

LORD OF THE FLIES: THE BEAST WITHIN

Dr Tarek Mousleh*

ABSTRACT

Lord of the Flies is a successful dramatisation of the idea of original sin. The boys in the novel who are marooned on a desert island show an instinctive readiness to lapse into savagery. Golding creates certain circumstances to reveal man's evil nature and his unyielding desire to achieve prominence at the expense of his fellow human beings. The book celebrates the end of innocence and the darkness of man's heart' in a cruel world where only the fittest and the most vicious can survive.

* Associated Professor Department of English - Damascus University - Syria.

□ ملخص □

قلق التأثر أو الصراع على الوجود بين الفنان الناشئ والسلف الفني المسيطر مفهوم إشكالي لقد كتب عنه نقاد كثير مما يجعل الدرس النقدي المقارن قضية رئيسة. يرى ت. س - إليوت أن التراث الأبي منتصر على الإضافة الأبية الجديدة مهما كانت وهذا مايتبناه الناقد بيت : على الفنان التابع أن يستسلم لعمالقة الماضي. ولكن يعتقد هارولد بلوم - المنظر الأكبر لقلق التأثر - أن الفنان الحداثي قادر دائماً على استبدال الأولوية الزمنية التي يتمتع بها الأسلاف بالأولوية الفنية. ويرسم بلوم لهذا الصراع خارطة معقدة من النقد الأبي وعلم النفس توطن قلق التأثر فتكون الخارطة من ستة أطوار لها صورها البلاغية الخاصة وارتكازاتها الدفاعية المتميزة وغاياتها الفنية التصاعديّة وفي نهاية الصراع يصير الفنان الناشئ سلف ذاته ووالد نفسه. ويتحول السلف العملاق إلى ناشئ عجوز. وتطبيقاً لهذا المنظور يجري البحث دراسة تفصيلية للعلاقة الفنية بين هنري جيمز والروائية السيدة ورد. ليس قلق التأثر قضية نقدية ثانوية. إنه محاولة لكشف المحرك الأول لتاريخ الأوب.

- 15- H. Bloom, A Map Of Misreading (New York, 1975), p.59.
- 16- A Map Of Misreading, p.93.
- 17- Ann Freud, The Ego and the Mechanism of Defence (London, 1979), p.14.
- 18- A Map Of Misreading, p.102.
- 19- Deconstructive Criticism, p.135.
- 20- Deconstructive Criticism, pp.135.
- 21- Deconstructive Criticism, p.135-6.
- 22- D. O'Hara, The Romance of Interpretation: Visionary Criticism from Pater to de Man (New York, 1985), pp.60.
- 23- The Romance of Interpretation, p.59.
- 24- E.M. Forster, Aspects of the Novel (London, 1974; first published, 1927), p.27.
- 25- J. Goode, 'The Art of Fiction: Walter Besant and Henry James', in Tradition and Tolerance in Nineteenth-Century Fiction, edited by D. Howard, J. Lucas and J. Goode (London, 1966), pp.243-81.
- 26- J. E. Miller, Jr., 'Henry James: A Theory of Fiction', Prairie Schooner, 45 (1971), pp.330-56.
- 27- Henry James's Letters, III, pp.58-60 (see index for the complete text of the letter).

ABBREVIATION

LHJ: L. Edel, *The Life of Henry James*, 2 vols (London, 1977).

NOTES

- 1- Henry James's Letters, edited by L. Edel, 4 vols (London, 1974-84), III, p.50.
- 2- Henry James's Letters, III, p.59.
- 3- Bloom, H., The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry (New York, 1973), p.26.
- 4- Rowe, J.C., The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James (London, 1985), p.46.
- 5- Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James, p.69.
- 6- T.S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' in Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism: A Reader, edited by D. Lodge (London, 1972), pp.71-7 (pp.71-2).
- 7- V. Leitch, Deconstructive Criticism: An Advanced Introduction (New York, 1983), p.131.
- 8- W. J. Bate, The Burden of the Past and the English Poet (London, 1970), p.3.
- 9- The Burden of the Past and the English Poet, p.82.
- 10- W. James, Talks to Teachers on Psychology And to Students on Some Life's Ideals (London, 1908; first published, 1899), pp.48-9.
- 11- Talks to Teachers, p.54.
- 12- D.T. O'Hara, The Romance of Interpretation: Visionary Criticism from Pater to de Man (New York, 1985), pp.81-2.
- 13- Deconstructive Criticism, p.134.
- 14- Deconstructive Criticism, p.139.

from his point of view. Her asymmetrical performance, James says, 'mixes slightly incongruous things a little more than they would have been mixed in life'. In short, Miss Bretherton does not rise to the standard of its raw material, and does not even gratify the ABC of art. Therefore it can be said that James is not going to learn from Mrs. Ward. On the contrary, he is going to teach her, as if he were the precursor and she were the apprentice, which recalls 'metalepsis'.

'Metalepsis', the trope of 'apophrades' is clearly in operation here. By referring to Kendal reading his 'foreign letters on the common', James seems to be metamorphosing his addressee from an authoress into a character. The message he encodes is that she should do what her Kendal is doing. She should go to the 'common', and read James's letter to herself-unless that epistle sounds 'foreign' to her, that is unless it is speaking a language - art - which is 'mumbo-jumbo' to her ears. This transumption recalls what Nick does to Nash - asking him to sit like a model; what Mariam does to Madame Carre-making her perform what Miriam herself has just recited; what Overt is commissioned to perform - turning his precursor, St. George, into a book; and what all the ephebes do to their precursors.

that will engender morality not art. If he did that, he would not be a novelist, at least from his own point of view. This is why, the distinction he brings into play functions like the imagery of 'askesis', namely, 'inside and outside'. To preserve morality and sacrifice art is to remain outside the literary institution. To do the opposite or to syncritize both areas, as James preaches and practises, is to be inside the canon. Accordingly, it can be understood that if Miss Bretherton is ethically 'framed', The Tragic Muse, is going to be aesthetically informed. 'Sublimation' is made complete when James 'generalizes away the uniqueness' of Miss Bretherton. He tells Mrs. Ward, 'I think your end has a little too much of the conventional love-story' (my emphasis). One wonders if James is not, zeugmatically speaking, playing on the word 'end' so that both the novel and the novelist can be put on the shelf together. The failure of the first is end of the second and vice versa.

Having corrected Mrs. Ward, swerved from her, antithetically completed her, emptied her out, curtailed her achievement; and achieved a state of solitude for himself, James rounds off his letter in a manner that resembles Bloom's last ratio, 'apophrades'. In other words, the text so far and the five ratios covered above anticipated the burial of Mrs. Ward, but the denouement of the latter resurrects her. 'Apophrades' is the return of the dead but not under their own colours. James's last sentences are: 'excuse my hasty harshness: - I didn't want merely to murmur compliments. These, however, you deserve for the grace and ease, the pleasant colour and discreet form of your story'. Clearly, Mrs. Ward is given a lease of life, but it is a lease designed by James himself. She will be seen as he represents her. Indeed, the compliments he showers upon her are no rain at all. The terms, 'grace', 'pleasant colour', and 'discreet form' are all phatic abstractions that have no concrete credit at all. They are social terms rather than real criticism. The quasi-substantiation James fills in confirms this reading. He says, 'Excellent is the description of the first night of Glorie and charming the picture of Kendal in Surrey, reading his foreign letters on the common'.

These phatic signs function like quasi-introjection and give the impression that James might enrich himself with them, but this is not the case as 'projection' confirms. 'Projection', the expulsion and casting out of anxiety, dominates the ending of the letter. First, James tells Mrs. Ward that 'your French people are too English!' And then he attributes to her the elementary mistake that undermines the career of any novelist, at least

therefore ... insist', James daemonizes, '[on] one or two points in which I should have liked your story to be little different ... I am capable of wishing the actress might have been carried away from Kendal altogether ... She lapses toward him as if she were a failure'. That epithet, 'capable', says it all: 'revision' has transmuted 'interpretation'. In other words, James is no longer criticizing Mrs. Ward. He is re-writing her novel and is self-consciously producing a text totally different from her work. This is not a difference for the sake of difference, but it is the corollary of Miss Bretherton's being a non-text. It is true that his raw material is the same germ and the same story but the product will be original. The 'high/low' contrast frames this section. James is aware of how 'low' Isabel's performance is, and can envision how 'high' Miriam's will be. In fact the clause, 'as if she were a failure' is a sort of 'litotes' suggesting that she is, as he sees her, a non-character. His wish that she be 'carried away' functions like a 'hyperbole' when contextualized with the reality of Miss Bretherton. This is why his own product, which is a technical transformation of all his premises into a novel, will be the 'counter-sublime' to Mrs. Ward's.

Getting down to the details signifies that James is sorting out what has potential in Miss Bretherton, but has been left in virtuality. Such material will be his, the rest is Mrs. Ward's. This is, after all what 'askesis' stands for. This ratio is pinpointing an aspect that is alien to the precursor, and representing it as if were the ephebe's own property. James addresses Mrs. Ward saying, 'You have endeavoured to make us feel her [Isabel's] "respectability" at the same time as her talent, her artistic nature, but in taking care to preserve the former, you have rather sacrificed the latter'. 'Curtailment', the function of 'askesis', is at work here. Morality is Mrs. Ward's territory, but art is 'Jamesland'. It is true that art, writing about an actress, is a part of her work, but it looks like a misfit there. In fact the verb, 'sacrificed', 'metaphorically' suggests that art is as consecrated for him as morality is for her - to say the least. More than that, by trying to consecrate something, Mrs. Ward has desecrated something else. The disjunction between these two disciplines - art and morality - has a double obligation. First, it polarizes the two writers, and secondly, it 'delineates' Mrs. Ward's world. The ensuing polarity is nothing more than a real 'sublimation' on James's side.

'Sublimation', of course, is the defence-mechanism of 'askesis'. James is not going to stoop to that homophonic novelistic delivery, for

trope in this part, for James is representing the earlier, Mrs. Ward - standing for the 'part' - as a sign of the 'wholeness' of himself - representing the latecomer.

The defence mechanism, 'turning against the self', which is a transformation of the anxiety into a sort of phobia, can be felt here as well. The list of the problematics relating to doing the public woman has that kind of function. It is clear how James disrupts the narrative of his letter and starts talking about himself instead of Mrs. Ward, which recalls the entry in The Notebooks. What he points out is that the subject itself is **challenging to him**. His abrupt remark sounds like an answer to the question, 'why haven't you written about it yourself?' 'Tessera'. It should be underlined, is the antithesis to 'clinamen', and consequently it represents a withdrawal.

The same dialectic generates the opposite of the withdrawal above, namely a 'crossing', which leads to third ratio, 'kenosis'. In the same letter, James reminds Mrs. Ward of the limitations in her novel saying, 'It seems to me, however, that, as I said, you have rather limited yourself - you have seen that concussion too simply, refused perhaps even to face it...' This is clearly a revisionist reading of Mrs. Ward, or what Bloom calls 'interpretation', the stage next to 'incarnation'. The function of 'kenosis', as Bloom points out is the 'emptying out' of the precursor. It is exactly what is taking place here. It is true that James has stopped talking about himself and has returned to addressing Mrs. Ward, but this return has a function: an evisceration of the precursor. In contradistinction to the 'fullness' required above, he is displaying now the 'emptiness' of Miss Bretherton. The way he expresses his point emphasizes this reading. She has 'limited' herself, has treated the problem 'too simply' and 'has refused to face' the crux of the whole project.

The rhythm of the letter is symmetrical so far. First comes Mrs. Ward; second, James; third, Mrs. Ward; and now back to James. In other words, after the regression of the latecomer, James reverses the strategy and starts to repress the predecessor. 'Repression' entails that if the predecessor were here now, she would be different, or if her text were to be reproduced, it would be of a higher quality. Therefore, anxiety itself should be obliterated since the ephebe's supremacy is logical, which gives full reign to the daemon. 'Daemoinization' replaces 'kenosis' - a procedure whose function is the production of 'the counter-sublime'. 'Let me

'man' and 'novelist' as homologous (a novelist is a man. Mrs. Ward is not a man, is not a novelist). The same thing can be said about the end of the quotation above, 'to write'. The stop here may bring into play the possibility that she is not illiterate after all. All these indirect significations of the non-existence of the novelist in Mrs. Ward can be substantiated by the image of absence, 'rare bird'. More than that, the epithets James chooses, 'refined' and 'senti', - especially when countextualized with the whole epistle - sound ironic. The crux is that all these signs function as a code of 'clinamen'.

The 'election' of knowing Mrs. Ward and the 'covenant' of reading her with pleasure do not last long. 'Rivalry' is introduced through the double disengagement and dissociation James pumps in. She is a woman, he is novelist. James, contrary to the woman, whose fingerprints are like hieroglyphics in her writing, will not give that 'security' to his readers. In short, the image of absence, the trope of irony and the signs of swerving signify that 'clinamen' frames the beginning of the later. The defence-mechanism, 'reaction-formation', surfaces in the first sentence where James insists that he has read the novel 'with pleasure'. Foregrounding this perlocutionary effect seems to me to be a device for camouflaging the opposite. ('Reaction-formation', after all, suggests that the reader look for the opposite of what the words on the page seem to be saying. A defence-mechanism is a falsification.)

'Tessera', the second revisionary ratio takes over and manifests itself as an antithetical completion. James says, 'The private history of the public woman ... the drama of her feelings, heart, soul, personal relations, and the shock, conflict, complication between her career, artistic life - this has always seemed to me a tempting challenging subject'. The pronoun, 'me', signifies that, after 'rivalry', 'incarnation' is underway. James is introducing himself as the true novelist, and representing the subject as his property. He knows the theme very well, can recite all the accessories which define that theme, which, being non-existent in Miss Bretherton, confirms that the subject is still uncompetitively his. Furthermore the list of complexities quoted above highlights what James really means by the 'security' he attributes to Mrs. Ward. He is using it merely as a euphemism for her 'simplicity'. James in this section is charting new territory and revealing that he will produce the antithesis to Miss Bretherton, and will 'steam away' where she has come to cule de sac. In short, her denouement is his beginning. Synecdoche is clearly the

subtly swerving from him (clinamen); openly taking the antithetical position (tessera); emptying out his opponent (kenosis); setting out to refute the other's argument point by point (daemonization); distinguishing himself when it comes to the ethical issue (askesis) and rounding off the exchange (apophrades) - confirms that James is not writing without an outline. **The point is that this outline identifies with the Map of Misprision.** It seems to me that every time James criticizes somebody, he starts with the representation of the other's case as objectively and commendably as possible. Then he introduces his own reservations which immediately take the form of a point-by-point refutation of the other's argument. Once his objective is accomplished, he tries to 'soften the blow' by murmuring some compliments, as he does at the end of his letter to Mrs. Ward, the one to be introduced next. This triadic frame of mind recalls the last modification of Bloom's theory, namely 'limitation', 'substitution', 'restitution'. The systematicity of James's writing of **critiques proves that he has internalized the structure to the extent that it functions like his private signature.**

Of course, the two variations here - influence without anxiety and anxiety without influence - are paradigmatic of the anxiety of influence, as in James's letter to Mrs. Ward in reference to her Miss Bretherton. He sent her the letter on December 9th., 1884.⁽²⁷⁾ He starts it saying, 'I read it [Miss Bretherton] with much interest and pleasure - it is very refined and sent ... the reader has the pleasure and security of feeling that he is **with a woman (distinctly with a woman!) who knows how (rare bird!) to write**'. It is clear how James is playing the concept of the woman against that of the writer. The presence of the first suggests the absence of the second. The judgement that the reader is 'secure' in the knowledge that the novelist is a woman is an innuendo that the woman is not a novelist. The way James disrupts the horizontality of his sentence fragments the lexical units that should be together to formulate a semantic whole. But being ruptured, they generate indeterminacy, get impregnated with plurisignation, and **create a** wide margin for speculation. This is due to the fact that, as the Reception theory argues, the reader expects the semantic unit to be relatively complete when the discourse comes to a stop. The point is that when James disrupts the letter twice after 'woman', the new fragmented utterance will foreground the message that Mrs. Ward is not a man. And since it is obvious that she is a woman, stating the obvious will either satirize her or question her identity and endow her with unwanted verity. The ploy makes more sense if James thinks of

make Nash sit for him, for he does not want the others to say that he has invented Nash.

This juxtaposition of the personae of influence confirms that it is literally possible for the young artist and the precursor to be contemporaries. Henry James himself is a good example. He is the ephebe of Hawthorne, Turgenev, Zola, Flaubert, G. Sand and G. Eliot, and Trollope, as suggested by J.C. Rowe. Metaphorically speaking, artists from different periods can be spatialized together in a single text. In fact E.M. Forester, in Aspects of the Novel, envisions the possibility of **convening** a gathering of artists from different eras, saying, 'We are to visualize the English novelists not as floating down the stream which bears all its sons away unless they are careful, but as seated together in a room, a circular room, a sort of British Museum reading-room - all reading their novels simultaneously'.⁽²⁴⁾ Accordingly, the representation of the anxiety of influence as a one-sided trafficking is a begging of the question. The precursor, as will be apparent later, is as involved as is the ephebe.

The other limitation is the scope of the applicability of the anxiety of influence. Eliot, Bate and Bloom categorize their projects as models for the study of poetry only. It is true that sometimes they use the term, 'artists', instead of 'poets', but it is only for avoiding monotonous repetition rather than pushing back the borders of their arguments. But, as some critics have already suggested and practised, the anxiety of influence can be extended to other genres, the novel included. Indeed, the kind of medium does not matter so much as long as there is a syncretism of an apprentice and a master in the same arena. Johnson, for instance, thinks of it as an approach to politics, and Rowe applies to Hawthorne. It is the central problematic narrative mode in The Tragic Muse and most of the short stories. In fact, its scope seems to be encyclopedic for it applies almost to all James's criticism too, such as 'The Lesson of Balzac', 'Guy de Maupassant' (1888) and 'The Art of Fiction'.

Talking about the latter, J. Goode suggests that it is not informed by any scheme or principle of organization, as if it were an instant reaction to W. Besant.⁽²⁵⁾ On the other hand, J.E. Miller points out that it is not as impulsive as it seems. He underlines the structuring subtleties and the syntactic nuances through which James organizes his article.⁽²⁶⁾ In fact, the way James begins the essay - commendably introducing Bessant.

Bloom, as Daniel O'Hara points out has never stopped revising his own theory, which makes him, according to O'Hara, 'the first literary critic in the American tradition ... to rival the greatest of the nineteenth-century masters of English prose'.⁽²²⁾ O'Hara devotes a large section to the later revisionary modifications with which Bloom has injected his 'heterocosm'. The latest version is a pattern of three ratios only. The first one is 'an initial moment of limitation or ironic self-reduction. The second one is a 'moment of substitution in which the writer develops his sense of identity by inventing the beloved masks of his precursors'. Finally there is 'the moment in which the writer produces a sublime representation of himself as the only begetter of his fathers and so of himself and his textual world as well'. In Bloom's latest book, Agon, 'this dialectic of limitation, substitution, and representation (or restitution) becomes the antithetical triad of negation (or cancellation), evasion (or self-preservation), and extravagance (or exaltation)'.⁽²³⁾

Before starting the dialogue between James and the anxiety of influence, I would like to underline some aspects of this theory. In fact they are two limitations. First, although the conflict is between ephebes and precursor, or ephebes and their literary traditions, Eliot, Bate and Bloom reduce the two-sided warfare to a monodimensional problematic. Eliot represents it as if it were simply the tradition dominating the present. So criticism is called upon to explicate the vagrant ways and forms the past manipulates to structure the present and surface in it. Bate and Bloom, portray the affair as if it were only the ephebe's dilemma. **When the latter embarks on his career he faces a number of obstacles, and he has to struggle for survival.** The precursors simply do nothing. Indeed, Bloom, at one stage, suggests that predecessors sometimes do not exist, therefore young **artists** have to manufacture them. He says, 'Kierkegaard in Fear and Anxiety announces, with magnificently but absurdly apocalyptic confidence, that "he who is willing to work gives birth to his own father." I find truer to mere fact the aphoristic admission of Nietzsche: "When one hasn't had a good father it is necessary to invent one' (Anxiety, p. 56). What informs this perspective is the postulate that the father is both literally and metaphorically dead, which is untrue. In James, as always demonstrated, precursors are not only there, but they are bedevilled by anxiety too. Mark Ambient, Henry St. George, Dencombe and Madame Carre are clear examples. Most of the works in which they appear are entitled after them. More than that, their presence is emphasized by the ephebes themselves. Nick, for instance, tries hard to

The last ratio, 'apophrades', is signified by images of 'early and late' by means of the trope of 'metalepsis'. The defence mechanisms involved are 'Interjection' and 'Projection'. The first is a 'transposition of otherness into the self [whereas] projection attributes outwardly all prohibited instincts or objects to others'.⁽¹⁹⁾ Ann Freud describes 'interjection' as a mechanism for enriching the self by internalizing external material. But 'projection', for her, is an 'expulsion' of anxiety into the outside. The two versions seem to me to complement and emphasize each other. However, Bloom expands on this last phase saying that Apophrades is 'the return of the dead'. It gives the impression of going back to 'the later poet's flooded apprenticeship before his strength began to assert itself in the revisionary ratios'. The point is that the new poem's achievement makes it seem to us, 'not as though the later poet himself had written the precursor's characteristic work' (Anxiety, p. 16). In other words, the precursor, as Rowe says, is metamorphosed into a mere character in the ephebe's text: the earlier ends as the latecomer, and the young artist becomes the precursor par excellence.

In his later work, as already mentioned, Bloom has modified his theory and halved his ratios. Leitch describes what has happened saying, 'Basically, Bloom reduces his Map to three dialectical movements or tiered processual planes: (1) clinamen <-> tessera; (2) kenosis <-> daemonization; (3) askesis <-> apophrades'.⁽²⁰⁾ Leitch systematizes the Bloomian material and observes that

Three times the latecomer contracts or withdraws himself, experiencing a 'negative moment,' followed by a 'crossing' over into expansive acts of 'positive' self-representation. Transgression of a taboo leads to transcendence. A whole set of structural homologies emerge in the Map. For example, irony, metonymy, and metaphor oppose synecdoché, hyperbole, and metalepsis. In other words, two dominant classes of tropes exist: (1) tropes of action, which exhibit a language of need and powerlessness; (2) tropes of desire, which display a language of possession and power.⁽²¹⁾

The early relation would be exchanged for a later; instead of simply submitting to the inherited tie and to the imposed complication, of suffering from them, our little wonder-working agent would create, without design, quite fresh elements of this order -contribute, that is, to the formation of a fresh tie, from which it would then (and for all the world as if through a small demonic foresight) proceed to derive great profit (AN,142)

The terminology James instrumentalizes here signifies that what Maisie is embarking on is the Bloomian transumption. The epithets, 'early' and 'late', 'inherited' and 'fresh' are in fact the same imagery that expresses the metalepsis of the last ratio, 'apophrades'. More than that, the trajectory charted by James, namely Maisie's change from 'submission' to 'creativity' recalls the progress from 'clinamen' to 'tessera' in the Map and the move from 'election' and 'covenant' to 'rivalry' in the Primal Scene of Instruction. But to undo her parents and reach a state of sublimated solitude, she needs to demonize herself and to humanize them. This is why James represents her as 'wonder-working' and as having 'demonic foresight'. The synthesis of all these dialectical ratios is what James terms as 'proceeding' and 'profit': Maisie's becoming her own parent.

The fifth ratio, 'Askesis' draws on images of 'Inside and Outside' through the trope of 'Metaphor'. Its defence-mechanism is 'Sublimation'. Bloom depicts it as 'a movement of self-purgation which intends the attainment of a state of solitude ...' To avoid any overlapping between this ratio and the two before it, Bloom argues that the distinction can be sustained by recalling the difference between 'Emptying out' and 'Curtailment'. Here the ephebe 'yields up a part of his own human and imaginative endowment so as to separate himself from others including the precursor' (Anxiety, p. 115). In another chapter, he adds that it is a successful reduction, 'a purgatorial blinding ... The realities of other selves and all that is external are diminished alike, until a new style of harshness emerges, whose rhetorical emphasis can be read off as one degree of solipsism or another' (Anxiety, p. 121). It should be added that the defence of this ratio, 'sublimation', is allocated the function of replacement, that is substituting higher for lower, as Ann Freud puts it.

or studying literary works: the application should not necessarily follow the ratios literary and in the right order as Rowe does.

The second trio of ratios **begins** with 'Daemonization', which uses images of 'High and Low' through the tropes of 'Hyperbole' and 'Litotes'. The psychic defence is 'Repression'. Bloom introduces 'Daemonization' as 'a movement towards a personalized Counter-Sublime, in reaction to the precursor's Sublime ... The later poet opens himself to what he believes to be a power in the parent poem that does not belong to the parent proper, but to be a range of being just beyond the precursor'. The drive behind this procedure is 'to generalize away the uniqueness of the earlier work' (Anxiety, p. 15). Later on in the book, Bloom clarifies the etymology of his term. The '**daemons**', he says, **are beings next to Gods**. In other words, the power that makes a man a poet is 'daemonic', but this does not mean that the poet is possessed. On the contrary, when the poet 'grows strong' he becomes and is a daemon'. Consequently, 'when the epebe is daemonized, his precursor necessarily is humanized' (Anxiety, p. 100). The importance of this ratio can be inferred from the way Ann Freud represents the defence at work here. She thinks that 'repression' is so powerful that the other nine defences look like mere accessories to it. Its function is the total obliteration of the anxiety. It is also interesting that Bloom aligns it to the fourth ratio because Ann Freud emphasizes that it **usually comes late in resisting anxiety**.

James himself, in his Preface to The Spoils of Poynton, uses the same epithet, 'demonic', to distinguish his 'free spirits' from his 'fools', or, as he puts it, those with intensities from the others with fixities. The first group represents the characters who can 'see' and 'feel' in contradistinction to those who can only 'feel'. If seeing and feeling, as Conrad emphasizes, catalyse persons into artists, then James's 'demonic' is identical with Bloom's 'daemonic', and confirms that James's characters are, polyphonically speaking, conceived of and represented as author-thinkers.

The same term 'demonic' surfaces again in a very important context in James. While talking about the symmetry of What Maisie Knew in his Preface to the same novel, James says,

process of misreading is preformed by the six ratios and is accomplished at the end of the Map.

The first ratio, 'Clinamen', is manifested by images of 'Presence and Absence', and is expressed by means of 'Irony'. Its defence-mechanism is 'reaction-formation'. Bloom describes the function of 'Clinamen' saying that it is a 'poetic misreading or misprision proper... A poet swerves away from his precursor ... This appears as a corrective movement in his own poem' (Anxiety, p. 14). What the ephebe wants to put across here is that the precursor himself should have done exactly the same swerving but he had not. The defence involved here is categorized as very important by Ann Freud. She describes its function as a sort of security that blocks the return of anxiety by reversing it into its opposite. Parent-hatred, for instance, is replaced by love, and jealousy by caring. The function of 'reaction-formation' surfaces in the performances of both ephebes and forebears, as what happens in The Tragic Muse. The young characters, who are supposed to be antagonistic to their seniors, are presented as being positive. But the precursors, who are expected to be compassionate, embark on a demeanour that betrays infernal hatred.

The second ratio, 'Tessera', is projected by the images of 'the Part for the Whole or the Whole for the Part'. This is expressed by the trope of 'Synecdoche' and the psychic defences of 'Reversal' or 'Turning against the Self'. Bloom defines 'Tessera' as 'completion and antithesis ... A poet antithetically "completes" his precursor, by so reading the parent-poem as to retain its terms but to mean them in another sense, as though the precursor had failed to go far enough'.⁽¹⁸⁾ This is signified by 'synecdoche', which, being a trope of representation, suggests that the earlier is a sign of the wholeness of the latecomer.

The third ratio, 'Kenosis', is delivered into images of 'Fullness and Emptiness' by means of 'Metonymy', which is a reductionist trope. Its psychic defences are 'Regression', 'Undoing' or 'Isolation'. Bloom defines it as 'a breaking device ... a movement towards discontinuity with the precursor' (Anxiety, p. 15). The ephebe represents himself as though he were 'ceasing to be a poet', but the real motive is 'emptying' the precursor and indirectly establishing the presence of the latecomer. This ratio distinguishes itself by its area of action. Contrary to the other two, 'this third ratio seems more applicable to poets than to poems' (Anxiety, p. 90). The importance of this specificity lies in its bearing on 'testing the Map'

visions'. 'Rivalry', which is embedded in 'covenant', as Bloom says, replaces the latter and engenders counter-inspirations and counter-muses. Such a minor substitution paves the way for a possible transumption when 'The apparently liberated ephebe offers himself as the true manifestation of the authentic poet (Incarnation); eventually the latecomer comprehensively revises the precursor (Interpretation) and ultimately recreates him in a new way (Revision)' (See also Bloom's A Map of Misreading, pp. 51-5).⁽¹⁴⁾

Bloom defines his Primal Scene of Instruction as 'a belated or metaleptic preface to a six-fold scheme of revisionary ratios that serve as a typology of intertextual poetic evasions'.⁽¹⁵⁾ Generally speaking, he relates the Primal Scene to the ratios either as a preface to the main body of the theory, or as a thesis to its detailed outline. The specificity of the Primal Scene, however, seems to me to lie in its etymology. Its Freudian coinage suggests that the relationship between the ephebes and their artistic parents is going to be another version of the 'family romance'. The ephebe, that is, is motivated by the drives of Freud's Primal Scene, namely patricide and the wish of being his own father. As far as practical criticism is concerned, this Primal Scene, like the Map, can be applied to the history of the conflict between precursors and acolytes, though on a scale less complicated and less comprehensive than that of the Map.

That Map of Misreading, or of Misprision, comprises six revisionary ratios that represent the phases of the anxiety of influence. Each one of them has its own images, rhetorical trope(s) and defence-mechanism(s). It should be underlined here that the correspondence between the tropes and the defences is significant: both are, to speak James's language, "watch-and-ward" devices. In fact Bloom prefers the term 'trope' to 'figura' or 'figure of speech' on 'evasion' grounds. He surveys the history of the two terms and tries to disambiguate their chronic overlapping by crystallizing some of their differences. Then he defines 'trope' as 'a willing error, a turn from literal meaning in which a word or phrase is used in an improper sense, wandering from its rightful place. A trope therefore is a kind of falsification, because every trope (like every defence, which is similarly a falsification) is necessarily an interpretation and so a mistaking'.⁽¹⁶⁾ In fact, Ann Freud, Bloom's precursor in this field, states the same point about the mechanisms of defence by describing their effects as 'omission, reversal, displacement of meaning, etc.'.⁽¹⁷⁾ This

terminology he uses and the interdisciplinary complications he pumps into his discourse. The outcome is a composite theory that incorporates psychoanalysis, theology, philosophy and manages to catalyse the components into a heteroglot literary framework. Bloom underlines that literary identity from the very beginning, saying, 'My concern is only with strong poets, major figures with the persistence to wrestle with their precursors, even to death' (Anxiety, p. 5). He goes on to emphasize that his approach is structured upon the self-versus-self conflict, not the self-against-tradition model. Using Freudian terminology, he points out that the 'Battle between strong equals, father and son as mighty opposites, Laius and Oedipus at the cross-roads; only this is my subject' (Anxiety, p. 11). Sometimes he renders this confrontation as a Rhadamanthine fatality for the young artist: 'Poetic influence is not a separation but a victimization - it is a destruction of desire' (Anxiety, p. 38). But as a **general thesis**, anxiety is not a form of closure for Bloom. This is why he attributes the history of literature to the anxiety of influence: 'The history of fruitful poetic influence, which is to say the main tradition of Western poetry of the Renaissance, is a history of anxiety and self-saving caricature, of distortion, of perverse, wilful revisionism without which modern poetry as such could not exist' (Anxiety, p. 30).

Bloom's work is not only a theory for explicating the trajectory of literature, but it is, as V. Leitch points out, a manual for making history as well. He intends it to be an Aristotelian Baedeker for both artists and critics to help them perceive the mechanisms that structure literary production. To put it in a Bloomian way, it is a scheme that helps readers read the ephebes' misreading of their predecessors. Leitch says, 'In addition to his poetics of the lyric and his literary history of the post-enlightenment era, Bloom offers in his Map a hermeneutic method. Like J. Hillis Miller and many other Americans, he often insists that he is primarily a "practical critic"'.⁽¹³⁾

Leitch charts Bloom's stages of the anxiety of influence as such. First of all comes the Primal Scene of Instruction 'which presents a primal moment of fixation and repression -the moment of the origin of intertextuality'. This generates a six-phased psychological scheme that begins with the primal moment and concludes with a moment of pride [W. James]: a revisionary take-over. 'Election' is the first confrontation when the young artist 'is seized by an older artist's power'. This takes the transient form of 'Covenant', which reveals 'an agreement of poetic

According to Daniel O'Hara, the anxiety of influence is deeply rooted in Bloom's career. It relates to Bloom's specific transaction with Nietzsche, and his drive to daemonize and humanize that ubermensch. O'Hara describes the process and the outcome of that 'literary judo', saying,

Early in his career, Bloom swerved from Nietzsche's influence by seeing him as a version of Pater and Emerson as seen through the eyes of an antithetical Arnoldian figure. Nietzsche was an aesthetic critic in need of the redeeming poet who is yet to come. Then, rapidly in the tetralogy [four of Bloom's books], Nietzsche is, first, a precursor whose insights into critical history Bloom would complete with his own antithetical theory of influence. But then Nietzsche becomes a brother who one claims is greater than one in certain ways. Only so such self-humbling may win one the fruits of the other's labors. Next, Nietzsche's sublime intuitions concerning the will to power as "the necessity of misreading" are put into their proper light by Bloom's own hyperbolic counter-sublime of Kabbalah and gnosis. Finally, however, Bloom sees Nietzsche as the master of the creative parody, the giant of irony who dwarfs de Man and Derrida and whom Bloom knows best. This Nietzsche can hollow out any pose, dart to any perspective, in an endless round of ironic self-cancellings of the ruling metaphors of the Western tradition of philosophical discourse. Nietzsche thereby becomes as formidable and graspable as the smile of the Cheshire cat.⁽¹²⁾

Whatever the case, there is no doubt that Bloom has produced a literary theory. In a series of books, starting with The Anxiety of Influence (1973), he has laid the foundations for his project, and followed them with numerous modifications. His monolithic project, compared with those above, is sophisticated and demanding because of the

available for them, as he claims, are either a cowardly surrender to the past or a pusillanimous rupture with it. He says that the 'artist', because of the spirit of emulation-because of his need to feel that he has a chance before the accumulated "perfection of the past" - is in danger either of giving up, or else of manicuring the past, or finally of searching for novelty for its own sake'.⁽⁹⁾ It is clear that Bate reiterates Eliot's concept of the absolute superiority of tradition. But unlike Eliot, he postulates that the anxiety of influence is not formative or constructive. It will either lock ephebes in or lock them out.

So far, the two alternatives of Eliot and Bate represent the anxiety of influence as a conjunction between the new artist and the past. Eliot's is an optional course, whereas Bate's is an inevitable path. But both fall short of becoming a full-fledged theory, as is Bloom's project. Before coming to Bloom, however, it is worth mentioning that William James, in his Talks to Teachers, maps the trajectory of the young talent in a way that figures like a proto-type to the anxiety of influence. He says that if the latecomer is to achieve 'invention', he/she has to go through the stage of 'imitation', 'emulation' and 'ownership'. 'Invention ... and imitation are the two legs ... on which the human race historically has walked'. Of course, one leg has to start first: 'imitation shades imperceptibly into Emulation. Emulation is the impulse to imitate what you see another doing in order not to appear inferior'. The two ratios are not so clearly delineated: 'it is hard to draw a sharp line between the manifestations of the two impulses, so inextricably do they mix their effects'.⁽¹⁰⁾ But still, he arranges them syntagmatically: 'As imitation slides into emulation, so emulation slides into Ambition; and ambition connects itself with Pugnacity and Pride'. W. James defines pugnacity as 'a general unwillingness to be beaten by any kind of difficulty'. If the young talent is not terminated, it will arrive at the stage of 'ownership'.⁽¹¹⁾ This Map of Invention is so close to Bloom's Map of Misprision. Imitation anticipates Bloom's first three ratios (clinamen, tessera and kenosis), whereas 'emulation' charts 'daemonization, askesis and apophrades'. In fact Bloom's last ratio occurs only when W. James's 'ownership' is accomplished. Furthermore, 'pugnacity' sounds precursory to Bloom's 'literary judo', reverberates in Miriam Rooth's grenadier-like character and 'la-guerre-comes-a-la-guerre' perspective. These similarities make it clear that, unlike Eliot and Bate, W. James is the only pre-Bloom voice to theorize the self-versus-self conflict. But Bloom, unlike his precursors, manages to produce a literary theory that transcends all the rest.

imposes itself because Eliot chooses three words and repeats them as if they signify the same meaning for him: 'predecessor' 'tradition' and 'order'. This paradigmatic synonymy will not generate a polarization of two artists or a self versus self confrontation. Instead, it pits one man of letters against the whole tradition. For example, the anxiety will not be between Stevens and Wordsworth but Stevens and romanticism at large; nor will it be between James and Hawthorne, or James and G. Eliot, but James versus romance and Victorianism, respectively.

This is why influence, for Eliot, is a sort of schooling or literary discipline rather than an Oedipus-Laius wrestling. The absence of anxiety here stands to reason when contextualized with Eliot's concepts of 'impersonality', 'disinterestedness' and the 'catalyst'. Bloom, as V. Leitch says, explains the background of this kind of guaranteed formative perspective saying, 'Before Milton, poets experienced influence as a healthy and generous force. But when poetry became subjective, influence began to create profound anxieties'.⁽⁷⁾ If that is the case, then literary history is already beyond Eliot's die-and-let-the-dead-live-in-you. Die or not, Eliot's ephebe will never become a master because his greatest success is his doom, that is, functioning like an unself-conscious medium, perhaps a catalyst, through which the forebears become immortal.

Fifty years after 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', W.J. Bate, in The Burden of the Past and the English Poet, also addresses the relationship between belated **artists** and their precursors. His perspective is relatively different from Eliot's, as will become apparent. Bate begins his book with a quotation from S. Johnson, which is also foregrounded by Bloom, about the anxiety between two successive regimes. Johnson says, 'The burthen of government is increased upon princes by virtue of their immediate predecessors... It is indeed always dangerous to be placed in a state of unavoidable comparison with excellence, and the danger is still greater when that excellence is consecrated by death'. Johnson analogically extends his thesis to literature with the view that 'He that succeeds a celebrated writer, has the same difficulties to encounter'.⁽⁸⁾ This hypothesis is too unambiguous to tolerate the free play of indeterminacy. It is about artistic problematics to tackle, dangers to brave, and the inevitable synchrisis of ephebes and precursors, unless the ephebe is Homresque. But Bate reads it as if it mapped a hierarchy of superiority and inferiority. This is why he believes that latecomers are always satellites in their precursors' orbits. Consequently, the only alternatives

belatedness (Anxiety, p.29). Perhaps, the same vision has dawned upon Bloom, for Eliot and Bate at least, whom he sidesteps, have preceded him to the issue.

Eliot, to start with, addresses the relationship between the poet and his predecessors, and suggests that criticism give up the search for the ahistorical originality and concentrate on the area where both the past and the present co-exist. He says, 'We dwell with satisfaction upon the poet's difference from his predecessors, especially his immediate predecessors; we endeavour to find something that can be isolated in order to be enjoyed'. It is clear that he is trivializing any approach which pits the individual talent against the tradition. In fact the diction he chooses, 'endeavour', 'something', 'isolated', signifies his intention. Having done that, he introduces his alternative model arguing that, 'if we approach a poet without this prejudice we shall often find that not only the best, but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously'. Indeed, he spells out his perspective with the same vigour: 'No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists'. These two judgements represent forebears as if they were the 'Council of Gods', and the latecomers, the plebeians at large. This is why the trafficking between them, according to Eliot, is, by and large, one-sided. He states that 'The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly altered'.⁽⁶⁾ The term, 'supervention', signifies the superfluity of the 'novelty', and renders it as a work extraneous to the 'complete order'. In other words, there is no logic, causality or historicism to explain the genesis of the new text, which confirms that Eliot's discourse is ambivalent. How can a work of art be superfluous if the best tissues of its texture are woven by tradition? And why should tradition bother about adjusting itself if the new work is its own product?

The theoretical implications of Eliot's critique can be formulated as the following. First the inter-relationship between latecomers and precursors is not an inevitable path or an inescapable conflict. On the contrary, it is represented as a recommendation for poets and a recipe for canonization. In fact, artists can do without it unless they trust Eliot's sagacity and crave to measure their wits against the canon. Otherwise, the order is complete and any interplay is redundant. The term 'canon'

younger writers such as H. G. Wells are precursors to Rowe's book. The difference between Rowe and his precursors is that he gives the impression that his work is not a dialogue between the theory and the artist. It is a sort of exercise that applies not only to James but to 'X' and 'Z' without any difference. This is why the approach should be reversed: deduction into induction, exercise into saturation and The Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James into the 'the Jamesian dimensions of literary theory'. James, after all, is not a Bloomian ephebe. It is the other way round, as The Tragic Muse, and fin de siecle tales strategically demonstrate.

1- The Anxiety of Influence:

Three Manifestoes

Abrams, in A glossary of Literary Terms, defines this theory as:

a phrase used by the influential contemporary critic, Harold Bloom, to identify his radical revision of this standard theory that influence consists in a direct 'borrowing' or assimilation, of the materials and features found in earlier writers. Bloom's own view is that influence inescapably involved a distortion of the work of a predecessor, and he uses the concept of influence to deal with the reading as well as the writing of poetry.

This entry suggests that the theory is a Bloomian project, with no counter-voice, a representation that accounts for the absence of any conflictual or labyrinthine dimensions that usually characterize literary theories. In short, Abrams's 'anxiety of influence' is anxiety-free. But, Bloom, as his books suggest, is himself a latecomer in this field. His history of the anxiety of influence establishes that it is a twin of literature. He categorizes it into two epochs: the healthy pre-Enlightenment influence and the post-Enlightenment anxiety of influence. In the latter period anxiety becomes, as he puts it, 'a disease of self-consciousness'. No wonder, the earliest vision that dawns upon the artist is the sense of

period, the mid-sixties, deal with 'usurpation' as a main theme and all of them have a similar denouement: the triumph of the latecomer. Eventually, with William away, Henry achieves a metalepsis of roles and plays the 'first-born'. 'In a sense he [Henry] was wearing William's clothes and had stepped into Williams's shoes; in the family in which he had for so long felt himself in a subordinate role, he had now achieved supremacy' (LHJ, I, p. 209). More than that, since William named one of his sons, Henry James, Jr., James became undisputably Henry James, Sr.

This pattern of transumption structures James's career as well. The way he relates himself to the literary traditions available to him - American, French and English - and the trajectory of his lionization signify that his den, the so-called 'Lamb House', is nothing but an overcrowded graveyard. "The young man's heart," Malraux says, "is a graveyard in which one inscribed the names of a thousand dead". J.C. Rowe in his Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James, addresses this aspect of the writer's career. In part one of Chapter Two, Rowe concentrates on what he terms the 'American anxiety' as manifested in James's Hawthorne. Rowe's thesis is plausibly that James has not only translated Hawthorne's romance into realism, but that he has 'mythologized Hawthorne as the last American innocent, alienated by provinciality of young America, precisely to establish for himself a local and native American tradition that could be denationalized'.(4)

In part Two of the same Chapter, Rowe focuses on the 'Victorian anxiety', and the relationship between James and Trollope in particular. He argues that James has categorized Trollope as the last Victorian so that he can represent himself as the first modernist. More than that, James's criticism of Trollope's untheoretical fiction is attributable to his worries 'that his own "experimentalism" would be mistaken... for an elaboration of the Victorians' slices of contemporary social life'.(5) Then, without bringing the French into play, Rowe says that James finds the three traditions wanting, so he projects himself as the 'synthesis' of them all.

Rowe's approach is undoubtedly central and has already been in operation in one form or another. All the studies that address James's relationship with Hawthorne, the French (the impressionists, the naturalists, Balzac and others), the Victorian novelists, and even the

Between 'A Tragedy of Error' and The Tragic Muse, James manages to achieve a transformational metalepsis from a mere apprentice to a real Master. The course of his odyssey seems to me to be an exemplar of the trajectory of the anxiety of influence. When he embarked on his career, for instance, he was everybody's junior, but, in a short span of time, he became everybody's senior. In the beginning, the tall Flaubert, and the giant Turgenev, as Edel documents, towered over James, and dwarfed him. But before very long, James became gigantic and started to represent himself as such. For example, in his letter to Violet Paget, the one written in 1884, the year of 'The Art of Fiction', the reader can recognize the voice of the Master and the authority par excellence. The predecessor says to the ephebe, 'You are really too savage with your painters and poets and dilettanti ... Your hand has been violent. Morality is hot - but art is icy. Excuse my dogmatic and dictatorial tone'.⁽¹⁾ In the same year, he writes to Mrs. Ward saying, 'I am ... reputation of being censorious and cynical: let me ... by it'.⁽²⁾ This self-representation as being 'dogmatic', 'dictatorial', and 'censorious' signifies James's self-consciousness about being everybody's precursor now. In short, while it is true to say that he began as a plebeian at the 'Council of Gods', it is also undeniable that he turned deity in the end. This epic of transumption - the daemonization of the self and the humanization of the others- confirms that the anxiety of influence is embedded in his life, career and fiction as the following analeptic recapitulation demonstrates.

First of all, the coordinates of James's position in the family structure committed him to inferiority. The fact that he was named after his father bedevilled his identity. The suffix, Jr., attached, like an embarrassing birthmark, to his name actually pre-fixed him. The point is that it did not disappear until the father himself did. Parenthood and patricide are, as will be argued later on, the main devices of the paraphernalia of the anxiety of influence. In fact, not only was James the second Henry, but he was the second son as well. This, as Edel explains, generated a context of rivalry and anxiety between the two brothers, 'Jacob and Esau'. 'Jacob emerges from the womb clutching to the heel of his brother, as if determined to be as little behind as possible' (LHJ, I, P.201). The two inhibited each other's life to the extent that, like a see-saw, when one was up the second was definitely down. 'Quincy Street did not seem capable of housing comfortably two geniuses at the same time' (LHJ, I, P. 203). But 'Henry, the mocked and derided junior of old' overtook William when he unexpectedly got published. Edel observes that some tales of that