sheep in it, white or black, and to show that there could be no doubt on the matter, he added a general claim to right on property in all mankind and the universe.”[16] Hierarchically pronounced dogma of a much less powerful nature was enough to drive Ralph Waldo Emerson from the clergy. For Esther Dudley, who like Henry Adams and Madeline Lee, experienced the grief of having a loved one die, the level of the faith Hazard is able to inspire in the churchgoers is impressive. Hazard and Esther begin to see one another outside of church, and in it as well; Esther is an amateur painter and works on decorating the walls of the cathedral. Esther is already suffering a weak constitution - the jellyfish Adams’s wrote of - without the added complications of a relationship with Hazard, telling Wharton, who is painting the church along with her: “I wish I earned my living. You don’t know what it is to work without an object.”[17] Living in the same

city as Adams's Madeline, Esther feels a similar ennui, one stemming from the trappings of bourgeois life.

Reverend Hazard is a compelling figure for Esther, especially after hearing him deliver a sermon to the congregation. In the chaos caused by the death of her father, with whom she shared a strong bond as the result of Esther's mother passing away when she was a young girl, the journey is underway. Death compelled or pushed Henry Adams, Madeline Lee and Esther Dudley to search for meaning. Madeline Lee applied the controlled conditions of a physiologist working in a laboratory to her investigation of American democracy. From his religiously chaste perspective, Hazard perceives that Esther puts too much zeal into her desire to find scientific proof which will solve the quest for understanding. Hazard points out, "You need what is called faith, and you are trying to get to it by reason. It can't be done."[18] One possible "education" which can fulfill the spiritual desires of Esther is formal religion; Reverend Hazard represents the outcome of putting faith in a Christian conception of the world. He urges her to forgo her adherence to scientific principles and asks Esther, "What do you gain by getting rid of one incomprehensible only to put a greater one in its place, and throw away your only hope besides?"[19] The pain of her father's loss, the stifling ennui of her life spent painting without the need to earn a living, and a broader journey to find meaning all combine to push Esther to seek her own suitable "education."

But religion was not the only perspective, or "education," which offered an explanation and understanding of what plagued Esther. She is told by her cousin, George Strong, that "science alone is truth."[20] Truth was achievable, and the chance to settle her internal double life, but the two paths to reconciliation between her mind and a higher understanding differed vastly. Reverend Hazard offers the ritualized practice of worship in a church, one where the rituals he leads serve as the focal point. He represents organized religion and the chance to find salvation through weekly prayer at St. John's. The alternate system of understanding to this formal religion is the agnosticism promoted by the scientific rationality of George Strong. For Madeline, the internal conflict is created by a scientific search for order, morality, and understanding in the American democratic system. The presence of Ratcliffe and Carrington compounds her confusion, doubling both her inner and outer worlds. The man, and the perspective of democracy - necessarily corrupt or simply imbalanced - she chooses will shape the course of her existence.

The internal disorder experienced by Madeline and Esther is caused by their choice in which "education" each assumes or believes. For Madeline, the choice is between political faith and acceptance of corruption, while Esther must decide if science or agnosticism provides more inner fulfillment. Their respective quests unfold in relation to male suitors, but the central tension in *Democracy* and *Esther* is that of the quest

for personal revelation. From the way in which the two women form relationships with the males wishing to suit their companionship needs, it seems that the internal discord is strong enough to cause ambivalent behavior. Carrington, the lawyer, accepts that Madeline is a strong and independent woman, one deserving of the space to make her own decisions on which paradigm to employ in interpreting the world. "For months his heart had ached with this hopeless passion. He recognized that it was hopeless. He knew that she would never love him, and, to do her justice, she never had given him reason to suppose that it was in her power to love him, or any man."[21] Carrington, less dogmatic and willing to accept Madeline's independence, perceives her need to assert her will by finding her own truth. Rather than imposing his own will, the Virginia rebel has already fought his war and proven his masculinity; honoring Madeline's decision to not chose him did not challenge to emasculate this valiant former soldier.

Instead of making it easy on Madeline, Ratcliffe is adamant that his will can subsume Madeline's. His political career, which is his main passion in life, will be enhanced by his union with Madeline. Ratcliffe, with a name that implies a corrupt nature (as in "Rat"), discloses his immoral practices as a politician, explaining his behavior in a dismissive manner. He thinks Madeline will be persuaded to accept his will, like a politician whose vote can be purchased with a bribe. He is demanding in his desire for Madeline. "I must have it. You alone can give it to me. You are kind, thoughtful, conscientious, high-minded, cultivated, fitted better than any woman I ever saw, for public duties."[22] Despite this pressure, Madeline resists the attraction of a strong, educated man, one she does feel an attraction towards. Unequivocally she explains that, "Mr. Ratcliffe, I am not to be bought. No rank, no dignity, no consideration, no conceivable expedient would induce me to change my mind."[23] Madeline is not only a strong character, but she is inquisitive and willing to be alone if it means she has a better chance of uncovering the most suitable "education" for herself. For her, "men were valuable only in proportion to their strength and their appreciation of women."[24]

In spite of Senator Ratcliffe's political maneuvering, he cannot win the one thing he believes his life positively requires. Whether or not Mrs. Lightfoot Lee is naive, by the end of the novel, she found the understanding which drew her to Washington. "She had got to the bottom of this business of democratic government, and found out that it was nothing more than government of any other kind."[25] Democracy, as she discovers, is certainly not democratic, which becomes apparent when Madeline learns that Ratcliffe used his influence on Capitol Hill to eliminate Carrington as a competitor for her affection. Even though Madeline told Sybil, her younger sister, that she would wed Ratcliffe, his corrupt politics push Mrs. Lee away. "Was it politics that had caused this atrophy of the moral senses by disuse?" she wondered, finding that

Ratcliffe's behavior proved that the heart of the American democratic government was not necessarily mysterious, but definitely in an unhealthy state. Democracy was not the way to create order amidst the chaos of the post-Civil War "megaphonic" era.[26] In spite of her optimistic hopes, Madeline realizes that corruption is seemingly endemic to Washington.

The men competing for Esther's affection create an external conflict, which is directly related to the "education" paradigm they represent. George Strong, college professor of paleontology – is a man of science. Esther respects his opinion as an educator, asking him, "is religion true?"[27] Esther's Aunt Sarah Murray believes that even though George is her cousin, he is the best suited mate for the painter. He offers the chance to unify the double life Esther is leading, one conflicted by the choice between agnosticism and religion; he understands that there is not a physical division in men's souls. "I can tell you all about the mound-builders or cave-men, so far as known, but I could not tell you the difference between the bones of a saint and those of a heathen."[28] As a scientist, Strong is pointing out that there does not have to be an original sin, nor an inherent dichotomy between good and bad, heathen and saint. But, he is careful to realize the limitations of this similarity at the basic level of one's skeleton. He does not believe in science as a terminus, a supreme form of "education," but thinks that his service to "help in making it truer," is worthwhile, since science is capable of removing the continual conflict faced in life.[29] George Strong, a hearty name for a character, is a man representing the faith to believe, but the desire for empirical proof.

Reverend Hazard, as a result of his religious beliefs, is more interested in putting faith in the church and its doctrine. His idea of courtship involved the casting of his will upon the desires of Esther. Writing to her cousin, Esther informs him that she is aware of one thing: "All I know about it is that I can't be a clergyman's wife…"[30] Rather than accepting a faith forced upon her by Hazard, Esther is honest with herself and aware of the challenges George's field offered to counter the orthodoxy the Reverend wishes she will embrace. "I am hopelessly wicked! I can't go to church every Sunday or hold my tongue or pretend to be pious."[31] Caught between religion and science, skeptical that either could provide a thorough understanding of the world, Esther continued to paint, resisting the force of Hazard. Much like Madeline, Esther is a strong female character, one intrigued by men, but adamant in finding her own understanding and asserting personal will. An indication of how Henry Adams felt about women, and why he created two such strong female characters in his novels is provided in his *Education*. "Adams owed more to the American woman than to all the American men he ever heard of, and felt not the smallest call to defend his sex who seemed to be able to take care of themselves...affirming that the woman was superior."[32] The reluctance of Madeline and Esther to enter into a union with men

who threaten to usurp their independence reflects the admiration Adams felt for the opposite sex.

Writing about issues he personally experienced through fictional characters did not alleviate the external forces which trouble Henry Adams. The death of his sister sent him in search of understanding, while he struggled to overcome the *tedium vitae* William James considered innate to members of the bourgeois class towards the end of the nineteenth century. Writing his own semi-autobiography, the duality of life, and the ability of "education" to change perspective remained an issue Adams explored. For all of his honesty and willingness to struggle through personal confusion in an effort to locate meaning, it is significant that Adams left out the pain he experienced after the suicide of his wife. Throughout his *Education*, Adams returns to this idea of the internal conflict he experienced throughout his life. "The violence of the contrast was real and made the strongest motive for education. The double exterior nature gave life its relative values. Winter and summer, cold and heat, town and country, force and freedom, marked two modes of life and thought, balanced like lobes of the brain."[33] From the structure of the human brain, to the contrast between seasons, Adams felt the pull between opposite forces. In *Democracy* and *Esther*, he uses the main characters as manikins, fictional forms which allow him to examine his own feelings about the inner disorder of modern life.

As the hegemony of religion faded, and the confusion of James's "megaphonic" era overstimulated one's mind, it was necessary to find a new "education." From his own experiences as a member of an elite family, to his life in Washington, Adams perceived the problems with the democratic government of the nation. Esther was deeply troubled by the loss of her father and Adams knew the affect such a death could have on a woman; Marian, his wife, was driven to her own death by the loss of her father. He indicates the depth of his own personal troubles well in *Education*, pointing towards the "jellyfish" life that plagued him, which is felt by both Madeline and Esther. "So passes the whole of life. We combat obstacles in order to get repose, and, when got, the repose is insupportable; for we think either of the troubles we have, or of those that threaten us; and even if we felt safe on every side, ennui would of its own accord spring up from the depths of the heart where it is rooted by nature, and would fill the mind with its venom."[34]

Over thirty years before Henry Adams was willing to write about how his own "life was a double," he explored the inner disorder created by daily life through characters in his novels. This division was naturally experienced, like the momentary connecting with the eternal moon, and the subsequent return to dilemmas of daily life, both big and small. But, the possible solution to creating internal unity was in the "education," or paradigm that one employs in order to find meaning. Adams is able to explore relationships between men and women in detail, a piece missing from *Education*.

Both Madeline and Esther finally conclude that it is best to remain single, to reject the men who covet their love. Ratcliffe is not merely politically corrupt, but reprehensible for his casual ability to justify his behavior. The democracy of Senator Ratcliffe suffered from moral bankruptcy, since he was elected to be a public official, but was nothing more than a well-dressed scoundrel. Madeline understood after traveling to Washington and meeting Ratcliffe the actual rules which dictated American democracy: "Wealth, office, power are at auction. Who bids highest? Who hates with most venom? Who intrigues with most skill? Who has done the dirtiest, the meanest, the darkest, and the most, political work? He shall have his reward."[35] Once she gained an understanding of Reverend Hazard and his church, Esther succinctly described her dissonance with his system of education. "It must be that we are in a new world now, for I can see nothing spiritual about the church. It is all personal and selfish."[36] Through the leading characters in his novels *Democracy* and *Esther*, Henry Adams explored the way in which he felt a dualism of life, an ongoing conflict within himself. Religion or science, faith in morality or skepticism, each placed differing requirements on the personal will. Madeline and Esther, though it was difficult, chose to pursue their own understanding and assert their own will. Pushed by the pain of death and eager to find an education which satisfied their desire to understand their world, Madeline and Esther, and Henry Adams, accepted the dualism of life and allowed the resulting ambivalence to serve as a reason to find meaning.

Closing in on the twilight of his own education, the crucial end of his study and intellectual journey, it is not clear that Henry Adams reached an understanding that provided contentment. Death and a fear of inertness pushed him to write, think and explore, as he refused to accept the *tedium vitae* his family name threatened to impose upon his life. In the twenty-fourth chapter of *Education*, entitled "The Abyss of Ignorance," Adams contemplates the search for unity and the faith of religion. "True, the Church alone had asserted unity with any conviction, and the historian alone knew what oceans of blood and treasure the assertion had cost; but the only honest alternative to affirming unity was to deny it; and the denial would require a new education. At sixty-five years old a new education promised hardly more than the old."[37] Science and religion were diametrically opposed and a sense of resignation in Adams is apparent. In a way, his final education was not the discovery of a gratifying paradigm, but the choice between two contradicting forces, a conflict he lacked the time to resolve. At least Henry Adams refused to live his life as a jellyfish and valiantly struggled to find his own meaning.

Bibliography

Adams, Henry. *The Education of Henry Adams*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Adams, Henry. *Esther*. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1938.

Adams, Henry. *Democracy: An American Novel*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1908.

Cotkin, George. *William James: Public Philosopher*. Illinois: Illinois University Press, 1994.

---

[1] Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 14.

[2] George Cotkin, *William James: Public Philosopher*. (Illinois: Illinois University Press, 1994), 74.

[3] Cotkin, 75.

[4] Henry Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*. (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1908), 1-2.

[5] Cotkin, 71.

[6] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 10.

[7] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 17.

[8] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 36.

[9] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 242.

[10] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 56.

[11] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 152.

[12] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 153.

[13] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 260.

[14] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel,* 309.

[15] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 39.

[16] Henry Adams, *Esther*. (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1938), 6.

[17]Adams, *Esther* 117.

[18] Adams, *Esther* 201.

[19] Adams, *Esther*, 290.

[20] Adams, *Esther*, 72.

[21] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 235.

[22] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 310.

[23] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 365.

[24] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 100.

[25] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 342.

[26] Cotkin, 74.

[27] Adams, *Esther*, 198.

[28] Adams, *Esther*, 198.

[29] Adams, *Esther*, 198.

[30] Adams, *Esther*, 269.

[31] Adams, *Esther*, 230.

[32] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 369.

[33] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 12.

[34] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 357.

[35] Adams, *Democracy: An American Novel*, 114.

[36] Adams, *Esther*, 297.

[37] Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 359.

Last Updated: 8/12/16

Kandinsky and Schoenberg: An Historical Analysis of Expressionism and Modernism

Kristel Kempin
History 481J
Professor Poetzl
7 December 2007

Vienna at the turn of the nineteenth century and Berlin between World War One and Two were cities whose social makeup fostered vibrant artistic and musical movements. In Vienna, the decadence of bourgeois society and the effect of World War One produced Expressionist art and atonal music; in Berlin, the destructive consequences of the war and the desperate desire to create something new led to the development of Modernist abstract art and 12-tone music. While Expressionism and Modernism are inexplicably tied to their social contexts, these artistic and musical styles came to reflect each other as well. Therefore, by visualizing music through art (and vice-versa), one can define both Expressionism and Modernism in Vienna and Berlin. For example, Kandinsky's painting *Composition IV* (1911) mirrors the radically new musical styles created and promoted by Arnold Schoenberg: heavy brush strokes akin to dramatic rhythms and emphatic accents, each vibrant color a hint of chromaticism and the overall chaotic nature of the painting echoing the confusion one feels after listening to atonal music. Similarly, Kandinsky's abstract, geometric painting *Within the Black Square* (1923) reflects the simple, yet innovative, 12-tone system of music developed by Schoenberg in the 1920s. In this way, art becomes a physical manifestation of the music. Thus, the works of Kandinsky and Schoenberg can be combined to show how Expressionism and Modernism reveal the turbulence inherent in Austrian and German society before, during and after World War One.

While it is true that almost all forms of art and music can be viewed as reflective of each other, for the purposes of this essay the focus will be on the works of Wassily Kandinsky (1866 – 1944) and Arnold Schoenberg (1874 – 1951), both of whom lived in Berlin at various points in their lives. While there were many important contributors to Expressionism and Modernism, Kandinsky and Schoenberg epitomized the cultural flux inherent in their radically changing time periods. Hence, their art exceeded the traditional bounds placed upon them.[1] While Kandinsky and Schoenberg stood out as rebellious individuals against what was perceived as the decadent past and its traditions at the turn of the century and thereafter, both the artist and the musician became part of a collective movement in the 1920s and 30s (Modernism) to help update and reformulate a culture that was devastated by war. As a result, Kandinsky and Schoenberg's works reflect the overwhelming discontent that defines the four decades in Austria and Germany between 1890 and 1930: nostalgia for the stability of the past, anxiety towards an uncertain future, *Angst* towards the

total destruction caused by the war and liberation from the traditional restraints imposed upon them in the past.

In more relative terms, Kandinsky and Schoenberg are ideal artists to study because their works reflect the fluidity and interconnectivity of artistic disciplines. Arnold Schoenberg experimented extensively with Expressionist painting, producing over two-thirds of his work between 1908 and 1913.[2] Still, Schoenberg remained "musical" in his painting styles because he created a motif that unified most of his art. Schoenberg used the theme of "gazes" or "penetrating eyes, usually directed straight at the viewer, which are so strong in expression and dominating and intensive in their effect" that Schoenberg can be counted among the great names of Expressionism.[3] Similarly Kandinsky, although admittedly not as prolific in music as Schoenberg was in art, had a "musical sensitivity" that informed the creation of his musical tableaux.[4] For instance, the series of canvases titled *Improvisation, Composition and Impressions* (of which *Composition IV* is a part)*[5]* imply that Kandinsky's art attempted to depict the gestures we hear in atonal music. Expressionist artist Franz Marc best defines this effort as "color hearing." Marc further explains this term by revealing the unique relationship between art and music to his friend and fellow artist, August Macke. Marc asks, "Can you imagine a music in which tonality…is completely suspended? I was constantly reminded of Kandinsky's large *Composition*, which also permits no trace of tonality…and also of Kandinsky's 'jumping spots' in hearing this music, which allows each tone sounded to stand on its own...."[6] Evidently the correlation between art and music was apparent not only to Kandinsky and Schoenberg but was also expressed by other artists associated with the Expressionist movement. Still, why is it so important to note the close relationship between art and music? This time it is Macke who responds, "the miracle that makes music so beautiful works also with colors in painting. Only it needs tremendous vision to coordinate them all like musical notes."[7] In other words, a canvas or a piece of music becomes more profound if it can be expressed, understood and translated across multiple media. Kandinsky and Schoenberg present interesting case studies because their work so eloquently presents these cultural movements, Expressionism specifically and Modernism generally.

Before the turn of the twentieth century, the era often referred to as *fin-de-siècle*, Vienna was a cosmopolitan, culturally charged city that came to represent the larger trends that dominated the Austro-Hungarian Empire and much of the European continent as well. On the surface, Austria-Hungary was a stable and seemingly permanent regime; the line of ruling Hapsburgs had sustained itself for over 700 years.[8] As a result of this stability, Viennese bourgeois truly indulged themselves in all aspects of culture: art, music, theater, dance and sex. In the Viennese experience above, the Victorian era earned its "decadent" reputation. Additionally, the end of the

nineteenth century saw a general advance in innovation, both inside and outside of the Austro-German realm, resulting in many types of scientific and technological developments. It was at this time that Wilhelm Röntgen discovered X-rays, Marie and Pierre Curie uranium and radioactivity, Lord Rutherford the atomic nucleus, Max Planck "quantum theory" and Albert Einstein the atomic theory as well as the special and general theory of relativity ($E=mc^2$).[9]Reflective of the stability and "golden age" of Austria-Hungary, the rapid development of scientific knowledge had significant repercussions, among them a radical decline in traditional religiosity.[10] The continuing shift away from a belief in a higher being that began in the earlier years of the Enlightenment helps to explain the intense devotion to art and music in Vienna, a trend that led to a type of artistic fanaticism. Stefan Zweig, a Viennese bourgeois and literary artist, commented in his autobiography that one "was not a real Viennese without this love for culture, without the sense, aesthetic and critical at once, of the holiest exuberance of life."[11] Clearly, art and music had become an alternative to religion in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna. Indeed, the swift development of science and technology, paired with an excessive enthusiasm for the arts, produced the cosmopolitan, culturally infused atmosphere of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna that inevitably produced the radical Modernist movements of the twentieth century.

To truly see and understand the decadence of the Victorian middle classes, one can look to art, in particular to Gustav Klimt's *The Kiss* (1907-08), which fully captures the opulence of Viennese bourgeoisie. The subject of Klimt's painting—a kiss—serves as a throwback to the Enlightenment and Romantic periods, two historical precursors that helped establish *fin-de-siècle*Viennese society. While it is hard to the see the influences of the Enlightenment, the simple fact that this painting is an expression of Klimt's individuality as a painter reflects the power of human liberty and thought emphasized by Enlightenment thinkers. In contrast, the portrayal of a kiss, which is in itself a move away from traditional Enlightenment themes, such as victories of human reason and logic, reflects intimacy and passion, two specifically Romantic ideals. Lastly, Klimt's excessive use of gold leaf and attention to intricate detail (making his work look more like a mosaic than a painting) not only reflects Victorian decadence but it also harkens back to the galant artistic styles of Enlightenment and Romantic painters and musicians, such as Jean Honoré Fragonard (painter) and Franz Schubert (composer). Thus, *The Kiss* serves as an explanation for Victorian decadence by encapsulating the artistic progression from the Enlightenment to Romanticism and ultimately, *fin-de-siècle* Vienna.

In music as in art, it becomes easy to see the preference for classical trends amongst the Viennese middle class by tracing its roots back to its Enlightenment and Romantic precursors. Classical composers of the Old Style—Mozart, Beethoven, Haydn, Schubert and Brahams—had become cultural icons and their music the standard from

which all other musical styles were judged.[12] Old Style composers, specifically those from the Enlightenment and Romantic periods, produced tonal music, which is defined by its clear harmonic progressions, typically moving from the home key (referred to as I or tonic) and towards the closely related dominant key (based on the fifth note of the tonic scale). This passionate desire to create predictable music is reflected in Classical aesthetics and Enlightenment ideals. In what has been referred to as the "cult of the natural," musicians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were obsessed with logical harmonic progressions because it made their music appear more natural and less forced, directly contrasting with the artificiality of the Baroque era.[13] At the same time, tonal music parallels the "golden age" of Austria-Hungary in orderly and predictable harmonic progressions that reflect the stability and reliability of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It was this illusion of permanence that first stimulated resistance to the status quo and ultimately the progression towards new artistic and musical developments.

Although devoted to the arts, Viennese bourgeois were exceedingly reluctant to accept and support the increasingly pronounced development towards new artistic and musical styles. In his historical overview entitled, *Schnitzler's Century,* Peter Gay asserts that the Victorian "bourgeois character…[was] largely built [on] prohibitions that middle class people will not do and words they will not allow themselves to say." He continues: "But if the bourgeois motto is self-abnegation, that is not because their passions are feeble but because their passions are harnessed."[14] Answering his own question, Gay uses Freud's psychoanalytic theories to explain that the upper middle classes living in Vienna at the end of the nineteenth century "harnessed their passions" because of various manifestations of cultural anxiety. Gay claims that it was "the dizzying inventions and discoveries, the unsettling ideas that invaded every domain of Victorian life…[that] gave its bourgeois culture an air of tension, of hopeful enterprise with anxiety following it like a shadow."[15] In other words, the rapid social, economic and artistic developments of Vienna's "golden age" intimidated the majority of Viennese bourgeois who, as a result, sought solace in the familiar, unchanging traditions of the past. Thus, the late nineteenth century in Vienna was characterized by a glorification of classical artistic styles in all media from architecture to art and music.

As a result of the reluctance to experiment among the Viennese bourgeoisie, there was a degree of animosity towards new artistic and musical styles that began to reject prevailing traditions. While Zweig reveals the overwhelming enthusiasm in Vienna for the arts, he fails to identify which movements were accepted and which were repressed. For instance, even before the beginning of the nineteenth century, Gustav Klimt led a group of "rebellious" artists called the Viennese Secession.[16] These artists produced works that coincided with the larger European Art Nouveau

movement and critiqued the bourgeois idolization of classical artistic trends as static and archaic. While Ringstrasse architecture presented a blend of Greek, Roman and Renaissance ideals, this style of construction "became a museum of historical architecture."[17] For example, the intimacy of Klimt's three paintings, *Philosophy, Medicine and Jurisprudence* (1899-1907) as well as his *Beethoven* frieze (1986) [18] reflect a deliberate break with the past and the start toward self-analysis and the development of an individual style. Parallel to artistic developments, there were composers at the turn of the century that formed a second wave or New Style of music.[19] For example, Gustav Mahler became one of the first to emphasize the importance of emotional expression through his conducting styles; he was so emphatic that he stood rather than sat while directing his orchestras.[20] Klimt and Mahler together pioneered the beginning of self-analysis as a justifiable mode of artistic expression. It was this tendency to favor individual rather than collective concerns that not only contradicted the prevailing artistic preferences amongst the Victorian middle class, but also helps explain the absence of a unique bourgeois style, whether in music, art or architecture. Thus, it was the lack of originality among the middle-class that sparked resistance and innovation.

Expressionism and Modernism have their roots in the problematic Viennese *fin-de-siècle* society. Although the Victorian bourgeoisie did not create its own artistic style, the period and society in which they lived plays a formative role and serves as a striking contrast to the generations that followed. While Peter Gay describes the associations of rebels in Vienna at the end of the nineteenth century as "rather mild in their departure from accepted norms," he nonetheless credits artists like Klimt and Mahler with being forerunners for the later, more radical movements.[21] "These associations of rebels," Gay writes, "spawned secessions from the [Viennese] Secession as the subversives as one generation became the establishment of the next."[22] Clearly, the trends that sparked the successive development of Expressionism and Modernism began in Vienna before World War One.

Expressionism can best be described as the embodiment of protests against inherited prohibitions as well as of new trends emphasizing individuality and self-analysis. Expressionism in the early twentieth century, in particular, was a "result of artists' unique inner or personal vision, and often [had] an emotional dimension."[23] The four essential elements of Expressionism can be seen in Edvard Munch's *Scream* (1893). First, the wide, heavy brush strokes and vibrant colors boldly defy classical artistic conventions, revealing Expressionism's severe move away from artistic traditions. Second, a scream is an "outer manifestation of inner suffering."[24] From this, Munch's painting can be viewed as a representation of his own inner emotions, such as anxiety, anger and confusion. *Scream* becomes an emblem of self-analysis and an exploration of the unconscious mind, two defining

characteristics of Expressionist art and music. Finally, the act of screaming is a way of letting loose and revealing the unrestrained emotions within, a trend that goes along with the rejection of classical cultural practices. All in all, *Scream* helps illuminate the essential elements of the Expressionist movement.

More, German Expressionism, or early Modernist art in Austria-Hungary, became an exploration of color and form: both were used to distort reality and reflect inner emotions and critiques of traditional artistic standards. Two groups stood as the forerunners of German Expressionism: *Die Brücke* (The Bridge) and *Der Blaue Reiter* (The Blue Rider). The first group, created in Dresden in 1905, included artists such as Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and Emil Nolde. These artists created tableaux with "harsh colors, aggressively brushed paint and distorted forms [that] expressed the painters' feelings about injustices of the society and their belief in the healthful union of human beings and nature."[25] Clearly, *Die Brücke* rejected the decadence of Viennese high society by experimenting with color and form. On the other hand, *Der Blaue Reiter,* established in Munich in 1911 by Wassily Kandinsky and Franz Marc, revolted against artistic norms by combining a manipulation of color and form with their beginning explorations of abstraction. Marc's famous painting *Fate of the Animals* (1913) portrays a blue wolf amidst a wild array of blurred colors. This unique combination of the tangible with the abstract helped Marc to relate an inner truth, a personal expression he believed was not found in classical art.[26]Meanwhile Kandinsky was more heavily influenced by abstract art than Marc. He admitted that once seeing his art turned on its side, he realized that it was "the object that harmed [his] art."[27] Thus, Kandinsky's abstractions proved to be some of the most profound expressionist work because he utterly rejected traditional standards and definitions of art.

Kandinsky's *Composition IV* (1911), in particular, epitomizes expressionist ideals and reveals why painting became an ideal medium through which to express the discontent and frustration that were festering in Vienna and Berlin since 1910. For example, the jumble of lines and nondescript shapes painted in bright colors and set against an empty white space rejects the predictability seen in nineteenth-century art. Because of the lack of order in *Composition IV,* our eyes are constantly diverted around the canvas, unsure of which line to follow. This confusion and lack of a central focal point mirrors the chaotic nature of early twentieth-century Austro-German society. While the bourgeoisie felt anxious towards the Expressionists, the Expressionists themselves communicated their individuality unyieldingly and both traditionalists and modernists struggled to comprehend the threat of cultural decline and a world war. Thus, *Composition IV* is a perfect example of Expressionism because Kandinsky remakes the standards of traditional art, builds on the ideals of the

Expressionist movement while using these to match his own individual emotions and critiques.

In music, Expressionism is found in the atonal style. The most important quality of atonal music is the avoidance of a tonal center; unlike classical music, it is hard to identify a "home key." In order to achieve this effect, atonal composers attempt to emancipate the dissonance by using total chromaticism, a musical technique that maximizes the number of dissonant notes and chords, confusing the melodic line and thereby masking any tonal center. As a result, atonal music became a style that "was about expression, achieving a new way to express thoughts in music."[28] Emotional expression drove the production and development of atonal music, as it did for Expressionist art. However, atonal music is not as radical as its artistic Expressionist counterpart because the music still retains a semblance of a tonal center; this tie to musical traditions better reflects artists of the Viennese Secession rather than later Expressionists from the groups *Die Brücke* and *Der Blaue Reiter*. Nevertheless, the desire to communicate using unique forms became the thrust behind musical Expressionism.

A good example of atonal music is Arnold Schönberg's, *Pierrot Lunaire* (1912). This collection of 21 poems, written by Belgian symbolist poet Alfred Giraud, was set to music and has become one of the pioneering examples of musical Expressionism. Pierrot is a clown who is tormented by threatening images of the moon.[29] In order to capture these images in his music, Schönberg experiments with atonality. For example, he produces a variety of colors, both light and dark (depending on the phases of the moon), by using a combination of instruments—flute (piccolo), clarinet (bass clarinet), violin (viola), cello and piano—alongside an increase in chromaticism and dissonant chords. In this way, Schönberg's music avoids a strict tonal center, or even a clear melodic line. Rather, *Pierrot Lunaire* is dominated by rhythmic and tonal motives. For example, the eighth movement (*Black Moon*) has a rising minor third and a descending major third (E-F-Bflat), a tonal motive that is elaborated upon throughout the 21 movements.[30] Similar to the thematic development in classical music, both rhythmic and tonal motives in atonal music are constantly transformed throughout a piece. The act of presenting an idea or a motive and drawing out variants of the idea/motive through inversion or retrograde variation (backwards) is referred to as developing variation, a technique also found in Schoenberg's later 12-tone style.[31] Lastly, *Pierrot Lunaire* uses *Sprechstimme*, an imitation of spoken dialogue that "follow[s] the notated rhythm exactly but only approximates the written pitches in gliding tones of speech."[32] The replacement of singing with *Sprechstimme* reflects Schoenberg's constant desire to find new ways of musical expression. In these enumerated ways, *Pierrot Lunaire* serves as an exemplar of atonal music.

To identify better the significance of atonal music and expressionist art, one must evaluate the two media with respect to each other. In Kandinsky's treatise, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* (1914), Kandinsky reveals and explains the interconnectivity between artistic disciplines and music. In this treatise, Kandinsky assigns a form and a function to the primary colors—yellow, blue, green, black, white, red, orange, purple and brown—all the while comparing these colors to the timbre of particular instruments. But why does Kandinsky create such correlations in art and music? Are these connections artificial? Kandinsky argues that the relationship between art and music is profound, so much so that art can help define music and vice-versa. He writes,

> A painter…in his longing to express his inner life, cannot but envy the way with which music, the most non-material of the arts today, achieves this end. He naturally seeks to apply the methods of music to his own art. And from this results that modern desire for rhythmic painting, for mathematical, abstract construction, for repeated notes of color, for setting color in motion.[33]

In other words, because music is abstract in nature, Kandinsky envies music's almost effortless yet successful attempts to portray inner emotions. And so, Kandinsky attempts to make his art more expressive by eliminating form and focusing entirely on color; that is, he makes his art more musical. Using the relationships defined in Kandinsky's 1914 treatise, one can say that Schoenberg's *Pierrot Lunaire* becomes colorful and artistic in form. Specifically, Schoenberg's use of various instruments not only masks the tonal center, a defining feature of atonal music, but (according to Kandinsky), the instrumentation also produces a rainbow of color: the flute is a light blue; the violin is placid green; cello a dark, more profound blue; and the piano an intense and aggressive yellow.[34] This application of color to music can be done to all types of music and as a result, strips the barrier between the arts. And so, by defining art in relation to music and vice-versa, the Expressionist and Modernist movements respectively become more profound.

Building upon his analysis of color in relation to music, Kandinsky's Composition IV can be used to show the characteristics of atonal music. Peter Gay writes that Expressionism "took strong, simple, aggressive colors, the consciously primitive craftsmanship, the passionate and cruel distortion of the human figure—all discovered before the war—to new extremes."[35]Here, the "primitive craftsmanship" to which Gay refers to can be seen in the flat, white backdrop of Kandinsky's Composition IV. This blank space can be seen as Kandinsky's removal of Victorian decadence in his artwork, a type of decadence that defined artistic styles before the war. Similarly, the use of total chromaticism in Schoenberg's Pierrot Lunaire rejects the traditional notion that dissonance is mere ornamentation; in Pierrot Lunaire the addition of chromaticism creates color in the piece and serves as a defining stylistic feature. Furthermore, because of its abstract and chaotic nature, Composition IV reflects an "inner reality…a truth that demanded

emancipation from the 'lie' of convention and tradition."[36] Here, the stress on the individual—whether it is the artist or his viewer—represents a rejection of the past, a major feature of Expressionism. This move away from tradition is also inherent in the definition of atonality. Using the same vocabulary, the "emancipation of dissonance" not only creates a more chaotic, ambiguous piece of music, but it also serves as a criticism of the strict adherence to tonal structure and predictability in classical music. Furthermore, one can compare the confusion created by the bold lines in Composition IV to the lack of a tonal center in Pierrot Lunaireand the vibrant colors to the increased use of chromaticism and dissonance. Overall, it is clear that Expressionism was a movement that encompassed both musical and artistic styles. Kandinsky's Composition IV and Schönberg's Pierrot Lunaire illustrate the pioneering new artistic trends in Austria-Hungary and Germany, Vienna, before and Berlin thereafter.

With the conclusion of World War One, "life would not let art alone"[37] and Berlin became one of the most prominent, cosmopolitan cities in Europe between 1918 and 1933. In fact, "artistic life in Germany between the wars witnessed a virtual explosion of forms, subject matter and ideologies."[38] In one city, Modernism enveloped movements such as Dadaism, Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity), Gebrauchsmusik and Bauhaus. Among all these movements, a sense of internationalism was ever present, effecting the type of art that was produced as well as who produced it. Some artistic movements became functionalist (serving a practical purpose) and defined their art as a medium through which to achieve progressive social and political goals.[39] Other movements restated the functionalist theory and emphasized the unity of artistic media. The early Bauhaus movement under Walter Gropius harkened back to medieval/Baroque craftsmanship, the arts and crafts and European Art Nouveau movements, which stressed unity amidst all the arts. For example, Einstein's Observatory (1920-21), designed by Erich Mendelsohn, reflects an organic unity to architectural design. Of course, as modernization and industrialization (Americanization, Fordism, etc.) took hold in Europe between the wars, the Bauhaus movement became more standardized and functionalist in nature. Another example is Wassily Kandinsky himself. A native Russian, Kandinsky was criticized by his contemporaries for moving to Munich (and later Berlin) rather than staying in Russia to help ferment a Russian nationalist art movement.[40] The rise of internationalism in art changed the form and function of Modernist art and "[b]y 1919, the belief that Expressionism had run its course was widely shared by many on all sides of the artistic spectrum."[41] In other words, the face of Modernist art changed fundamentally and the center of all this artistic activity was now in Berlin.

Still, Berlin's society was immersed in turmoil. Created on November 9, 1918, the Weimar Republic was overwhelmed by inflation, war reparations and the social

instability of the Republic itself.[42] Although there was a relative period of stability from 1924-1929, the early phase of the Weimar Republic was dominated by two stages of inflation: demobilization inflation from 1919-1921 and catastrophic hyperinflation from 1922-1923.[43] In 1923, due largely to resistance to French occupation of the Ruhr, the German currency collapsed.[44] Widespread hunger and unemployment dominated Berlin society between the wars. For example, some 40% of Germans were unemployed in 1932.[45] The situation was exacerbated further by the high, seemingly impossible demands made by the Allied Powers in the Versailles Treaty. In addition to the war guilt clause, which held Germany fully responsible for the war, the Weimar Republic was expected to pay for all of the damages incurred by the war, which approximated 269 million gold marks.[46] Moreover, the Weimar Republic and its new left-center parliamentary coalition government were so weak that immediately after its creation in November 1918, a series of revolts, protests and mass movements dominated the political scene. Despite the successful Reichstag elections on June 6, 1920,[47] "in less than 15 years of Weimar, there were 17 [separate] governments."[48] All in all, it was the world war and its aftermath that served to catalyze the plethora of new artistic conventions that changed the face of the Modernist movement, making Berlin the most culturally infused city of the time.

Modernism as an artistic and musical movement can be used to describe the mentality of the interwar years. By definition, Modernism "reassessed inherited conventions…and challenged…perceptions and capacities."[49] While this definition is very broad (since it even encompasses Expressionism), Modernism is unique in the sense that its adherents were looking to "re-make the past."[50] In this sense Modernist trends reflected the contemporary social, economic and political realities in Berlin and the Weimar Republic generally. The war had devastated Germany's inherited structure, forcing it to regenerate into a modern republic. In addition to facing incredible financial burdens, Germany lost considerable territory and 13% of its population, totaling six million people.[51] Consequently, Weimar was almost forced to adopt new social, political and artistic structures. Similar to their Expressionist precursors a decade earlier, Modernist artists rebelled against traditions, such as the French Impressionism and Naturalism that had become the artistic norms.[52]

However, Modernists went further in their rejection than the Expressionists of the earlier periods. As a result of the total devastation of World War One, there was hardly anything left to critique. Thus, artists and musicians worked to create a new artistic model: Modernism. As mentioned above, there were many guises of the Modernism that developed between the wars in and beyond Berlin. There were two artists in particular whose styles captured the spirit of Modernism generally: Paul Klee (1879 – 1940) and Wassily Kandinsky. Klee's goal was to show the invisible

forces at work in Berlin after World War One. Because of the war, political foundations, national boundaries and traditional conceptions of reality were all challenged and to an extent, destroyed. Nevertheless, both Germans and Europeans struggled to rebuild their respective societies. It was this process, which as invisible because not tangible, was exactly what Klee strove to portray in his art. As he himself notes:

Art does not reproduce the visible; rather it makes visible…[t]he formal elements of graphic art [which] are the dot, line, plane and space – the last three charged with energy of various kinds…Formerly we used to represent things visible on earth, things we either liked to look at or would have liked to see. Today we reveal the reality that is behind visible things.[53]

Clearly, Klee felt strongly tied to his society and attempted to help rebuild dilapidated artistic structures through his art. In his painting Twittering Machine (1922), Klee uses birds, oddly constructed, to represent the world before World War One and steely black lines to represent machines and technology in post World War society. The birds are welded to the black lines, the same way Germans and Europeans were so closely tied to the process of modernization to help rebuild their society. By examining Twittering Machine, it becomes clear that Modernism resulted in radical forms of art that provided the Weimar Republic and the larger European world with new and distinct cultural goals and ideas.

Modernism is often referred to as abstraction, the rejection of identifiable figures, objects and space that totally re-vamped traditional perceptions of art. Kandinsky felt that through his art he was "destined to create a new world…the symphony of spheres."[54] This belief embodies the spirit of Modernism and the simple desire to create. In his painting Within the Black Square (1923), Kandinsky moves away from the bold, fluid brushstrokes that defined Composition IV and uses geometric shapes juxtaposed with vast, blank spaces, leaving his viewers unsure of the point.[55] From a historical perspective, Within the Black Square can best be explained in relation to the history of Weimar Germany and post World War Europe. The lack of a distinct expression or meaning in the painting mirrors the lack of substantial structures in Weimar Germany; it also parallels the general destruction in Europe as a result of the war. Thus, Within the Black Square reveals the move toward simplicity and ambiguity to create a new artistic trend for Weimar Germany and the larger European scene.

While modern art was abstract, modern music developed into the methodical 12-tone system. This system developed by Arnold Schoenberg is a "form of atonality based on systematic orderings of 12 units of the chromatic scale."[56] The same way abstract art rejects traditional perceptions of art to create a new form, Schoenberg's 12-tone music denies both the customary forms and functions of tonal and atonal music.

Schoenberg replaces different keys from the tonal system with 12 tones (pitches) from the C major scale and assigns each pitch an integer designation.[57] In this new musical scale, the "12 tones are related only to one another (rather than the tonic)."[58] As a result, 12-tone music is not restricted in any way. Rather, Schoenberg created a new system that is fundamentally free. Although it is easy to make comparisons with tonal and atonal music—such as associating the basic set with a "tonal region" or motive and different transformations to "modulations"—one must remember that in 12-tone music there is no theme.[59] Notes in the 12-tone series are related to each other but, because the concept of a key has evaporated, there is no longer a concept of a "free note" or a non-chord tone (dissonance).[60] Thus, Schoenberg successfully emancipated dissonance from its traditional function in tonal music. Taken together, Schoenberg effectively created a new form of music.

Although Arnold Schoenberg pioneered the revolutionary 12-tone system of music, his student Anton Webern in his Opus 27 Piano Variations (1936) for example, develops the main components of the 12-tone system his teacher produced. In Webern's work, measures one through four make up the basic set in its prime (original) form in which all 12 tones are introduced. Immediately following the prime form, measures four through seven transpose the basic set by writing the musical pattern backwards (retrograde); this retrograde is repeated exactly in measures 15 – 18. In measures eight through fifteen, the basic set is split into smaller sets and becomes "fragments of the theme." These smaller sets, despite their inversions, maintain their original groupings that are presented in the prime form (mm1 – 4). For instance, there are four groups of fragments – (541), (e76), (302) – whose order may be varied but only within themselves. In this way, Webern creates unity in his seemingly haphazard piece by repeating and varying the four fragments embedded in the opening "theme." Thus, an analysis of Webern's Piano Variations not only reveals the characteristics of 12-tone music but also shows the particulars of a radically new system of music that was based on Schoenberg's prior work.

While Webern's Piano Variations can be used to illustrate the basic components of 12-tone music, Schoenberg's Opus 33a (1928) reveals the larger trends and elaborations that are possible in the new 12-tone system. As in Webern's work, Schoenberg's music is defined by the absence of a melodic line. The "theme" in Opus 33a is a pitch series that is further varied and elaborated throughout the rest of the piece. Unlike tonal music, Opus 33a does not have any distinct phrases but moves in relation to the number of variations upon the prime form. This technique is called developing variation. Similarly, there is no sense of harmonic direction. Typical of tonal music, one can hear a clear harmonic progression towards a final cadence. But because 12-tone music has liberated dissonance and abolished the tonal center, there

is no such thing as the need to resolve. As a result, 12-tone music seems chaotic and confusing to the listener, but upon a closer examination clearly shows an order hidden beneath the disorder. Lastly, 12-tone music is defined by its odd rhythms and frequent drastic changes in tempo. In Opus 33a, Schoenberg begins in 4/4 meter but on the last page, he switches between 5/4 and 6/8, only to end in 3/4. These shifts in tempo are mirrored by a change in dynamics; Schoenberg rapidly switches from pianissimo to forte at the end of the opus. Together the changes in tempo and sound create a more dramatic, expressionist piece of music. Thus, Schoenberg's Opus 33ais typical of 12-tone music and reflects the burning desire to create a new way to communicate musically.

The same way that Kandinsky's Composition IV illustrates the elements of atonal music, Within the Black Square mirrors the characteristics of the 12-tone system. Upon listening to 12-tone music, the pieces appear to have no direction. This ambiguity is reflected in the flat, empty spaces of Within the Black Square. In contrast, the painting includes clearly defined geometric shapes, which are similar to Schoenberg's 12 chromatic pitches with integer equivalents, organized into strict forms and fragments. Clearly, there is order beneath the disorder, one that may be more readily visible in the abstract paintings. While this new concept of art and music may be less expressive, the fact that both disciplines work to create a new image or sound completely out of nothing is what defines Modernist art and music. Finally, it may be said that abstract art, however profound, is not necessarily aesthetically pleasing. The same can be said about 12-tone and atonal music. When Schoenberg premiered his music in Vienna in 1900, "[his] songs met laughing and hissing."[61] But all together, the lack of a "pretty" melody and the absence of a traditional form mirror the social realities of Weimar Germany, which as a result of World War One, had to be reconstructed and rebuilt in modern guise. Reflecting this trend, Kandinsky and Schönberg "turned more and more towards an abstract style…."[62] In a fundamental sense then, abstract art and 12-tone music served to fill the cultural vacuum that was a direct result of World War One and its aftermath.

To sum up, it is clear that art and music are artistic media that more than reflect each other's styles. Both mirrors the societies in which they are embedded in as well. By revealing the close relationship between art and music, Kandinsky and Schoenberg's works themselves become more profound. Kandinsky's Composition IV becomes more than a mess of lines and colors on a canvas and Within the Black Square is not just a collection of shapes. Similarly, Schoenberg's Pierrot Lunaire is not a bizarre collection of songs and Opus 33a is not just a hectic mess of notes on a page. Rather, both Kandinsky and Schoenberg's early works express the desperate desire for change in early twentieth-century German society while their later works reveal an attempt to create new media of artistic and musical communication after 1918. This

analysis of Expressionism and Modernism, as exemplified in Kandinsky and Schoenberg's works, reveals the creative turbulence that characterized Vienna and Berlin across a forty-year period.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. Philosophy of New Music. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Burkholder, Peter J., Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca. A History of Western Music, 7th ed. New York: WW Norton & Company, 2006.

Dimenberg, Edward, Martin Jay and Anton Kaes. The Weimar Republic Sourcebook. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1994.

Ennulat, Egbert H., Arnold Schönberg Correspondence: A Collection Tranlsated and Annotated Letters Exchanged with Guido Adler, Pablo Casals, Emanuel Feuermann and Oline Dowes. New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1991.

Ehrenzweig, Anton. The Hidden Order of Art. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Fanning, David: 'Expressionism,' Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy (Accessed 9 October 2007), <http://www.grovemusic.com.>

Finscher, Ludwig: 'German Art Music,' Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy (Accessed 9 October 2007), <http://www.grovemusic.com.>

Frisch, Walter. Schönberg and his World. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Gay, Peter. Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle Class Culture, 1815 – 1914.

New York: WW Norton and Company, 2002.

---. Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider. New York: WW Norton & Company, 2001.

Gardner, Helen, Fred S. Kleiner and Christin J. Mamiya. Gardner's Art Through the Ages: A Concise History. Australia and United States: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2006.

Greenberg, Robert. Robert Greenberg: How to Listen to and Understand Great Music,

Lecture 48: Early Twentieth-Century Modernism--Arnold Schoenberg. 45 min. The Teaching Company, 2007, cassette tape.

Hughes, H. Stuart. Contemporary Europe: A History. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981.

Hutton-Hutschnecker, Leonard. Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, August Macke: Drawings and Watercolors. New York: Hutton-Hutschnecker Gallery Inc., 1969.

Johnston, Paul. Art: A New History. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1993.

Johnston, William M. The Austrian Mind, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Kandinsky. Produced and directed by Andre S. Labarthé. 60 min. RM Arts, TFI, 1986. Videocassette.

Koska, Stefan and Dorothy Payne. Tonal Harmony With an Introduction to Twentieth-Century Music, 5th ed. New York: Mc Graw Hill, 2004.

Novotny, Frtiz. Gustav Klimt. London: Thames and Hudson, 1968.

Palisca, Claude V. Norton Anthology of Western Music. New York: Norton, 1980.

Peukert, Detlev J. K. The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity. New

York: Hill and Wang, 1989.

Schorske, Carl E. Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture, 1st ed. New York: Knopf,

1980.

Wan-Ki Lee, Wendy. Theory IV notes. 2007.

Zweig, Stefan. World of Yesterday. London: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

---

[1] Jelena Hahl-Koch, Arnold Schoenberg – Wassily Kandinsky, trans. John C. Crawford (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984), 136.

[2] Ibid, 150.

[3] Hahl-Koch, 168.

[4] Hahl-Koch, 135.

[5] Paul Johnston, Art: A New History, (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1993), 666.

[6] Hahl-Koch,136.

[7] Leonard Hutton-Hutschnecker, Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, August Macke: Drawings and Watercolors, (New York: Hutton-Hutschnecker Gallery Inc., 1969), 108.

[8] Stefan Zweig, World of Yesterday (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 284.

[9] H. Stuart Hughes, Contemporary Europe: A History, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981), 180.

[10] Hughes, 180.

[11] Zweig, 20.

[12] Robert Greenberg: How to Listen to and Understand Great Music, Lecture

48: Early Twentieth-Century Modernism--Arnold Schoenberg, 45 min., The Teaching Company, 2007, cassette tape.

[13] Prof. Schleuse, The Enlightenment and Changes in Italian Opera, lecture notes, 2007.

[14] Peter Gay, Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle Class Culture, 1815 – 1914, (New York, London: WW Norton and Company, 2002), 26.

[15] Gay, 142.

[16] William M. Johnston, The Austrian Mind, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2000), 144.

[17] Johnston, 148.

[18] Johnston, 148.

[19] Robert Greenberg: How to Listen to and Understand Great Music, Lecture

48: Early Twentieth-Century Modernism--Arnold Schoenberg, 45 min., The Teaching Company, 2007, cassette tape.

[20] W. Johnston, 137.

[21] Gay, Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle Class Culture, 1815 – 1914, 231.

[22] Gay, 231.

[23] Helen Gardner, Fred S. Kleiner and Christin J. Mamiya, Gardner's Art Through the Ages: A Concise History, (Australia and United States: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2006), 1004.

[24] David Fanning, "Expressionism," Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy (Accessed 9 October 2007), http://www.grovemusic.com.

[25] Gardner, Kleiner and Mamiya, 1009.

[26] Ibid., 1010.

[27] Kandinsky, prod. and dir. Andre S. Labarthé, 60 min., RM Arts, TFI, 1986, videocassette.

[28] Peter J. Burkholder, Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca, A History of Western Music, 7th ed. (New York and London: WW Norton & Company, 2006), 835.

[29] Burkholder, 835.

[30] Claude V. Palisca, A Norton Anthology of Western Music, 1st ed., (New York: WW Norton, 1980).

[31] Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, 835.

[32] Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, 835.

[33] Wassily Kandinsky, Concerning the Spritiual in Art, (Millbank, London: Tate Publishing, 2006), 41.

[34] Kandinsky, 74-82.

[35] Peter Gay, Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider, (New York: WW Norton & Company, 2001), 106.

[36] David Fanning, "Expressionism," Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy (Accessed 9 October 2007), http://www.grovemusic.com.

[37] Gay, Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider, 133.

[38] Anton Kaes, Martin Jay and Edward Dimendberg, The Weimar Republic Sourcebook (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1994), 474.

[39] Kaes, Jay and Dimendberg, 475.

[40] Kandinsky, prod. and dir. Andre S. Labarthé, 60 min., RM Arts, TFI, 1986, videocassette.

[41] Kaes, Jay and Dimendberg, 475.

[42] Detlev J. K. Peukert, The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989), 42.

[43] Peukert, 61.

[44] Ibid., 62.

[45] Gardner, Kleiner and Mamiya, 1004.

[46] Peukert, 55.

[47] Ibid., 4.

[48] Gay, Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider, 75.

[49] Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, 801.

[50] Ibid, 802.

[51] Peukert, 15.

[52] Hughes, 200.

[53] Gardner, Kleiner and Mamiya, 1043.

[54] Kandinsky, prod. and dir. Andre S. Labarthé, 60 min., RM Arts, TFI, 1986, videocassette.

[55] P. Johnston, 666.

[56] Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, 802.

[57] Prof. Wendy Wan-Ki Lee, Theory IV notes, 2007.

[58] Egbert M. Ennulat, Arnold Schönberg Correspondence: A Collection Tranlsated and Annotated Letters Exchanged with Guido Adler, Pablo Casals, Emanuel Feuermann and Oline Dowes, (New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1991), 3.

[59] Stefan Koska and Dorothy Payne, Tonal Harmony With an Introduction to Twentieth-Century Music, 5th ed., (New York: Mc Graw Hill, 2004), 52.

[60] Ibid.

[61] W. Johnston, 139.

[62] Hughes, 201.

Machiavelli and Shakespeare: Disguise as a Means to an End

Matthew Thomas Nilsson

The late American writer Kim Hubbard once said, “There is no disguise which can hide love for long where it exists, or simulate it where it is not.” Judging the ends of their plays, William Shakespeare, author of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*, might have agreed with Hubbard’s quotation, but the author of *La Mandragola* (*The Mandrake Root*, translated into English) may very well have disagreed. Disguise, as a literary device, can take many forms, some of which both Machiavelli and Shakespeare used. In her master’s thesis, Jia-ying Tang breaks down Shakespeare’s use of disguise into two broad categories: same-sex disguise and opposite-sex disguise.[1] In order to divide further the device, Tang references Susan Baker; Tang writes: “Baker divides disguise into four kinds — the concealing disguise, the substitutive disguise, the task-oriented disguise, and the improvisational disguise.”[2] Though referring only to Shakespeare, some of Tang’s ideas can be applied also to Machiavelli’s *Mandragola*. While Shakespeare employed a broader range of disguise devices in *Twelfth Night* than Machiavelli in *The Mandrake Root*, both Shakespeare and Machiavelli implemented “task-oriented,” means-to-an-end disguise devices into their plays. However, Shakespeare’s used of disguise more broadly, in *Twelfth Night* at least, than that of Machiavelli, who, in *The Mandrake Root*, used a means-to-an-end device almost exclusively.

The plot of *The Mandrake Root* is rather simple: Callimaco is, as Machiavelli called him, “a young Florentine in love,”[3] who is infatuated with Lucrezia, the wife of Messer Nicia, who is widely considered a fool by the characters of the play. Callimaco enlists the assistance of Ligurio — “a clever parasite,”[4] according to Machiavelli — to trick Nicia into allowing Callimaco to bed Nicia’s wife. Ligurio and Callimaco together hatch a plan to convince Nicia — who is unable to have children — that a magic plant, the mandrake root, will produce him a child; the only catch is: the man that makes love to a woman consuming the root’s potion will die; the only way for that man to live is to for another man to sleep with the woman — then, the second man will die. Along the way, “a priest whose services are for sale,”[5]Brother Timoteo, is sought out by Ligurio to convince Lucrezia to go along with the plan because she is not as easily prodded as was Nicia, who, in his supposed foolery, agrees to the plan almost immediately.

Throughout the story, a number of characters wear disguises; the most notable among them being Callimaco — who assumes a disguise both "*as* himself as well as a disguise *of* himself"[6] — and Timoteo, who is the only other character to disguise himself as another person. In the end, Timoteo, along with her mother, Sostrata, successfully convince Lucrezia to take part in the plot. Nicia, Ligurio, and Timoteo (all in disguise, but with Timoteo disguised as Callimaco) kidnap Callimaco, disguised as a random lute player, and take him to Lucrezia's bedroom (presumably after Nicia had already been there) so that Callimaco may make love to Lucrezia and allow Nicia to live. The play ends with a celebration and some comments on the part of Nicia which may leave the reader wondering what he really knows about the previous night's goings-on.
Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, however, cannot be described so simply, so only the parts that are relevant to this piece will be discussed at length, with other portions of the plot inserted as illuminating details. In the second scene of the play, Viola is shipwrecked and separated from her twin brother, Sebastian. She takes to Illyria disguised, in man's attire, as Cesario, so she can become a page and, later, a close confidant of Orsino, Duke of Illyria. The majority of Viola's duties for Orsino involve attempting to woo Oliva, a countess and member of the *Twelfth Night* 'high court' for him; however, Oliva wants nothing to do with Orsino and, instead, falls in love with Cesario, who is Viola is disguise. At the mid-point of the play, Sebastian arrives in Illyria and there is much confusion between him and the other characters because they mistake him for Cesario. Confrontations result from this mistaken-identity case between the plays characters and both Viola and Sebastian, separately, of course. At plays end, however, both Sebastian and Viola appear together and Viola reveals her true, female identity. After Viola's revelation, Orsino pledges his love for Viola and Oliva the same to Sebastian. The main character that appears in disguise is, as has already been discussed, Viola, but Feste, the jester for Oliva's late father, also appears disguised as a religious figure in a trick on one of the play's characters.
Shakespeare and Machiavelli's usage of disguise is similar, most simply, in that both men used very complicated and confusing devices in their respective works. In Shakespeare's case, when played on stage during Shakespeare's time, a man would have played the part of Viola, the English stage excluded women during his time. Then, when Viola disguises herself as Cesario, the man playing Viola would have to, in turn, disguises himself as a man, which he already is; hence, a complicated man-playing-a-woman-playing-a-man scenario.
Machiavelli, for his part, also employed a hard-to-follow disguise motif. When Nicia is initially brought by Ligurio to meet Callimaco, Callimaco pretends to be a doctor — by

Ligurio's orders — so as to convince Nicia that the mandrake root really can cure his child-rearing problems, which will allow Callimaco to bed Nicia's wife. Ligurio, later in the play, devises the plan to have Callimaco captured and brought into Lucrezia's bedroom, but one problem arises: Nicia already knows Callimaco as a doctor. To solve the problem, Callimaco is convinced to disguise his face so that Nicia will not recognize him and don a lute player's garb. Callimaco's role in the play, then, involves the complicated schema, as Harvey C. Mansfield pointed out in an essay in *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli: Essays on the Literary Works*, "of a disguise *as* himself [Dr. Callimaco] as well as a disguise *of* himself [the lute player]."[7] There is a definite similarity in Machiavelli and Shakespeare's usage of disguise in that both utilized difficult-to-comprehend elements of disguise in their works.

Both *The Mandrake Root* and *Twelfth Night* deal with love through disguise, which is a further similarity between Machiavelli and Shakespeare's implementation of disguise into their plays, though Machiavelli's take on love differs greatly from that of Shakespeare. Viola falls in love with Orsino early in the play, but it is her male disguise that gains her a close enough proximity to the Duke to fall in love with him that keeps her from expressing her love for him.[8] Oliva, on the other hand, falls in love Cesario, and there is no indication that her love, though expressed towards a person who is not what Oliva thinks he is, is anything but genuine.

If the sort of love Shakespeare describes in *Twelfth Night* is true love, however, the same cannot be said for Machiavelli's *Mandragola*. Throughout the majority of the play, Callimaco's goal is to bed Lucrezia, nothing more. It is only after Ligurio's insistence that Callimaco, at play's end, actually says that he loves Lucrezia, but that may have happened only because of Ligurio's persistence. In one of the final scenes of the play, Callimaco tells Ligurio of his night with Lucrezia; he says: "when I told her about my love for her, and how easily the stupidity of her husband might allow us to love happily . . . and how I would marry her as soon as god made other plans for Messer Nicia."[9] Such a statement surly sounds to be true love, but throughout the rest of the play Callimaco speaks very differently of his intentions with Lucrezia; his discussion about her throughout the play sound much more similar to his statement to Siro, his servant, in the first act: ". . . I want her so badly that I am nearly out of my mind."[10] Indeed, Callimaco does not say that his love is causing his to go out of his mind — he speaks only of his "want" for her. In any event, disguise is used by Callimaco in order to achieve his end of making love to Lucrezia. Though a love-through-disguise theme is used by both Machiavelli and Shakespeare, they differ in that Shakespeare's characters experience true love while Machiavelli's Callimaco, for much of the play, desires only sex.

Machiavelli and Shakespeare's usage of disguise are further similar in that both men use disguise to hide what they feel are religion's true intentions. *Mandragola*'s religious figure, Timoteo, is painted by Machiavelli as someone who cares only for money and would do anything to earn it. J.R. Hale writes, in the introduction to his translation of *The Mandrake Root* in *Eight Great Comedies*, that Machiavelli "does not scorn religion; in a way he does worse . . . He cheapens it so that it becomes a useful tool for the man who wishes to control."[11] In other words, Timoteo is used by Ligurio and becomes nothing more than a means to Ligurio's end of having Callimaco bed Lucrezia; Timoteo allows himself to become such a tool because of his desire for money. In 5.3, for example, Timoteo is congratulating himself on a job well done after the plan goes off, seemingly, without problem when he decides that he cannot be seen outside and he will "wait for [the others] in church, where my services bring a higher price."[12] In this case, Timoteo is using the church as a means to his end of obtaining more money. He would have been provided money for his "services" outside of the church, but Timoteo is so greedy for money that if there is the slightest chance he can earn more money through some act, he will almost certainly perform that act.

Shakespeare, too, confuses the intent of religion by having Feste appear before Malvolio, a character in *Twelfth Night* who has gone mad, disguised as a religious figure, Sir Topas. Feste does so because of the prodding of Maria, Oliva's servant, and Sir Toby. In appearing before Malvolio disguised as a religious figure, Feste takes on a role similar to Timoteo — that of the malleable religious figure. In addition, Feste's role as Sir Topas is indicative of Shakespeare's thoughts on religion and how it can, as is for Machiavelli, be manipulated. Machiavelli questions the role of religion in *The Mandrake Root* by making his religious figure care for nothing but money; Shakespeare accomplishes a similar goal by having Feste appear before Malvolio in disguise as a religious figure, making all religious figures appear as if they can be bought or convinced into doing anything.

In *Twelfth* Night and *The Mandrake* Root, Shakespeare and Machiavelli employ a character who discovers the true identity of a disguised character in the play, but does not give away that character's true identity because of a self-interested motive. It can be argued that both Feste and Nicia know who a disguised character is in their respective plays: Feste with Viola, disguised as Cesario; and Nicia with Timoteo, disguised as Callimaco. Feste's conversation with Cesario is interesting because he refers to him as *sir* in virtually every line. The only other characters in the play that Feste refers to as *sir* with any regularity are the members of *Twelfth Night*'s 'high court', Orsino and

Oliva (Feste calls Oliva *lady*, *modonna*, or *madam*, which are all roughly the female equivalent to the word *sir*).

Feste addresses Orsino with *sir* in nearly every line. In 2.4, for example, Feste says to Orsino: “No pains, sir. I take pleasure in singing, sir.”[13] Feste speaks to Oliva in much the same way, simply replacing *sir* with a respectful female counterpart. Other characters of lower social standing, on the other hand, do not receive the same verbal treatment from Feste. Outside of Cesario and Orsino, Feste refers only to two other characters as sir: one of them, Malvolio, happened to be in Oliva’s presence; thus Feste calling him *sir*, is likely out of respect for Oliva. In the other case, the character had *sir* in his formal name.

The way Feste speaks to Cesario in 3.1, however, coupled with the way he speaks to Sebastian in 4.1, offer compelling evidence that Feste knows Cesario’s true identity. As Michael Pennington observed in *Twelfth Night: A User’s Guide*, “of all people’s, it could be the trained eye of the Fool [Feste] that sees through [Viola’s] disguise.”[14] In 3.1, Feste says *sir* to Cesario almost every line he speaks to him; sometimes, Feste says *sir* to Cesario as many as three times. In one example, Feste says to Cesario: “Not so, sir, I do care for something; but in my conscience, sir, I do not care for you. If that be to care for nothing, sir, I would it would make you invisible.”[15] Orsino is the only character that Feste would refer to with three *sirs*; Cesario certainly is not on the same level as Orsino, as Cesario is but a mere page of Orsino’s. In 4.1, Feste encounters Sebastian, who he mistakes for Cesario. Not once does Feste call Sebastian *sir*, however, which does not make sense, considering: Feste should think Sebastian is Cesario, for one; and, moreover, Feste had just spoken with Cesario an act earlier and referred to him as *sir* many times. Unless, of course, Feste knows that who he is speaking with is not Cesario because he knows that Cesario is actually a woman disguised as a man. The only reason, then, Feste would refer to Cesario as *sir* and not Sebastian is because Feste was taking a subtle jab at Cesario each time he said *sir*.

Feste and Cesario have an interaction in 3.1 which offers further evidence as to what Feste knows about Cesario’s true identity:

FESTE. Now Jove in his next commodity of hair send thee a beard.
VIOLA. By my throth I’ll tell thee, I am almost sick for one,
though I would not have it grow on my chin. Is thy lady within?
FESTE. Would not a pair of these have bred, sir?
VIOLA. Yes, being kept together and put to use.
FESTE. I would play Lord Pandarus of Phrygia, sir, to bring a
Cressida to this Troilus.

VIOLA [*giving money*]. I understand you, sir, 'tis well begged.[16]

In the line just prior to the above passage, Viola gave Feste money as a sort of bribe to convince him not to reveal her identity; as Pennington observed, Oliva "resorts to giving [Feste] money, the one thing that always distracts him, and Pavlov-like, he sets about doubling it."[17] After receiving the first payment, Feste makes a comment to Viola about her next "commodity of hair" and Viola finds herself worried once again that Feste might give her away. Feste does not, however, because Viola pays him off again, which leaves Feste contented because he is, as A.C. Bradley put it in an essay in *Twelfth Night: Critical Essays*, a "shameless beggar."[18]

It can be similarly argued that Nicia knows the true identity of Timoteo, disguised as Callimaco and, in turn, Callimaco, as the lute player. In order for Nicia to fall for the poor disguise Callimaco implemented as the lute player — distorting his facial features without assistance of a mask — Nicia would have to be a true fool; all of the characters in *Mandragola* do indeed seem to take that much as a fact. In the introduction to *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli: Essays on the Literary Works*, however, Vickie B. Sullivan poses the question, albeit indirectly: just how dumb is Nicia, anyway?[19] In the play, Nicia desires nothing more than to have a child; he says himself in the play's second scene, "I want children so much, I am ready to do anything."[20] All Nicia wants is to have children and he is willing to use any means necessary to achieve his end. As Mansfield so eloquently questioned, however, Nicia's "stupidity consists in his single-minded desire to have children. Why is this necessarily so stupid? If it were an intelligent desire, then Nicia could be intelligent."[21] That is, in order for Nicia to be considered foolish, it must be assumed that a "single-minded desire" for children is foolish.

If Nicia's stupidity is forgotten about, however, it becomes possible to view Nicia as an intelligent character capable of uncovering disguise. Take, for example, an exchange Nicia has when he, in disguise, meets the other characters — Ligurio, Siro, and Timoteo (as Callimaco) — also disguised and ready to capture Callimaco in disguise and put the next phase of Ligurio's plan in motion:

NICIA. Oh, you're all here. If I hadn't recognized you, I'd
have given you all a whack with my sword! Are you Li-
gurio? And you Siro? And this other is [Callimaco]?
Good.
LIGURIO. Yes, counselor.
NICIA. Let's take a look. Oh, [Timoteo's] disguised so well that not
even the sheriff would know him![22]

Nicia is seemingly unnecessarily scrupulous of the other characters in disguise, which may leave the reader wondering what he does or does not know. Furthermore, when Nicia decides to investigate the matter further, he looks only at Timoteo, who is disguised as Callimaco — he does not closely examine any other character. If Nicia is truly as foolish as he is taken to be, surely he would have been more trusting. Instead, when Ligurio tells him that Callimaco is indeed Callimaco, Nicia needs to see for himself, almost as if he was expecting Callimaco not to be there.

As Mansfield suggests, it could be possible that Nicia knows he his being cuckolded, but plays the fool in order to achieve his end of having a child. “Instead of being forced to trust his tormentors . . . [Nicia] could be pretending to be forced,” Mansfield writes, “all the time laughing up his sleeve and counting on the character of Ligurio and Brother Timothy to make good on his trust.”[23] In his translation of the play, James B. Atkinson, one of the editors of *The Comedies of Machiavelli*, has Nicia providing Callimaco, at the end of the play, “with a house key, so that he ‘can get back in’ whenever he feels like it.”[24] His translation is slightly different than the one the writer is using, but he further illuminates the point that Nicia was knowingly cuckolded. Callimaco did not enter Nicia’s house at any point in the play other than the time when he bedded Lucrezia, yet Nicia is telling Callimaco to come “back in” his house. Nicia and Feste’s reactions to disguise are similar in that both appear to figure out that a character in their respective play is not who he says he is; neither put an end to the ruse because not doing so is of great benefit to both characters: Feste gets his money and Nicia his child.

Though Shakespeare used a variety of disguise devices in his plays, he and Machiavelli were similar in that both implemented a means-to-an-end, or task-oriented device. There are other ways, for sure, in which Shakespeare and Machiavelli’s usage of disguise were similar — many are discussed above — but the main similarity falls in their use of the task-oriented device. The uncovering of disguise happens to characters in both of Tang’s broad categories: same-sex disguise, when Nicia discovers Timoteo; and opposite-sex disguise, when Feste discovers Viola’s true identity. Not only is Shakespeare’s usage of disguise more broad than Machiavelli’s, it is equal opportunity — disguising a woman and then discovering her in much the same fashion that Machiavelli uses with Nicia’s discovery. Machiavelli and Shakespeare’s main similarity with regard to disguise, however, is that both men employ a disguise device with a motive all its own.

Bibliography

Barnet, Sylvan, Morton Berman, and William Burto, eds. *Eight Great Comedies*. New York: NAL Penguin Inc., 1958.

Bradbury, Malcolm and David Palmer, eds. *Shakespearian Comedy*. New York: Crane, Russak & Company, Inc., 1972.
Giannetti, Laura and Guido Ruggiero., eds. *Five Comedies from the Italian Renaissance*.
Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2003.
Hale, J. R., ed. *The Literary Works of Machiavelli*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
Ko, Yu Jin. *Mutability and Division on Shakespeare's Stage*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004.
Marrapodi, Michelle, ed. *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertexuality*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
Machiavelli, Niccolo. "The Mandrake Root." In *The Portable Machiavelli*, eds. Peter Bondanella and Mark Musa, 433-79. New York: Penguin Books, 1979.
Pennington, Michael. *Twelfth Night: A User's Guide*. London: Nick Hern Books Ltd, 2000.
Shakespeare, William. "Twelfth Night, or What You Will." In *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, eds. Stephan Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, 1768-1821. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1997.
Sices, David and James B. Atkinson. *The Comedies of Machiavelli*. Indianapolis: Hackett
Publishing Company, Inc., 2007.
Sullivan, Vickie B., ed. *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli: Essays on the Literary Works*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
Tang, Jia-ying. "Disguise: An Alternative Process of Identity-Fashioning in Shakespeare." Master's thesis, Northcentral University, 2003.
Wells, Stanley. *Twelfth Night: Critical Essays*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984.

[1] Jia-ying Tang. "Disguise: An Alternative Process of Identity-Fashioning in Shakespeare" (Master's thesis, Northcentral University, 2003), 6.
[2] Tang, "Disguise," 21.
[3] Niccolo Machiavelli, "The Mandrake Root," in *The Portable Machiavelli*, eds. Peter Bondanella and Mark Musa (New York: Penguin Books, 1979), 433.
[4] Machiavelli, "The Mandrake Root," 433.

[5] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 433.
[6] Vickie B. Sullivan, ed., *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli: Essays on the Literary Works* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 24.
[7] Sullivan, ed., *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli*, 24.
[8] Stanley Wells, *Twelfth Night: Critical Essays* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984), 264).
[9] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 4.4.476. Reference is to act, scene, and page number.
[10] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 1.1.437.
[11] Sylvan Barnet, Morton Berman, and William Burto, eds., *Eight Great Comedies* (New York: NAL Penguin Inc., 1958), 67.
[12] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 5.3.476.
[13] William Shakespeare, “Twelfth Night, or What You Will,” in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1997), 2.4.67. Reference is to act, scene, and line.
[14] Michael Pennington, *Twelfth Night: A User’s Guide* (London: Nick Hern Books Ltd, 2000), 147.
[15] Shakespeare, “Twelfth Night,” 3.1.24-26.
[16] Shakespeare, “Twelfth Night,” 3.1.39-47.
[17] Pennington, *Twelfth Night*, 147.
[18] Wells, *Twelfth Night*, 21.
[19] Sullivan, ed., *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli*, xvii.
[20] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 1.2.440.
[21] Sullivan, ed., *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli*, 15.
[22] Machiavelli, “The Mandrake Root,” 4.9.470.
[23] Sullivan, ed., *The Comedy and Tragedy of Machiavelli*, 19.
[24] David Sices and James B. Atkinson, eds., *The Comedies of Machiavelli* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2007), 18.

“Cognate Fathers of the Church: Grace, Original Sin, and the Possibility of Sinlessness in the Anti-Pelagian Works of Jerome and Augustine”

Joseph F. Stanley

- Introduction and Historiography -

As a result of Constantine’s “vision” and the subsequent Edict of Milan (313), Christianity expanded rapidly throughout the Roman world during the fourth and fifth centuries. The Church was now an institution with the patronage of God *and* an empire, but its expansion experienced a multitude of growing pains. As Norman Tanner contends in his examination of the early ecumenical councils, Christianity fell under a very wide rubric, wherein the Church became determined to establish one true doctrine as universal.[1] It was during this turbulent period that the Church sought to eliminate the “heretical” teachings of Arius, Nestorius, and Mani to name but a few. During this time, Jerome and Augustine of Hippo emerged as staunch defenders of the Catholic faith, providing strong, and often vehement, support for ecclesiastical policies [C1]. In the controversy concerning Pelagius, both scholars denounced Pelagianism; never again do we see Jerome and Augustine employ their prose in defending the Church against one individual and his theological edification.[2] In terms of their theological attacks, the polemics of Jerome and Augustine appear remote from one another, and this notion is exacerbated by the limited scholarship that concurrently examines their reactions to Pelagius [C2]. Overall, this scholarship claims that Augustine was provoked to denounce the grounds of Pelagianism by means of his theology of grace and original sin.[3]Conversely, scholars contend that Jerome was incited to refute its possibility through his logic of dialogue and his views on the nature of man. However, a thorough analysis of Jerome’s *Against the Pelagians* and Augustine’s *On Nature and Grace* and *On the Proceedings of Pelagius* suggests that each author’s polemic offers many cases that resemble the other’s hermeneutical[C3][C4] grounds. This paper intends to bridge the historical and theological chasm that current scholarship has posited by examining Jerome and Augustine’s anti-Pelagian works in terms of their respective treatments of grace, original sin, and the possibility of a sinless life. An examination of their earlier writings further corroborates the parallel arguments found in their anti-Pelagian polemics and suggests that Jerome and Augustine collaborated in promoting a united, Catholic Church.

In order to explicate the nuances of patristic theology in this area, it is necessary to give a brief account of the man to whom Jerome and Augustine responded. Pelagius was born in Britain around 350. Due to a lack of documentation, the details of his life remain enigmatic.[4]Before 385, it is believed he arrived in Rome on a pilgrimage, and he settled there permanently. In Rome, Pelagius became an ascetic and began to preach the importance of asceticism while composing several theological treatises in favor of such a lifestyle. By the early fifth century, although radical in his religious devotion, Pelagius gained status as a well-respected theologian, with Augustine praising him on several accounts.[5]

Pelagius had an unwavering body of supporters who were determined to spread Pelagian ideas (via his letters) as far as Sicily, Britain, and Rhodes.[6] Pelagianism, primarily viewed as an ascetic movement by its contemporaries, had appealed to the masses that had witnessed the brutal purges, political assassinations, and barbarian invasions of the fourth and fifth centuries. Amidst this confusion, Pelagius offered Christians “absolute certainty through absolute obedience.”[7] As Pelagian popularity climbed and its followers reached all corners of the Mediterranean in the early years of the fifth century, Pelagius became adamant in promulgating his theology on free will and original sin.[8] Pelagian theology claimed that the gift of free will was implanted in our nature by God. Pelagius believed that once free will was bestowed, it became independent from God[C5] and, thus, through this freedom, one retained the power to live a life without sin. To reinforce the idea that a human was capable of a sinless life, Pelagius disputed the concept that original sin was transmitted through procreation. The harm done by Adam and Eve’s “Fall,” according to Pelagius, did not necessarily affect humanity, “but rather established a model for human disobedience to God.”[9] This archetype of an “inescapable habit of sinning,” impinged on humanity and Pelagius saw himself as the protagonist in its resolution.[10] According to Pelagius, it was impossible to sin without knowledge of one’s actions, and he extended this concept to the unbaptized infant: because of its ignorance, a deceased infant had not sinned and, thus, was guaranteed salvation.

It was in the second decade of the fifth century, on account of advocating his concepts of free will and original sin, that Pelagius found himself in hostile environments. His outspoken disciple, Celestius, only aggravated Pelagius’ situation when he was condemned publicly in Africa. With his name now permanently linked to Celestius, Pelagius, a refugee in Palestine, was brought as a heretic before the Synod of Diospolis in December 415, only to be acquitted after anathematizing Celestius.[11] As a result, Pelagius is believed to have attained newfound religious fervor that led to the

composition of his most well-known epistles: *On Nature* and *On Free Will*. It is generally agreed that Jerome and Augustine composed their polemics denouncing Pelagius as these works were being disseminated (415-417). The austere attacks of Jerome and Augustine, it can be argued, led to the eventual demise of Pelagius and his followers. He was condemned by three future popes (Innocent, Zosimus, and Celestine) and excommunicated at the Council of Ephesus (431).[12]

Responsible for the downfall of a "heretical" sect that had garnered considerable size by the time of Pelagius' excommunication, Jerome's *Against the Pelagians* (c. 416) and Augustine's *On Nature and Grace* (c. 416) and *On the Proceedings of Pelagius* (c. 416) deserve scholarly attention. An assessment of these works allows us to understand better the motives behind their composition and the theological prose employed by each author in the Church's defense. There have been a small number of publications that examine the three polemics, all of which paint a similar picture. Unfortunately, these examinations are minor components of larger compositions and provide unsatisfactory analyses.[13]

In works that examine Jerome's reaction to Pelagius, scholars tend to agree that, in refuting Pelagius, Jerome was most concerned with his past coming back to haunt him. Pelagius' concept of life without sin, for Jerome, immediately called to mind the Stoic doctrine of *apatheia*, or freedom from passion or disturbance, a notion attributed to the "heretic" Origen.[14] In the early fifth century, Rufinus of Aquileia, a contemporary of Jerome and an adherent of Origen perfectionism made multiple claims that Jerome had ties with Origenism.[15] Over a decade later and under the assumption the Origen accusations had been put to bed, Jerome found his reputation at stake once again. *On Nature* did not necessarily invoke theological acrimony in Jerome but it did engender a lot of anxiety.[16] In *Against the Pelagians*, scholars find the crux of Jerome's theological assault in his repudiation of the "possibility of a sinless life." For Jerome, "sinlessness is impossible so long as man is in his present bodily state, since a sinless man would be one who directs his thoughts uninterrupted to virtue but man is always subject to hunger, thirst, and cold."[17] Secondary literature generally concurs that Jerome saw Pelagius as the "continuer of perfectionism," and as past history dictated, Jerome dedicated *Against the Pelagians* to refuting the notions of sinlessness and perfectionism.[18]

While scholarship regarding Jerome's position on Pelagianism[C6] is markedly thin, secondary material devoted to Augustine's reaction to the Pelagian controversy is in abundance. Robert Evans astutely observes that whenever we hear the name of

Pelagius, we are conditioned to summon up the name of Augustine and “to consider the important historical and theological issues to center on the antithesis of these two figures.”[19] In this cast[C7], Augustine-Pelagian scholarship suggests first and foremost that Pelagius’ classification of grace (most notably outlined in Pelagius’ *On Nature*) is the catalyst that sparked Augustine. Augustine, it should be noted, wrote two letters that indirectly concerned Pelagianism before writing *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius*: these were *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins* (c. 412) and *On the Spirit and the Letter* (c. 412). However, the tone of these epistles is far less austere and there is no intimation of polemicism against Pelagius regarding grace.[20] Throughout *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius*, however, Augustine recurrently argued that free will is not only bestowed upon us by the grace of God, but that grace continues to heal us as man’s nature is constantly “at a nadir of uncertainty.”[21] For Augustine, freedom can *only* be the culmination of a process of healing from original sin.[22][C8]

Scholarship also underscores Augustine’s definition of grace. In rebuking Pelagius, Augustine deepened the Church’s understanding of the doctrine of original sin; Adam and Eve were its culprits, and the effects of their transgression cascaded to all humanity. Thus, baptism is essential to humanity’s salvation, and this salvation is cultivated by the faith enabled by grace itself. In campaigning on behalf of the “Catholic faith,” Augustine’s rhetoric is regarded for its sober prose.[23] In his two letters, he openly attacked Pelagius, declaring his name repeatedly to remind the reader of the antagonist. By dismantling Pelagius’ heretical claims and restructuring them with a surfeit of Scripture, Augustine has received praise for his theological, as well as his rhetorical, prowess.[24]

In summation, our understanding of the Pelagian controversy stems from secondary analysis that has framed Jerome as the opponent of the “possibility of sinlessness” and Augustine as the “advocate of the grace of God.” Although they are both characterized as denouncing Pelagius, their motives and theological concerns are seen as different. The description of Jerome, it seems, fits well into the paradigm of what Peter Brown calls the “liberal East;” this “liberality” is evidenced by Jerome’s less malignant attack on Pelagius, and due to the view that he was more concerned with his own reputation than

Pelagius' theology. Augustine, by contrast, in his austere attack, represents for scholars the North African view that Pelagianism tested their rigid orthodoxy.[25]

In examining scholarship that analyzes Jerome and Augustine's response to the Pelagian controversy, there are several features that appear problematic. First, the narratives of these studies often contradict one another due to the chronology of the texts in question. There have been numerous dates, for example, attributed to Jerome's *Against the Pelagians*.[26]These various dates make one question if *Against the Pelagians* was written before or after the Synod of Diospolis; did Pelagius' acquittal prompt Jerome, like Augustine, to produce this polemic?[27] Secondly, and more importantly, these examinations lack adequate comparative analyses between Jerome and Augustine that accurately reveal the "stark differences" in their reactions to the Pelagian controversy. Additionally, studies of Pelagius are far more concerned with Augustine's reaction than Jerome's to the Pelagian controversy as a result of his conflicting views on grace and baptism. Upon review of the three primary texts, however, it appears unbefitting to continue to accept this conclusion. In removing this overarching theme and casting a lens on the rhetoric of the polemics, there are, in fact, many similarities that bridge the chasm between Jerome and Augustine. What surfaces in this analysis is Jerome's incorporation of factors previously deemed exclusively Augustinian; Jerome refuted Pelagianism not only in terms of the impossibility of "human sinlessness," but also on the grounds of grace and original sin. And consonantly, Augustine displayed concerns with the possibility of Pelagianism that calls to mind the methodology of Jerome.

- Grace and Original Sin -

In Augustine's *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius*, his theology of grace and free will met Pelagius head on. Augustine's concept of salvation certainly acknowledged the concept of free will, but a free will that was fastened to faith in grace. In formulating his own treatise, Augustine simply added this word onto Pelagius' original title, hence, *On Nature and Grace*. It is this faith that allows us to identify the good "we ought to do," he contended. He opened *Grace* claiming that the righteousness of God is "the aid afforded by the grace of Christ."[28]Likewise in *Proceedings of Pelagius*, Augustine wrote "that without God's grace no man can live rightly…they may be purged from their sins through our Lord Jesus Christ."[29] Human nature, or free will, is constantly ailing, and, throughout both polemics, Augustine invoked the grace of Christ with the image of a physician who prescribed his grace to bring about convalescence and salvation.[30] Augustine scarcely addressed the logistics of how one could live a life

without sin; he even admitted it might be “an open question among true and pious Christians” because the grounds, or causes, for its existence were fabricated by Pelagius.[31]

To warrant his reprisal against the grounds of a sinless life and his affirmation of the subsistence of Christ’s grace, Augustine summoned the work of Jerome on one occasion. In this (brief) chapter, he quoted Jerome: “The pure man is seen by his purity of heart; the temple of God cannot be defiled…God created us with free will.” [32] Augustine used Jerome’s excerpt to help support his claim that through “the forementioned presbyter…we may be able to look upon God with a pure heart, by his grace through our Lord Jesus Christ.”[33] Remarkably, Augustine’s use of Jerome in *Grace* has received little scholarly attention. The possibility that Augustine read *Against the Pelagians* is unlikely, as most scholars attribute the dating of Jerome’s text to after Augustine’s *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius*. We are aware, however, that Augustine had read epistles attributed to Jerome earlier in his life.[34] Augustine’s reference to Jerome, nonetheless, merits an observation. At this stage (near the conclusion) of *Grace*, Augustine defended Catholic writers against Pelagius’ insistence that they accept the possibility of a sinless life. Using the support of Jerome (the extract is from Jerome’s *Commemoration of Matthew, Book IV*), Augustine repeated his belief that it is not the possibility, but the basis of living a sinless life in which grace is needed. It is interesting that Augustine used Jerome in defense of his notion of grace. An assessment of *Against the Pelagians*, in fact, reveals many occasions in which Jerome is adamant in defending the concept of grace, exhibiting analogous attributes to Augustine. As stated above, Jerome’s connection with Origen often leads to the conclusion that his *Against the Pelagians* sought to stamp out perfectionism by means of revealing the impossibility of sinlessness. In Chapter 9 of Book I, for example, Jerome demanded Pelagius to provide “an instance of those who were for ever without sin…confess your impotence…you have not learned even the rudiments of logic.”[35][C9] He recurrently challenged the possibility of a sinless life by alluding to man’s confrontation with nature: “Find me a man who is never hungry, thirsty, or cold, who knows nothing of pain, or fever, or torture, and I will grant you that a man can think of nothing but virtue.”[36]

However, while Jerome’s dialogue is rife with references to perfectionism and sinlessness, it is simultaneously interspersed with defenses of grace. Like Augustine, in accepting free will, Jerome made it dependent on divine assistance. Illustrating the problems with Pelagius and Origen, Jerome concluded his prologue by denouncing those who put “the true faith in the power of my choice,” and, thus, refused to

acknowledge the permanent priority of Christ's grace.[37] Early in Book I, Jerome indicted Pelagius' denial of "the grace which you banish from the parts of life" and underscored "the assistance of God in each action."[38] This theme continues in Books II and III. In the third chapter of Book III, Jerome, like Augustine, attacked the grounds of Pelagianism when he wrote that sinlessness is not the issue at stake, but "the grace of God."[39] In reminding Pelagius what was discussed, for he was "lost in forgetfulness," Jerome took this opportunity to review his understanding that "grace wherewith He bestowed upon us free choice, assists and supports us in our individual actions."[40] In fact, near the conclusion of *Against the Pelagians*, Jerome invoked the symbol of the "true physician, our Savior," in order to illustrate how humanity needed to implore the help of grace to acquire salvation.[41] This image of Christ, the physician, underscores the importance of grace in his dialogue while evoking many examples of the "physician" employed by Augustine.[42]

While it is reasonable to characterize Jerome as the enemy of Pelagian perfectionism, specifically in his assaults on the possibility of sinlessness, one cannot deny the importance of grace in his attacks. Jerome repeatedly found fault in Pelagius' denial of grace, applying similar theological prose to that of Augustine's anti-Pelagian works. Thus, it is tempting to give more credence to *Against the Pelagians* in its illustration of a twofold[C10] concern with grace in addition to the possibility of a sinless life.

In the seventh accusation made at the Synod of Diospolis, one that concerned the Pelagian disciple, Celestius, the council asked Pelagius how "Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he had sinned or not sinned; that Adam's sin injured only himself and not the human race?"[43] Pelagius anathematized Celestius and denied all of the allegations of which the council subsequently acquitted him. Infuriated at the fallacy of Pelagius' defense, Augustine wrote in regard to the ignorance displayed by the council members: "[Pelagius claims] That infants, even if they die unbaptized, have eternal life. That rich men, even if they are baptized… can[not] possess the kingdom of heaven."[44]

Pelagian views of original sin and baptism formed another principle aspect for Augustine in defining the Pelagian heresy. For Pelagius, Adam and Eve were destined to die regardless if they committed original sin or not. With the view that original sin did not affect all of humanity, Pelagians argued that man had always been created free and had the power of choosing between doing and avoiding what was wrong. Sanctifying grace given in baptism, therefore, was not the necessary foundation of salvation; it was merely a remedy for actual sins.[45] In his refusal to acknowledge this interpretation, Augustine spent several chapters contradicting Pelagius with regard to Adam's failing.

This explanation supported Augustine's cause in denying the grounds of a sin-free life. It is because of Adam's transgression that we are born with original sin and automatically disposed to sin. "Man's nature indeed," wrote Augustine, "was created at first faultless and without any sin; but that nature of man in which every one is born from Adam, now wants the Physician."[46] Augustine soon after warned Pelagius of the grave nature of his blasphemy. If human sins did not derive from Adam upon birth, questioned Augustine, then Pelagius rendered the crucifixion of "Christ of none effect."[47]This inheritance revealed, thus, the necessity of baptism in attaining salvation. Related to this observation, Augustine devoted numerous chapters to promulgating the importance of infant baptism. Pelagius' notion that unbaptized infants are innocent, thus free of sin and promised the kingdom of heaven, kindled vehement opposition in Augustine's *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius*. Ignorance is not an excuse for errant acts, claimed Augustine, and through the grace of baptism "even for the infants the help of the Great Physician is sought."[48] In congruence with his defense of the continual grace of God, Augustine's attack on Pelagius' concept of original sin, coupled with his support of infant baptism, certainly appears to make a case against Pelagian sinlessness: because of the Fall of man, original sin precludes any possibility of being sinless.

Jerome attacked Pelagianism from a similar theological perspective. Opposed to Pelagian tenets, he staunchly affirmed the reality of original sin. He questioned the causality of sinlessness in the opening of Book II in quoting *Romans*: "Sinners are estranged from the womb; they sin 'after the similitude of Adam.'"[49] Later in Book III, he claimed that all men are held liable for sin on account of their "ancient forefather Adam."[50] He contended that baptism is a necessity because it annuls old sins, but in doing so he reminded Pelagius that baptism does not offer new virtues. Jerome stated that only after baptism, with Christ's grace, is paradise attainable.[51]

Jerome dedicated the concluding chapters of Book III to the debate regarding infant baptism. Challenging the Pelagian belief that a deceased, unbaptized infant's salvation is guaranteed, Jerome paraphrased the theology of Cyprian in arguing that an infant still incurs the taint of Adam. Moreover, Jerome wrote that Christians should be most concerned with an unbaptized infant because s/he exhibits several vices in the form of "cries and tears."[52] One of the more fascinating aspects on infant baptism in *Against the Pelagians* is found in the conclusion of Book III. It is here that Jerome consulted "that holy man and eloquent bishop Augustin[e]."[53] As he leaves the reader with "one thing I will say and so end my discourse," Jerome incorporates the words of Augustine to maintain that infants should be baptized for the remission of sins after the "likeness of

the transgression of Adam."[54] Jerome's discourse on original sin and baptism offers strong evidence that, like Augustine, he was concerned with the concept of sinlessness. This is not to discount his arguments against the possibility of perfectionism, but it certainly appears feasible to maintain that both concerns bore similar weight for Jerome.

-Augustine and the Possibility of a Sinless Life-

As Jerome's polemic reveals similarities with Augustine's concern in refuting the grounds of Pelagianism, Augustine's *Grace* and *Proceedings of Pelagius* equally expose an unease regarding the possibility of sinlessness for which Jerome was renowned.[55] It is accurate to contend that Augustine was most alarmed by the cause of sinlessness in *Grace*, but, before he addressed this concern, Augustine became engrossed in disproving any possibility of living a sinless life.[56] In Chapter 15, for example, he questioned this possibility by citing several passages of Scripture to reveal that "it is nowhere found that any man is described as being without sin, except Him only."[57] In the ensuing chapters, Augustine appeared determined to refute Pelagius' notion of sinlessness. He recurrently made references to *James 3:8*, "But the tongue no man can tame," with the aim of claiming that sinlessness "does not appear…to be capable of the interpretation."[58] With the support of James' rhetoric, Augustine argued that man's discourse was an unruly evil, full of poison that "kills the soul."[59]*Wisdom 1:11* assents, he wrote, for the "mouth that belies slays the soul."[60]The intractability of man's tongue was so intrinsic to Augustine's thought that he suggested that even animals were more "tameable."[61][C11]

Augustine also questioned the possibility of a sin-free life through the inherent defects of the flesh. Calling upon *James* again, he denied the integrity of man "for where there is envying and strife, there is confusion and every evil work."[62] Augustine fittingly employed *Romans 8:7-8*, where it states "The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God."[63] He even purported that his treatment of Scripture in *Grace* was helpful, for "showing the impossibility of not sinning."[64]

Further on in *Grace*, Augustine examined the shortcomings of man that denied the possibility of sinlessness and used examples that evoked those employed by Jerome. In Chapter 41, he asserted that "we cannot live here without sin…which is committed in ignorance or infirmity."[65] Several chapters later, and without the support of Scripture (in which Augustine appeared vulnerable), he claimed that Abel must have "indulged in immoderate laughter…was ever jocose in moments of relaxation, or ever looked at an object with a covetous eye, or ever plucked fruit with extravagance."[66] In *Against the Pelagians*, Jerome employed similar rhetoric when he demanded Pelagius to "Find me

[Jerome] a man who is never hungry, thirsty, or cold who knows nothing of pain, or fever, or the torture of strangury."[67] In concluding his analysis on the possibility of sinlessness, Augustine again cited the example of human and bestial intractability: "There are wretched shadows in the human soul, which knows how to tame a lion, but not how to live."[68]

Interspersed in these chapters Augustine alluded to the power of grace "In order that we might be induced to request the help of [it] for the taming of the tongue."[69] However, Augustine's use of grace in this capacity did not question the grounds of living a sinless life; it merely acted as advice to lead a more virtuous, sin-free life.

Augustine devoted a large portion of *Grace* to dispute the logic of Pelagian grounds, but incorporated in this letter, particularly in the first half, are numerous references to the impossibility of a sinless life. In challenging this possibility tendered by Pelagius, Augustine employed a paradigm reminiscent of Jerome's model of the invalidity of sinlessness given the nature of man and the elements of the earth. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that the possibility of a sinless life, albeit second to Pelagius' understanding of grace and free will, was a concern for Augustine.

- Theological Pasts and Theologian Correspondence -

Another way in which to substantiate the parallel arguments found in Jerome and Augustine's theological attacks on Pelagianism is through a comparison of earlier documents that hint at the basis of their similar anti-Pelagian polemics. Although it is beyond the scope of this essay to investigate the vast scholarship devoted to the interwoven scholarship of Jerome and Augustine, strong connections may be found upon review of their earlier anti-heretical writings, in addition to their correspondence concerning Pelagius.[70] In examining their reactions to Pelagius, it appears Jerome and Augustine may, in fact, have had similar stimuli in the condemnation of Pelagius. This first observation does not come from a detailed analysis of the primary material, but rather from the reordering of the historiographical clutter. As stated previously, scholars have attributed Jerome's prime impetus to be Pelagius' revival of old charges made against Jerome in earlier controversies concerning Origen and Jovinian.[71] In his two works, *On the Ephesians* and *On the Galatians* (c. 387), Jerome explicitly stated that he was an admirer of Origen.[72] However, by the early fifth century, Origen views regarding human perfection rendered his theology "deeply suspect" in the eyes of Jerome.[73] Pelagius and Jerome each composed letters to the virgin Demetrias, in 413, praising her eternal chastity and offering theological counsel in her maintenance of Christian virtue. The first letter, written by the pen of Pelagius, praised the concept of

free will and its ability to prevent sin and cited Origen and Jerome as supporting theologians. Jerome, with knowledge that Pelagius had associated his name with Origen, subsequently warned Demetrias against “Origen’s errors” in his own letter.[74] Two years of fermentation were exacerbated by Pelagius’ newfound zeal after his acquittal at Diospolis and, as a result, Jerome composed *Against the Pelagians*. The notion of perfectionism, notes John Kelly, not only recalled Jerome’s history, but it also rekindled a heresy that was thought to have been eliminated. For these reasons, Kelly contends, Jerome felt obliged to weigh in against them. [75] In the prologue of *Against the Pelagians* Jerome appeared resolute when he wrote “Origen is peculiar in maintaining…that it is possible for man…to become so strong that he sins no more.”[76] Augustine’s motives, again, were manifold and involved the Christian failure to stamp out Pelagianism at the Synod of Diospolis; he also reacted against Pelagius’ pride, falsehood, and ambiguity in *On Nature*.[77] Pelagius’ *On Nature* made a point of fundamental importance against the inevitability of sin: “Whatever is bound by natural necessity is thereby lacking in the choice and deliberation proper to will.”[78] This extract, noted Evans, evoked a position taken by Augustine in the third book of his earlier piece entitled *On Free Choice* (written twenty years prior to the Pelagian controversy, c. 388-395).[79] In this work, Augustine likewise wrote “when the soul moves from enjoyment of the Creator to enjoyment of the creature, it does so by a movement of its own will.”[80] This passage certainly exposed some congruity with the Pelagian idea of free will as Augustine suggested that the Creator’s assistance was not necessary. *On Free Choice* also showed Augustine’s allusions to the possibility of sinlessness. In the second book, he described the three types of “goods:” the great goods, the minimal goods and the middle goods.[81] These “goods,” Augustine argued, could be used both rightly and wrongly; he thus posited that free will is not only self-transcendent, but, if employed properly, may prevent sin.[82] Like Jerome, Pelagius seems to have brought to light memories of Augustine’s own theological past that he did not want to recall. More importantly, however, Jerome and Augustine’s respective theological “pasts” dovetailed in the sense that both men had previously made concessions regarding the possibility of sinlessness. Therefore, one may conclude that Pelagianism engendered anxiety for Jerome and Augustine about their past pronouncements and led them to launch similar polemics against the possibility of sinlessness.

Although Jerome and Augustine never met in person, they maintained a steady correspondence through numerous letters.[83] Their cordiality in doctrinal affairs was rough, at best, but in the early years of the fifth century their relationship became more

amicable, and by the time of their last correspondence – that concerning Pelagianism – their letters exhibited camaraderie and a common cause in refuting Pelagius.[84] In 415, before the Synod of Diospolis and their respective anti-Pelagian writings, Augustine wrote Jerome two letters that questioned Pelagian denial of original sin. In the first letter Augustine attacked the grounds of Pelagianism in embracing *Romans 5:12* and *Corinthians 15:22*: "The grace of Christ [is] necessary for salvation…bestowed only by baptism."[85] Augustine's second letter solicited Jerome's guidance in interpreting the concept of virtue found in *James 2:10*, but still asserted that infants "incur the debt of sin which undoubtedly has to be cancelled by the sacrament of Christ's grace."[86] Augustine's rigidity in denouncing the doctrine of Pelagianism was palpable in these letters and one wonders to what extent Jerome was induced by Augustine in his concluding remarks of *Against the Pelagians*: "[They] are free from all sin through the grace of God, which they received in their baptism."[87] Perhaps Jerome's response to Augustine (c. 416)[C12] offered credence to Augustinian influence when he replied: "[The two letters are] both very learned works, glittering with every brilliant rhetorical effect."[88]

Augustine's courier, Paulus Orosius, hand-delivered both letters to Jerome.[89] In his first letter, Augustine described Orosius as "a devout young man…who was reliable" whom he had instructed.[90] Maribel Dietz illustrates the many ways in which Orosius emulated Augustinian defense of grace and original sin, which is manifest in his *Seven Books ofHistory against the Pagans* (c. 418).[91] Contemporary sources confirm that Orosius spent several months in Jerome's monastery in 415, and although the extent of their private conversations is unknown, one can assume that Orosius professed Augustinian doctrine during their Pelagian deliberations. In his reply to Augustine, Jerome disclosed his admiration for Orosius as "an honorouable man who stands as a brother to me and a son to you [Augustine]."[92] The amalgamation of Augustine's letters, coupled with the presence of his entrusted diplomat, provides strong basis for arguing that Jerome's theological musings were strongly influenced by Augustinian doctrine in *Against the Pelagians*.

- Conclusion -

In the final chapter of *Proceedings of Pelagius,* Augustine praised God's mercy in sparing the life of Jerome.[93] He expressed deep concern for Jerome's well-being and Augustine's contempt for the Pelagians was palpable when he anticipated their papal condemnation in response to their "scandalous enormities."[94] In fact, the concluding chapters of the three polemics explored in this essay all remarked on the "venerable"

and “eloquent” attributes of the author’s trans-Mediterranean, anti-Pelagian supporter.[95] As Carolinne White discerns, correspondence between Jerome and Augustine concluded with both men respecting and admiring one another in their devotion to a united, Catholic Church. [96]

It seems that Jerome and Augustine’s expostulations fittingly corresponded to the Christian world in which they lived. In the span of their lives, the Roman Empire helped foster a centralized Christian faith; from colluding in frequent acts of pagan eradication to the creation of the *Theodosian Code* (436-438), the Church and Empire of the fourth and fifth centuries were undergoing a process of integration that was directed toward the promulgation of Christianity and the consolidation of Christian doctrine.[97] In this sense, Jerome explicated the concept of unity in his last words to Augustine: “If…the heretics see that we hold conflicting opinions, they will falsely conclude that this is due to ill-feeling between us. I…admire you and defend your words as if they were my own.”[98][C13] The Pelagian controversy, analogous to the other heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, threatened to rupture Christian doctrine and, in doing so, endangered Christian hegemony in the Mediterranean world. Jerome, it seems, conceded the consonance of his theology with Augustine’s when he wrote that, together, he and Augustine could “make a greater effort to eradicate that most dangerous heresy [Pelagianism] from the churches.”[99] In their staunch defense of authentic[C14] Christian doctrine, Jerome and Augustine clearly illustrated a collaborate effort. Their mutual ideologies of grace, original sin, and the impossibility of a sinless life, directed in this case against the threat posed by Pelagian theology, were an integral part of the preservation of ecclesial unity in the fifth century.

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources

Augustine. *On Nature and Grace.* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1503.htm (accessed 02 November - 10 December, 2007).

Augustine. *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*. http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1505.htm (accessed 02 November – 10 December, 2007).

Jerome. *Against the Pelagians*. http://www.newadvent.org/ fathers/3011.htm (accessed 02 November – 10 December, 2007).

White, Carolinne, ed. & trans. *The Correspondence (394-419), between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo.* Lewiston, UK: E. Mellen Press, 1990.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Jeremy du Quesnay. *The Populus of Augustine and Jerome: A Study in the Patristic Sense of Community.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2000.
_____. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Adversity, AD 200-1000.*Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
Collinge, William J., ed. and trans. *Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings*. Fathers of the Church 86. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1992.
Dietz, Maribel. *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300-800.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 2005.
Evans, Robert F. *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals.* New York, NY: The Seabury Press, 1968.
Hritzu, John, ed. and trans. *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works*. Fathers of the Church 53. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965.
Kelly, John. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1975.
Leff, Gordon. *Bradwardine and the Pelagians.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
O'Meara, John J. *Understanding Augustine.* Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997.
Rees, B.R. *The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1991.
_____. *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic.* Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1988.
Tanner, Norman P. *The Councils of the Church: A Short History.* New York, NY: Crossroad, 2001.
Williams, Megan Hale. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

---

[1] Specifically the Councils of Nicaea Constantinople, and Chalcedon. See Norman P. Tanner, *The Councils of the Church: A Short History* (New York, NY: Crossroad, 2001).
[2] The Pelagian controversy engaged Jerome and Augustine from 414-417. Jerome's (c. 347-420) biographer, John Kelly, calls the Pelagian controversy Jerome's "Last Controversy." Although Augustine (354-430) continued to write more treatises against heresy in the 420s, his last correspondence with Jerome (c. 416) concerned Pelagianism. See John Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York,

NY: Harper & Row, 1975), 309-323; Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 380-381.

[3] Augustinian scholar William Collinge uses the term “grounds” to show how Augustine refutes the foundation, or basis, of Pelagianism through the grace of Christ. See William J. Collinge, ed. and trans. *Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings*, Fathers of the Church 86 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1992), 19-20.

[4] For detailed biographies of Pelagius and his theology see Robert F. Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (New York, NY: The Seabury Press, 1968); B.R. Rees, *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1988).

[5] Evans, *Pelagius*, 73.

[6] Brown, *Augustine*, 346.

[7] Ibid., 347.

[8] For a detailed account of Pelagius’ theology and letters, see B.R. Rees, *The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1991), 29-35. Rees sees this transition in the early years of the 410s.

[9] Collinge, *Augustine*, 8.

[10] Ibid., 10.

[11] Rees, *Reluctant Heretic*, 2.

[12] Robert Evans confers more responsibility to Augustine in the ultimate papal condemnation. Evans, *Pelagius*, 3.

[13]These examinations fall under the categories of introductions to the primary materials or biographies of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius. The more recognized biographies are Evans, *Pelagius*; Rees, *Reluctant Heretic*; Gordon Leff, *Bradwardine and the Pelagians*(Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1957); Kelly, *Jerome*; Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006); Brown, *Augustine*; John J. O’Meara, *Understanding Augustine* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997).

[14] Collinge, *Augustine*, 17. Origen of Alexandria was a Christian scholar of the third century. His Platonic views of perfectionism were anathematized by Pope Anastasius I in 400.

[15] See Evans, *Pelagius*, 9-10. In particular, Rufinus claimed that Jerome had “turned his back upon the master [Origen] from whom he had learned so much.” Rufinus claimed Origen perfectionism is inundated in Jerome’s *On the Ephesians* (c. 387-389). In Jerome’s *Apology for Himself against the Books of Rufinus* (c. 402), he staunchly defies Rufinus’ claims, but, as Evans points out, Rufinus had a “legitimate point” which worried Jerome.

[16] See Collinge, *Augustine*, 16-17; Evans, *Pelagius*, 6-25 concerning the conflict between Jerome and Pelagius.
[17] Evans, *Pelagius*, 23.
[18] Jerome's analysis of grace in *Against the Pelagians* is concluded as "superficial and inconclusive." See Kelly, *Jerome,* 319.
[19] Evans, *Pelagius*, 3.
[20] See Evans, *Pelagius*, 73-75. Augustine actually shows Pelagius deference several times.
[21] Brown, *Augustine*, 369.
[22] Ibid., 375.
[23] See Evans, *Pelagius*, 82; Collinge, *Augustine*, 15-16.
[24] See especially *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*. In this letter, not only does Augustine reveal the flaws in Pelagius' defense at the Synod of Diospolis, he also displays the incompetence of the council that was comprised of fourteen bishops.
[25] Brown, *Augustine*, 359. In addition, although the document of Pelagius' *On Nature* was lost in the fifth century, his theology is well-preserved in his numerous other letters. See Rees, *Letters of Pelagius.*
[26] John Hritzu believes it is after the Synod of Diospolis. See Hritzu, ed. and trans., *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works*, Fathers of the Church 53 (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965), 227. Evans believes it to be 414 or 415, see *Pelagius*, 7. Williams claims it to be before the Synod in 415, see *Monk*, 300-301.
[27] In the most recent biography of Jerome, Megan Hale Williams dates *Against the Pelagians* to early 415, before the Synod, without citation. See Williams, *Monk*, 300. If this is the case, *Against the Pelagians* was not written in reaction to the council's acquittal nor Pelagius' *On Nature*. See Hritzu, *Jerome*, 227.
[28] Augustine, *On Nature and Grace*, Chapter 1, retrieved from http://www.newadvent.org/ -fathers/1503.htm (accessed 02 November - 10 December, 2007). This translation is taken, and revised, from the Fathers of the Church series (volume 86). See Collinge, *Augustine*, 3-90.
[29] Augustine, *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*, Chapter 3, retrieved from http://www.newadvent.org/ -fathers/1505.htm (accessed 02 November – 10 December, 2007). This translation is taken, and revised, from the Fathers of the Church series (volume 86). See Collinge, *Augustine*, 93-177.

[30] In *Grace*, Augustine refers to Christ the Physician in chapters 1, 6, 21, 23, 25, 29, 31, 39, 46, 57, 59, 63, 64, 65, and 76. The image of the physician is mentioned in Chapter 3 in *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*.
[31] See Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 70.
[32] Ibid., Chapter 78.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Evans notes that in refuting Pelagius' belief that Pope Xystus was the author of the *Sextine Enchiridion*, Augustine undoubtedly read Jerome, for it is on the same basis that he makes the same assertion. *Pelagius*, 46-53. Also, see below for a detailed analysis regarding Augustine-Jerome correspondence.
[35] In *Against the Pelagians*, Jerome and Pelagius assumed the names Atticus and Critobulus, respectively. For the quotation, see Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book I, Chapter 9, retrieved from http://www.new -advent.org/ fathers/3011.htm (accessed 02 November – 10 December, 2007). This translation is taken, and revised, from the Fathers of the Church series (volume 53). See Hritzu, *Jerome*, 223-378.
[36] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 4.
[37] Ibid., Book I, Prologue.
[38] Ibid., Book I, Chapter 5.
[39] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 3.
[40] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 6.
[41] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 11.
[42] Both Jerome and Augustine made reference to the Gospel according to Matthew in offering the image of the physician. See Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 1; Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book III, Chapter 11.
[43] Augustine, *Proceedings of Pelagius*, Chapter 23.
[44] Ibid. Collinge observes that as a member of the council at the Synod of Diospolis, John of Jerusalem may have played a role in Pelagius' acquittal as he was known to have had a sympathetic posture towards Pelagianism. Augustine revealed his strong reactions to the Synod as a result of Pelagius' exoneration in addition to Pelagius' role in publicizing his own acquittal throughout the Mediterranean. See Collinge, *Augustine*, 95-96.
[45] See Hritzu, *Jerome*, 224.
[46] Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 39.
[47] Ibid., Chapter 7.
[48] Ibid., Chapter 23.

[49] Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book II. Augustine does not ascribe chapters to the beginning of Book II.
[50] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 18.
[51] Ibid. Jerome wrote “baptism…set free from the chain of his own…sin by the blood of Christ.”
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid., Book III, Chapter 19. Here, Jerome consulted the two treatises “on infant baptism” that Augustine wrote to Marcellinus.
[54] Ibid.
[55] See historiography above.
[56] This argument of “cause” is developed in the latter half of *Grace*, specifically in Chapters 48-81. In the first half, although Augustine discussed the importance of grace, he did introduce the grounds of living a sinless life.
[57] Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 15. In particular, he cited Corinthians 5:21, Hebrews 4:15, and John 1:8 & 3:9. Interestingly, however, Chapter 42 of *Grace* contradicted this notion of “Him only” when he wrote that “We must except the holy Virgin Mary…when it touches the subjects of sins.”
[58] Ibid. Augustine cites James 3:8 in chapters 16 and 17.
[59] Ibid., Chapter 16.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid. “It [man’s tongue] cannot be tamed by any man, although even beasts are tameable by human beings.”
[62] Ibid., Chapter 17. Extract taken from James 3:13.
[63] Ibid., Chapter 18.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid., Chapter 41.
[66] Ibid., Chapter 48.
[67] Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book III, Chapter 4.
[68] Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 47.
[69] Ibid., Chapter 16.
[70] For a thorough, comparative analysis of Augustine and Jerome, see Jeremy du Quesnay Adams, *The Populus of Augustine and Jerome: A Study in the Patristic Sense of Community*(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); and Carolinne White, ed. & trans. *The Correspondence (394-419), between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo* (Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1990).
[71] See footnote 9. See Kelly, *Jerome*, 145.

[72] In fact, Jerome acted as one of its chief protagonists beyond the end of the fourth century. Kelly, *Jerome*, 210.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid., 312-315. Kelly offers insightful analysis on each letter written to Demetrias.
[75] Kelly, *Jerome*, 314-315.
[76] Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Prologue.
[77] See Collinge, 3-17, 93-103; Evans, *Pelagius*, 85. Furthermore, Augustine was enraged over the substantial number of Catholic theologians employed in warranting Pelagian theology that included both himself and Jerome. Although no copies of *On Nature* remain, we know from various sources, including Augustine, that Pelagius also used Lactantius, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, John Chrysostom, and Systus of Rome.
[78] Extract take from Augustine, *Grace*, Chapter 54.
[79] Evans, *Pelagius*, 86. Evans observes that by 415, Augustine showed that "he has either forgotten or abandoned positions which he had taken in [*On Free Choice*]."
[80] Augustine, *On Free Choice*, cited in Evans, *Pelagius*, 86-87.
[81] Evans, *Pelagius*, 87. These "goods" are comprised of virtues, bodily beauty, and will.
[82] Ibid.
[83] For a detailed analysis of their correspondence in addition to the translated texts see White, *Correspondence*.
[84] Ibid., 2-5. From 395 to 405, it should be noted, their communicative relationship was abrasive. In a letter written around 395, Augustine charged Jerome with an unsatisfactory interpretation of the Galatians. White attributes their ensuing coarse rapport to this accusation.
[85] Ibid., 51.
[86] Ibid., 208.
[87] Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book III, Chapter 17.
[88] White, *Correspondence*, 227. White believes the letter was written in 416, which may have been composed during or after the writing of their anti-Pelagian writings.
[89] Paulus Orosius was a Spanish priest and close friend of Augustine. See White, *Correspondence*, 205.
[90] Ibid., 180-181.
[91] See Maribel Dietz, *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300-800* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 2005): 43-68. Dietz states that Augustine provided guidance for Orosius in composing *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*.

[92] White, *Correspondence*, 227.
[93] As a result of vocally denouncing Pelagius, Jerome's monastery was sacked by avid Pelagians in 416. See Hritzu, *Jerome*, 228-229.
[94] Augustine, *Proceedings*, Chapter 66.
[95] In Chapter 78 of *On Nature and Grace*, Augustine refers to Jerome as the "venerable presbyter." In Book III, Chapter 19 of *Against the Pelagians*, Jerome describes Augustine as a "holy man and eloquent bishop."
[96] White, *Correspondence*, 10.
[97] See Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Adversity, AD 200-1000* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996), 35-38.
[98] White, *Correspondence*, 227.
[99] Ibid., 227.

[C1]Definitely vehement. Jerome was one cranky man when it came to heresy! And thank God for that!
[C2]Excellent sentence.
[C3]
[C4]A fun term for "theological approach."
[C5]And here's where the heresy begins. It all depends on how you understand "independent." Pelagius understood it really badly!!
[C6]Since you began the next paragraph with "Conversely," can I assume that Jerome is "neglected" in this area?
[C7]Do you mean "case" here?
[C8]Brilliant!!!
[C9]Ouch. He didn't pull any punches, eh?
[C10]How "twofold"? In terms of the original "grace"(gift) of free-will and the working of grace in every good act? You might want to clarify this.
[C11]I can see his point about man's uncontrollable tongue, but I'd hesitate to say that he's reducing man's nature to sub-animal with this comment.
[C12]Response to whom? I was a little confused here.
[C13]Woohoo! The Fathers of the Church rock!
[C14]Adding "authentic" may be a little subversive by academia's allegedly 'objective' evaluative approach, but it's true!