The Source and Nature of Evil in Robertson Davies' Deptford Trilogy

by

Ronald Ewing

a thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

December 16, 1981

under the supervision of Professor L. Dudek
of the Department of English

The Source and Nature of Evil in the Deptford Trilogy

Abstract

Robertson Davies is an admitted moralist, and in this light the thesis examines the conflict between good and evil in his work, especially as it is presented in the Deptford trilogy. As a preliminary, some earlier Canadian fiction and its treatment of this conflict are considered; then some aspects of Jung's philosophy and psychology are presented since these are pertinent to our study. In Fifth Business Ramsay and Staunton are revealed as Jungian Shadows of each other; their relationship reveals the ambiguity of evil. In The Manticore David Staunton undergoes Jungian analysis; the source of evil is mythically explored. World of Wonders provides an example of extreme evil (Willard) and archetypal characters (Eisengrim and Liesl), who act in harmony with the Great Justice; good and evil are portrayed as complementary elements rather than independent forces. Finally the thesis summarizes these findings on the nature and source of evil and relates them to the earlier Canadian writings.

Resumé

Robertson Davies admet être un moraliste, et sous cet aspect, la thèse examine le conflit qui existe entre le bien et le mal dans ses travaux, surtout comme on les trouve dans la trilogie de Deptford. Pour débuter nous avons d'abord étudié dans les anciens romans canadiens de quelle manière ils abordaient ce conflit. Ensuite, nous avons étudié certains aspects de la philosophie et de la psychologie de Jung, étant donné que ces aspects concernent directement notre étude. On se rend compte que Ramsay et Staunton nous apparaissent comme les ombres jungiennes l'un de l'autre dans Fifth Business: le rapport qu'existe entre eux nous montre l'ambiguité de la notion du mal. Dans The Manticore, David Staunton se soumet à l'analyse jungienne; et on voit qu'il explore la source du mal de façon mythique. Dans World of Wonders, on retrouve un exemple du mal mené à l'extrême (Willard), on y voit aussi deux archétypes (Eisengrim et Liesl) qui agissent en harmonie avec la "Grande Justice"; on y décrit le bien et le mal comme des éléments qui se complètent plutôt que des forces indépendantes. Enfin, dans cette thèse, on y résume cet apport inédit sur la nature et la source du mal et on y fait le lien avec les oeuvres canadiennes antérieures.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my thesis supervisor Professor L. Dudek for his critical guidance throughout this work. His help was above and beyond the call of duty.

Thanks are also due to my sister Greta for spending many long hours typing this work.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Historical Review

Canadian writing, fiction in particular, has been slow in confronting the topic of evil. Desmond Pacey writes: "With a few honourable exceptions, our novelists seem cursed with timidity... they restrict their gaze to the more pleasant and superficial aspects of life."[1] In the first half of the century, Canadian fiction recognized the presence of evil but always dealt with it in a restricted manner — sentimental, humorous, polarized, or compassionate. It will perhaps be useful to begin by briefly examining the treatment of evil in a representative work of fiction from each decade of this century. Each work tends to reflect the contemporary attitude toward the problem of evil. The purpose then would be to demonstrate that Canadian fiction became increasingly concerned with this topic as the century advanced. We would thus arrive at a working definition of evil in Canadian literature and so make clear that a full consideration of evil in Canadian fiction emerges with the publication of theDeptford trilogy.

Let us begin with a rather lengthy quote from one of Robertson Davies' lectures:

> It may be that you wonder why I have chosen to begin this discussion of Evil in Literature with an examination of the roots of melodrama....

> First, it [melodrama] shows Evil as a requirement — indeed, a necessity — for a plot that will hold our attention and provoke our concern. Without Evil there is no tension, and without tension there is no drama. One of the things that makes the usual descriptions of Heaven so repulsive is that it is shown as a place utterly wanting in tension. Similarly, Hell is unbearable to contemplate because it is imagined as a place of unrelenting and agonizing tension. Our conception of human life is of a varying degree of tension between opposites. In melodrama this tension of opposites is displayed in a manner that is simplified, but not therefore falsified. In its simplified form it is a reflection, not of the surface of life, but of its underlying structure, and thus it satisfies us as a form of art.[2]

This is clearly a view of evil simply as part of the machinery of art, here the machinery of melodrama. Though the first works considered in this review are not all melodramatic, they do possess "simplified" examples of evil. It is most helpful, when attempting to identify and separate good from evil, to remember that evil causes the tension.

L.M. Montgomery's Anne of Green Gables, published in 1908, seems an unlikely source from which to begin our search for evil. Anne enters an earthly paradise once she passes under "the White Way of Delight". The novel is a regional idyll, the form which dominated Canadian prose fiction in the first two decades of this century.[3] It accepts and promotes rural virtues and the Christian way of life. In this novel the religious outlook is Anglican and optimistic — there is very little temptation or tension in this community. At times, the fictional Prince Edward Island approaches Davies' description of a repulsive

Heaven. It would be quite boring if Anne did not occasionally introduce an element of conflict. The reader is therefore thankful for such incidents as Anne's angry outburst after Mrs. Rachel Lynde's rude comment about Anne's looks:

> How would you like to have such things said about you? How would you like to be told that you are fat and clumsy and probably hadn't a spark of imagination in you? I don't care if I do hurt your feelings by saying so! I hope I hurt them. You have hurt mine worse than they were ever hurt before even by Mrs. Thomas' intoxicated husband. And I'll never forgive you for it, never, never![4]

Such an outburst of temper toward an older person causes tension and is evil according to the standards of the setting. The narrative, to be sure, continues in a manner befitting a work which was first published in a Sunday School serial. Mrs. Lynde is properly horrified, Anne apologizes, and Mrs. Lynde, like every other character in the novel, comes under Anne's spell.

Anne brings life to this community. It is as if they had all been dead from an excess of goodness before her arrival. The outspoken Mrs. Lynde thinks of Matthew in just such a way: "That man is waking up after being asleep for over sixty years."[5] Needless to say, Anne is not morally evil. Her innocence and exuberance allow her to overcome problems; however, these two virtues contain some naivety, which propels her into confrontation with the accepted values, the good, of her adopted society. Her passions and questions introduce tension and an innocent

form of evil into the highly structured, ascetic, and religious society of Avonlea. Montgomery seems to recognize that some spice of naughtiness is needed to prevent atrophy within an individual or a society. This, in turn, might help explain why Anne of Green Gables is still admired and read today while most other regional idylls are forgotten.

Anne naturally develops both her feelings and her intellect, the good and evil within her — a goal which Dunstan Ramsay of Fifth Business must first learn of and then struggle to attain. However, Anne of Green Gables does not recognize the problem of serious or satanic evil. It is a work of sentimental realism; there is local colour and close observation of regional types, but it is tempered by general sympathy and edifying comment.[6] Anne brings life, in the form of tension, to Green Gables. Anne does not intend to cause evil; however, her exuberance contains an element of innocent trouble.

Stephen Leacock's Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town, written in 1912, is a series of episodic sketches with a dominant setting and recurring characters. It is not a regional idyll, for nature has not been conquered as in Prince Edward Island; this little town is surrounded by bush and water, which is sometimes threatening, as in the sinking of the Mariposa Belle. The tone of the work distances it even further from the aforementioned genre, for critics disagree whether Leacock wrote a mild or a harsh satire.[7] This conflict occurs because the author is personally sympathetic to his characters, but he

is also willing to reveal their weaknesses. He writes in the same manner as a relative who will defend the family from an outsider's attack but will not hesitate to voice complaints within the secrecy of the family.

Leacock treats evil with a humorous detachment. He reveals a character's shoddy attributes without rancour. Leacock accepts the precepts of Christianity as admirable, but he doubts the abilities of its practitioners to survive in the physical world. Thus, the impractical Reverend Drone is not able to guide his flock or handle the financing of his church.

The character most relevant to our purpose is the wordly-wise, cynical, and larger-than-life hotelier, Josh Smith. At the very beginning, Smith is in conflict with the law. The Mariposa Court has fined Smith a second time for selling liquor after hours; he is in danger of losing his license:

> Mr. Smith could never bring his mind to it [closing of the bar] — not as a matter of profit, but as a point of honour. It was too much for him to feel that Judge Pepperleigh might be out on the sidewalk thirsty at midnight, that the night hands of the Times-Herald on Wednedday night be compelled to go home dry. On this point Mr. Smith's moral code was simplicity itself — do what is right and take the consequences. So the bar stayed open.[8]

Leacock's sketches include a number of other such neutrally presented rationalizations by Josh Smith, including the abandonment of the caff and the Rats Cooler, the burning of the church for the insurance money, and the lying trickery to win

the election. Josh Smith is a study of the lovable hypocrite; he pretends to be working for the good of the town but is actually interested in his own advancement. Early in the story he donates ten dollars to provide free rides for children at a carnival. The parents crowd his hotel in appreciation: "They sold forty dollars' worth of lager alone that night, and Mr. Smith learned, if he had not already suspected it, the blessedness of giving."[9]

Smith is more than just a small-town hotelier. His girth and strength are constantly mentioned; he is larger than life. He becomes the leader of this little town. He represents the village hypocrisy that often dominates a little town: Smith, a publican, is willing to campaign for prohibition if that will help him win the election. The presence of evil in this sunny town is carefully camouflaged through humour. However, such evil becomes apparent during the election, as every voter scurries about trying to make sure that he supports the winning side. Everybody hopes for personal favours; nobody seems concerned with civic responsibility. Since Leacock's characters were based upon actual citizens of Orillia, these revelations did not make him a popular man. The townspeople did not find his sketches very sunny and were quite angry with the author. Davies surmises that their reaction combined with Leacock's desire to be liked meant that his artistry suffered, and "[h]e never struck so truly again."[10]

Leacock brought Canadian fiction to a new level of realism.

His humour made the fact that good did not automatically triumph over evil quite clear. The goodness which dominated regional idylls was revealed as a sham, a false element belonging to an artificial genre. Leacock wrote of the compromises with morality that occur in everyday life; however, his tone of amused detachment and feigned approval of wrongdoing act as limits in a possible consideration of evil. Since it is a humorous book, none of his characters suffers from wrongdoing. We shall see that Davies' Deptford is a little town where hypocrisy does not continue to reap such sunny effects.

Martha Ostenso's Wild Geese, published in 1925, presents a polarized portrayal of good and evil in the melodramatic mould. Caleb Gare is a thoroughly evil character; however, he maintains that his actions are Christian and justifies them through the Bible. His hypocrisy is not benign like Josh Smith's: Caleb does not knowingly defraud an insurance company many miles away but righteously and ruthlessly blackmails his neighbour and his own wife. He is a Calvinist giant; he is wrathful, unforgiving, demanding, and seemingly omnipotent. Since he believes that his actions are morally correct, Ostenso forces us to examine the surfaces of good and evil. Should children always obey their parents? Should illegitimacy carry a social stigma? Should industriousness have its limits?

The reader is introduced to the family through the eyes of the new teacher, Lind Archer, who acts as a superior moral judge within the novel. In the very first chapter the family is

waiting fearfully for Caleb. Judith explains that Caleb will try to bully the teacher. He does this by ignoring her presence and talking to Skuli. He then orders Ellen to play the piano and brags to Skuli that his girls have everything. Judith thrusts out her feet to show her damaged shoes, but Amelia restrains her. Later when Judith prepares to go to bed before the others, Caleb tells Amelia in his softest voice that Judith had better improve her manners. The chapter ends with this observation: "Lind felt then that, like the other members of the household, she would come to hate and fear Caleb Gare."[11]

The third chapter provides a different point of view — Caleb's. His control over his wife is revealed. She has borne an illegitimate son whose parentage she now wants to keep secret. Her lover died in an accident before marriage could take place. Though Caleb married her, he was never able to possess her soul, as though it had died with her lover. Caleb's control over her is one of the mind only, and his failure to possess her love makes him a bitter man. In order to maintain the secret of her eldest son's birth, Amelia has kept Caleb's children subservient to him.

The third chapter seems to suggest that Caleb compensates for his failure by being acquisitive. Since he cannot possess Amelia's love, he will gather as many possessions as possible. He thinks of the muskeg in this way:

> To get rid of the useless land and buy in its place the neck of timber held by Fusi Aronson:

> that was an honest ambition and something to be achieved....Something might come up that could be used to good advantage. Somehow he would use brother against brother.[12]

He thinks of the loss of his children in this way:

> Amelia's word would start the children, then it would be all over — the results of his labour would be swept from these fields like chaff from a barn floor. He was too old to carry on alone. Hired help was worse than none — lazy, treacherous, rapacious. As long as he kept track of the outcome of that little folly of hers.[13]

In his introduction to the novel, Carlyle King maintains that loneliness drives Caleb: "...he has worked in a very insanity of power lust — to own land, to make money, to dominate his family and his neighbours — in order to deaden his pain and to avenge himself on life that has done him an eternal wrong."[14] But surely loneliness does not justify blackmailing Fusi in order to own more and better land. A dislike or even hatred of Amelia's son, Mark Jordan, does not explain Caleb's enslavement of his own children. There is a greater power here than just loneliness. Amelia's lack of love is not an "eternal wrong" even though Caleb considers it so, for he knew of her "moral defection" before they married.[15] His course of action ensures that her lack of love for him will never be remedied. At some point Caleb chose to punish instead of to forgive. He chose evil over good.

Caleb is often associated with evil or the devil.[16] The climax of the story confirms this belief. Caleb orders Amelia

to inform Mark Jordan of the details of his birth. She refuses to follow this final order. Caleb loses his usual, sly composure. His voice rises to a thin, high pitch as he beats Amelia with a cattle whip. He realizes that she has defeated him in the very crisis of her life:

> Something crumbled within him, like an old wall leaving bare his spirit. His sanity came back to him, the cold clear sanity that had been gone from him during the years of his hatred.... Shame and self-loathing broke upon him overpoweringly.[17]

At this point he notices the fire accidentally begun by Fusi Aronson. Caleb's timber is being burnt and his flax threatened. It is symbolically appropriate that Caleb die not by fire in his flax field but by water and sod in the muskeg which he had forced upon Fusi.

Davies maintains that "...melodrama offers its audiences one of the sweetest rewards that art has to give, and that is Poetic Justice."[18] Caleb's death is such an occurrence, for his obsessive greed brings about his own death. Amelia is now the only person who knows the secret of Mark Jordan's birth. The two courting couples are liberated from Caleb's presence and are joined to the natural cycle, symbolically represented by the southward migration of the wild geese. The novel's optimistic ending is about the only element that remains of the regional idyll. Other prairie novels of this decade, such as Grain and Settlers in the Marsh, similarly reject the hypothesis that a community is naturally dominated by good forces. Instead,

a fierce battle is being waged between two opposing forces. Melodrama allows good to win in the end, even though evil had the upper hand throughout the story.

The introduction of an urban setting and the omission of a happy ending are the obvious next steps in the complete rejection of the regional idyll. The ideas of Freud, Nietzsche, Marx, and others who influenced modern literature finally found their way to Canada in the thirties. These thinkers' suppositions contributed to the development of a realistic viewpoint which is essentially pessimistic. The Christian belief that good will ultimately triumph began to be rejected and was even sometimes ridiculed. Authors now had to provide characters with new values or new reasons for maintaining the old values.

Morley Callaghan's works explore the seamier side of life; they are written in the tough, realistic mode of fiction. Such Is My Beloved, published in 1934, has the Depression and an urban centre as its setting. There is no clear division between good and evil in Callaghan's works. The characters' weaknesses tend to be blamed on society; yet, society is composed of individuals, so the explanation is circular. Callaghan suggests that compassion is necessary for survival because everybody is a possible victim. At the same time, the dark side of some characters is explained away as the product of circumstances.

The unlikely victim in this novel is a young priest who is trying to improve the lives of two prostitutes. Father Dowling's

naive attempts to do good are quixotic in a hypocritical world. His idea of good is at odds with his superior's. By trying to help the prostitutes, Dowling places the church in a possibly embarrassing situation. So, the Bishop arranges for the arrest and removal of the prostitutes from the city. It is clear that Callaghan's sympathy lies with Dowling and the prostitutes, not with the Bishop. The prostitutes are never portrayed as evil; they are just working girls struggling to survive. Their lives are drab, boring, and shoddy. Dowling feels compassion for them and favourably compares their situation to faithful wives who married for material gain.

Free will is the most important factor in Dowling's view of morality: "I think many people are decidedly evil. It is sometimes necessary to pretend that they are nice. To make it more deplorable many are often evil of their own volition."[19] Within this definition, a role reversal occurs. The prostitutes are not deplorably evil, for the novel implies that they have no choice in their occupation due to their economic plight. On the other hand, the Bishop and the lawyer, Robinson, have the opportunity to choose good or evil. They could forgive and help the prostitutes, as Christ did with Mary Magdalene and as Father Dowling is presently doing; or they can condemn them to further misery. They choose the latter, for they are more concerned with the external good than with the essential mission of their church. Within Dowling's terms, their hypocrisy is

decidedly evil because they have willingly chosen to harm these two women in order to ensure the good name of the church. It is interesting to note that Callaghan's judgement is never absolute: the Bishop and Robinson mistakenly believe that they also have no choice in their actions and that they must protect the reputation of their church.

A separate comment on evil occurs near the end of the novel. Dowling is struggling to continue his duties, and he is visiting a poor Italian family who have just been blessed with a twelfth child. Dowling congratulates the despondent father. He replies: "God is not good to do such a thing." Dowling mildly reprimands the immigrant, but he continues: "I believe in God, but he is not good... I do despair, Father. We must despair. What else is there for us to do? Look at my wife. Look at me. You understand, Father? There is nothing left but despair..."[20] Dowling has no answer to the Italian's anger. He can only offer sympathy. He cannot explain why some people are destined to live miserable lives. If God is responsible for their situation, is He, as the immigrant suggests, not good? Dowling's inability to answer this question and to resolve the problem of good and evil causes him to suffer a depression and to have an eventual breakdown. He is brought to a hospital where he studies the "Song of Songs" in his lucid hours. His love for all things is still great, but he cannot function successfully in contemporary society.

In an otherwise laudatory critique, Pacey writes:

> The defect of that type of Christianity [humanitarian], and of much of Callaghan's work, is that it often loses sight of the reality of evil. One feels the lack, in Callaghan's novels and stories, of any definite standards by which his characters are to be judged.[21]

Such Is My Beloved maintains that each person's actions are limited, even ordered, by his social position. It follows that circumstances, not acts, determine morality; this helps to clarify Pacey's complaint. Callaghan describes a society which has lost its previous certitude concerning moral matters. In his novels he reflects this confusion by neither explicitly condemning nor condoning his characters' actions. He writes compassionately but does not provide any affirmative options for his characters. Callaghan's outlook, which is decidedly deterministic, makes the choice between good and evil merely hypothetical. His rough characters, the two prostitutes, are sympathetically protrayed because they do not choose evil of their own volition. Callaghan, like Dowling, does not answer the conundrum: why is society evil if even the so-called "bad people" are good? Instead, he accepts this situation as unalterable and offers compassion as the alternative to despair. Callaghan provides us with an interesting, sympathetic, but incomplete look at evil.

Davies, as we shall see, explores those forces which make Callaghan's world deterministic. He reaches a different con-

clusion, that these forces can be controlled once they are understood; therefore, his outlook is not fatalistic and man is responsible for the evil he commits.

Hugh MacLennan also regards compassion as the virtue essential to counter the evil in society. His characters belong to a more respectable and traditional society than Callaghan's, but their hypocrisy and lack of feeling for others are similar. Two Solitudes, published in 1945, examines how a lack of compassion contributes to the destruction of a man.

The novel examines the tensions and lack of understanding that exist between Canada's two founding races. It is a distinctly Canadian novel, examining the sort of racial intolerance which was to cause the greatest amount of misunderstanding in the world of the forties. And it is a problem with which present-day society is still struggling.

MacLennan uses an historical approach to introduce the separate communities. Both the French and the English have an overweening pride in themselves. Athanase Tallard, descendant of seigneurs, is Pride's sacrificial victim. He wants to bring progress (industrialization and English people) to the rural town of St.Marc. He hopes to guarantee the future financial security of his family and act as a bridge between the two communities.

Tallard's tragedy is caused by his personal pride and by the failure of each culture to respond to the other. He underestimates local opposition, and he puts too much trust in his

English friends. Because his grandfather once horse-whipped the parish priest, he believes himself immune to Father Beaubien's wrath. Tallard acts as if he were a latter-day seigneur. Father Beaubien, motivated by his narrow outlook, xenophobia, and lack of charity, manages to isolate Tallard from the townspeople. Tallard's revenge is so misconceived that he makes himself a liability to his business partner McQueen. His hypocrisy and selfishness, in turn, permit him to abandon Tallard with complete ruthlessness. Though Tallard is ruined financially, he finds peace in a death-bed reconciliation with his church. Social forces are working on each individual so that guilt is difficult to establish. Tallard is partially responsible for his own fate, but Father Beaubien, McQueen, some secondary characters, and the racial intolerance of contemporary society also contribute to it.

MacLennan implies that evil is within individuals and within society. Some, like Yardley, make inroads against society's evil conventions, while others, like his own daughter, turn informer and contribute to them. The latter part of the novel deals with an attempt to overcome historical prejuduce. Heather and Paul belong to the second generation; he is the son of a mixed French-English marriage and she rejects the bias of her Westmount parents. They make a conscious and intelligent effort to deal with their past; however, their victory over their personal demons is dwarfed by the actions of the majority of their generation, who uncritically continue

their racial traditions. European developments, moreover, threaten to obliterate any small gain in human dignity that may occur in the New World. Hitler's racism is allegorically referred to in the character of Marius, where racial pride is subverted into hatred. MacLennan examines the inner life of his positive characters, but he does not do so with his negative ones. The latter are seen as driven by outside forces; they are all capable of justifying their acts, unaware that self-ishness is their real motivation.

MacLennan's characters seem to portray the Socratic dictum that knowledge is virtue and ignorance is vice. The characters with self-knowledge in Two Solitudes (Yardley, Heather, and Paul) are able to overcome the defects of their society, and they avoid ill-doing. Such a philosophy of self-knowledge will be much more thoroughly explored in the Deptford trilogy.

Perhaps the ultimate effects of racial persecution are best explored in A.M. Klein's The Second Scroll, published in 1951. It is the fictional, personal memoir of a Jew in Canada; it shows him coming to terms with the contemporary horrors of pogroms and fascism, and finally accepting evil as part of God's creation. The narrator chronicles the Jews' plight through his Uncle Melech. Though the narrator never meets Uncle Melech, he embodies Jewish experience. At the beginning of the story, set in Montreal, the narrator's uncle is revered as a distant wonder because he is a promising and gifted Talmudic scholar in Ratno, Russia. After witnessing a pogrom, Uncle Melech abandons

his religious beliefs; he cannot understand how an all-powerful God can allow the existence of such injustices. Melech quotes Jeremiah in a letter: "Wherefore doth the ways of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?"[22] In "Gloss Beth", Klein echoes this question and demands vengeance for the holocaust:

> As Thou didst do to Sodom, do to them!
> But not, O Lord, in one destruction. Slow,
> Fever by fever, limb by withering limb,
> Destroy! Send through the marrow of their bones,
> The pale treponeme burrowing. Let there grow
> Over their eyes a film that they may see
> Always a carbon sky! Feed them on ash!
> Condemn them double deuteronomy![23]

Searching for answers, Melech accepts and embraces the doctrine of communism; he is forced to abandon his hopes for human perfection when the U.S.S.R. betrays the Polish Jews. Melech somehow survives, considers and rejects Christianity, chooses exile with the miserable Jews of Casablanca, finally reaches the Promised Land, and dies a martyr's death.

While tracing his Uncle Melech's progress, the narrator comes to an understanding much like his uncle's. He now believes that he lives in Messiah's days and that the pain and agony of the Holocaust were essential to bring about the creation of the state of Israel.[24] In other words, evil is needed to create good; the narrator accepts the fact that evil is necessary to complete God's will. Klein has an answer to Callaghan's question concerning the presence of evil in the world. It is there

because it serves God's purpose; human eyes cannot see the total picture, so man cannot comprehend the necessity of evil. This return to a belief in God and acceptance of His ways is strongly emphasized at the end of the novel: "I intoned the kaddish for my uncle who had no son, uttering with pride this wonderful mourner's Magnificat which does not mention death; with pride, for it was flesh of my flesh that was here being exalted."[25] The narrator no longer laments but praises God's ways; he returns to the beliefs of his ancestors.

The Second Scroll is not so much concerned with the doing of evil as with the effects of evil. The motives of those who commit evil are not examined; why God allows them to prosper is questioned. Klein is concerned with the universal situation, not with a personal one. The narrator's encounter with an Italian gunman, who for some unknown reason steals Uncle Melech's letter about the Sistine Chapel, is ambiguous and inconclusive. Perhaps Klein wishes to emphasize the transience and meaninglessness of individual life. Had the narrator resisted, he could have been murdered because of a mistake or a misunderstanding. This section is never further explained; it is a simple but frightening encounter with the absurdity of life. The narrator comes to terms with his faith and the history of his race. He recognizes the emptiness of individual life, but he also sees beyond it and finds meaning in the totality and divinity of human life.

This review began with a novel which is representative of

the regional idyll and which fulfills the intention of this genre: "Avowedly didactic, they [regional idylls] aimed to inculcate love of their chosen region, pride in its past, and a respect for the Victorian ideals in religion and morality."[26] Leacock was the first to react to this literary strait-jacket; he ironically uncovered the hypocrisy and materialism of his age. When the characters of Mariposa are judged according to this accepted standard in Canadian fiction, they are revealed to be much more devious than the ideal allows. The later novelists, Ostenso, Callaghan, MacLennan, and Klein, continued this tradition; however, they did not disguise their condemnation in humour. These authors described human defects which cause harm to others, and they also provided alternate modes of living which might improve man's lot. Thus, the authors are all moralists; they create fictional characters and make some judgment upon their behaviour.

Chapter Two

Some Definitions and Concepts

It is apparent from this review of past novels that judgment on the morality of any act in the universe tends to be man-centered, and this is especially true of the first immediate reaction (an epidemic is considered evil, for it is harmful to man even though it may benefit other organisms). Anything harmful to humans is considered evil; however, as we have seen, disagreement occurs even over this simple statement. One man's good can clash with society's needs and vice versa: Caleb is righteous in his actions, so are McQueen, Father Beaubien, the Bishop, and the lawyer Robinson, yet they are all condemned by the reader. Some acts, such as murder, are universally censured, yet human law permits murder under certain circumstances (self-defence) and even orders it in others (capital punishment and war). The ambiguity concerning evil has grown with the decline of Christianity and with the corresponding rejection by society of its strict moral code. This confusion concerning the recognition of evil is the first problem that must be confronted.

There are two historical and orthodox categories of evil. There is physical evil which merely exists as a given fact: suffering, disease, accidents, death, etc.; and there is moral evil as human transgression: man chooses to commit an act harm-

ful to another human.[27]

The former category has as its basic question: Si deus bonus, unde malum? It is the subject of a distinct philosophy, theodicy, a word introduced by Leibniz in his work defending God from charges of being responsible for evil in the world.[28] Klein echoes Leibniz's main belief: man is incapable of seeing God's entire plan. This hypothesis makes man incapable of judging God's ways, for evil may exist in God's scheme in order to produce good. Davies is not primarily interested in this aspect of evil, perhaps because it lies beyond man's comprehension. His position, however, would seem to be quite similar to Klein's. There is no answer to the problem; one must simply accept an order whose cosmic repercussions individual man cannot understand:

> It is a tough world, and it only seems irrational or unreal to those who have not grasped some hints of its remorseless, irreversible, and often cruel logic. It is a world in which God is not mocked, and in which a man reaps — only too obviously — what he has sown. I do not think I understand it all, but I think I am acquainted with a few corners of it.[29]

The problem of wilfully committed evil concerns most novelists, Davies in particular. Theologians argue that God allows man to act against God's will and to commit evil because in His wisdom He has endowed man with free will, and He has thereby raised him in moral stature. The possibility of evil is then necessary in order that free will should exist, but this does

not explain why man chooses to commit evil. Another theory concerning the problem of evil maintains that there is a dualism in this creation. Evil is an independent and opposite principle in itself, not merely a privation of good as St.Augustine argues.[30]

Though some Canadian novelists had considered the nature of evil, none had thoroughly considered its source. Montgomery recognizes that a society which lacks spontaneity and choice is a dead one; accordingly, she introduces into her setting a sometimes mischievous Anne, who questions, challenges, and improves it. Leacock reveals through humour that small-town Canada is not as good or as pious as Anne of Green Gables would have us believe. Ostenso paints a portrait of a character consumed by evil without providing credible reasons for his behaviour. Callaghan does deal with the complex problem of evil in relation to free will, but to him the problem of good and evil is a dilemma. MacLennan, like Callaghan, sees compassion as necessary to endure the evil in the world. Finally, Klein accepts a traditional vindication of divine providence in view of the existence of evil. Davies is more complex and subtle in his treatment of the problem than any of his predecessors. He permits himself a variety of viewpoints on the same actions, and he treats the nature of evil in a number of complex ways: in Fifth Business, his approach is biographical and factual; in The Manticore, it is psychological and mythical; and in World

of Wonders, it is romantic and archetypal.

Davies is concerned with the source of evil and sees it as part of a dualism within a Jungian framework. It is obvious that Davies is steeped in the study of Jung; there is reference to Jung in Davies' plays, essays, and novels. In order to understand more fully Davies' ideas, we must be familiar with some of Jung's philosophical beliefs.

Jung's most comprehensive study concerning the source of evil occurs in Answer to Job, reprinted in The Portable Jung. He rejects Augustine's view of evil as a privatio boni, and he even reverses the monotheistic contention that God is all-good. He argues, "that whatever we call "good" is balanced by an equally substantial "bad" or "evil"." The concept of a God who controls both good and evil, "is clearly monotheistic, as it unites the opposites in one God."[31] Obviously this is not the perfect, logical, and rational God of Christian theology, but an antinomy — a totality of inner opposites.

Davies maintains, like Jung, that Job's ordeal was a turning point in both God's and man's evolution. Man no longer expected God to treat him indiscriminately, as was Zeus's habit. Man now expected fair and just treatment from God.[32]

Jung continues his brilliant if unorthodox insight concerning God by maintaining that God had not been conscious of Himself and that man had shown "himself superior to his divine partner both intellectually and morally."[33] For Jung, this is clearly demonstrated by God's treatment of Job: punishing his most loyal

servant to prove a point which God could have verified had He consulted His own omniscience. "God is practicing might over right; Job expects better behaviour than this from God. Jung argues that God's lack of consciousness does not permit Him to realize that Satan, His evil son, is the cause of Job's trials. This lack of self-knowledge helps explain God's mysterious diatribe contrasting His own omnipotence with man's lot even though Job has proven his loyalty; Job, of all people, needs no reminding of God's powers.

For Jung, the Book of Job is clear evidence of God's dual nature. Because God is omniscient, it follows that, "if Job gains knowledge of God, then God must also learn to know himself."[34] God became man because Job stands morally higher than his creator:

> [H]e [Yahweh] raises himself above his earlier primitive level of consciousness by indirectly acknowledging that the man Job is morally superior to him and that therefore he has to catch up and become human himself. Had he not taken this decision he would have found himself in flagrant opposition to his omniscience. Yahweh must become man precisely because he has done man a wrong. He, the guardian of justice, knows that every wrong must be expiated, and Wisdom knows that moral law is above even him. Because his creature has surpassed him he must regenerate himself.[35]

Thus, Jung sees God's dual nature as dynamic and as the source of both good and evil.

Davies seems to have adopted some of these unorthodox beliefs. In his study of evil in literature, Davies states

that he will not attempt to define God;[36] however, he maintains that God does have a Devil, and that this belief probably separates him from orthodox Christianity.[37] He believes in the wholeness rather than the perfection of God. He also refers approvingly to Bernard Shaw's theory of an evolving diety: "A God who is bound to us, and whose redemption we assist and share in, is a Shavian concept which seems not to be repugnant to the declared Catholic Graham Greene."[38] It follows that since man is created in the image of God, man also has this dual nature. Like God, man also must struggle to choose good in order to evolve to a higher consciousness, and in so doing help God evolve. The Devil encourages man to choose evil in order to have man regress to a lower order. Davies admits that this concept of wholeness is fraught with danger: "But because we recognize evil, and confront it as wisely as we may, we do not necessarily succumb to it."[39]

Davies is even more explicit in the use of Jung's psychology and its terms in his fiction, particularly in The Manticore. Here, the conscientious reader of Davies' fiction must be familiar with still another aspect of Jung's work. For our study the most important term from Jung's psychology is the Shadow. It is defined in The Manticore as "that side of oneself to which so many real but rarely admitted parts of one's personality must be assigned."[40] The existence of the personal Shadow is allied with the theory of the totality of human personality. The Shadow is an unconscious part of the personality which complements the ego (the conscious personality) to form a relative totality.[41]

When the individual agrees with the moral precepts of his culture, the personalShadow will be allied with what this same culture considers evil. There are instances when the individual lives such a negative life that the better side of the personality resides in his Shadow; under such circumstances, we can refer to a "positive" Shadow.

Another aspect of the Shadow is its tendency to projection, which usually occurs between persons of the same sex. A person is often particularly annoyed by those traits of another which the former actually possesses in his own Shadow. Jungians argue that the personal Shadow must be recognized in order to complete the personality:

> Time and again one can observe that something in man tends to compensate the conscious attitude through the recognition of sides that have been previously neglected — of weaknesses and imperfections. When this tendency is not accepted by consciousness, the shadow will generally appear anyway, but then in an unconscious and pernicious form.[42]

This same writer maintains that most individuals possessed by collective evil are observed to have a relatively weak ego-personality or a Shadow which is not sufficiently recognized. The relationship of the personal Shadow with the collective Shadow or Archetypal Evil is a matter of great importance and some debate. (An archetype is defined as a structural element of the psyche which has universal meaning.)

The experience of evil is most important because this is

often the first stage in the individuation process — the aim of one's life according to Jung's psychology. He defines it simply as "becoming one's own self" or "self-realization".[43] "The aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand, and of the suggestive power of primordial images on the other."[44] The Persona is the mask or role which the Self assumes to face the world. Recognition of the Shadow is the first step needed to realize that the Persona is not the whole Self, for it consists of opposites forming a totality. The other major archetype or "primordial image" is the anima or animus, depending on the sex of the subject. The anima is the female personification of a man's unconsciousness, the woman within; the animus is the masculine personification of a woman's unconsciousness, the man within. Each sex is compensated by an element of its opposite sex. These images may also be projected, this time onto members of the opposite sex. This can hinder the process of individuation because one fails to recognize the difference between the actual person and one's conception of this person.

Joseph Campbell explains Jung's belief that four functions of consciousness separate psychological types: thinking and feeling, sensation and intuition. People will arrive at judgments through the first pair, and they will experience the world and their friends through the second pair: "[O]nly one of these four functions takes the lead in the governance of a person's life, and it is seconded, normally, by only one (not both) from

the other duad..."[45] The undeveloped or even repressed functions reside in the unconscious. When activated, they may cause uncharacteristic moods or abnormal actions. Individuation includes an awareness of these types, recognition of one's own type, and development of the other functions. The personal Shadow is dominated by the function that is opposite to the ego's. Individuation allows one to come to know one's other side. Campbell maintains that this allows one, "both to enjoy and to control the whole range of one's capacities; i.e., in the full sense, to 'know oneself.'"[46]

Jung's psychology is therapeutic; his philosophy, to a large extent based upon his medical work, attempts to be universal. Jung and his disciples can only theorize about the thoroughly evil person who refuses to divulge his dreams, who will not undergo analysis, and who has no interest in either perfection or totality. Empirical research has never had a Hitler or a Napoleon as a subject. It is essential to remember that the possibility of a personal Shadow becoming one with evil incarnate is only a theory, and that many psychologists and other scholars disagree with the findings which have been briefly outlined in the preceding pages. However, these academic battles are of no immediate concern to us. Our interest lies not in Jung's general acceptance but in how Davies makes use of this psychology in his fiction. Jung's psychology is summarized herein to prevent a piecemeal introduction of this same material which would otherwise occur in our study of the Deptford trilogy.

The Larkin-Stuart Lectures which Davies gave in 1976 at Trinity College, Toronto, reveal that he has given much time to the contemplation of the problem of evil. He informs us that, over the course of the years, he has discovered he is a moralist. He comments on the role of a moralist:

> Of course he will be driven now and then to come to a few conclusions, but he will be cautious about giving them a too general application. He will observe that quite often people reap what they have sown. If he is honest he will admit that it is sometimes very difficult to know what they have sown, or to be certain about what the harvest is.
>
> That is the principal theme of my trilogy. I began it because for many years I had been troubled by a question: to what extent is a man responsible for the outcome of his actions, and how early in life does the responsibility begin? I concluded, not without long debate, that it began with life itself, and that a child was as responsible as anyone else if it chose a course of action knowingly. In Fifth Business, in the first few lines, a boy makes a choice: he wants to hurt his companion, so he throws a snowball at him, and in the snowball is a stone. The snowball hits somebody else — a woman who is brought to bed prematurely of a child whose struggle for life is long and heroic. The consequences of the snowball with the stone in it continue for sixty years, and do much to shape the lives of three men, and in a lesser way to influence the lives of many people whom they encounter.[47]

This central incident describing an unqualified act of evil provides the basis for the study of evil in the Deptford trilogy.

Chapter Three

Shadows

Fifth Business is the first and most important of the novels. The two latter novels tend to act as glosses upon the first. They do offer new material and some valuable insights; however, they mainly serve to confirm and enlarge upon the ideas first introduced in the original novel. The most important concept for our study is the Shadow, and Davies provides two characters in each novel who act as complementary Shadows of one another. The most complete is in Fifth Business, the most didactic is in The Manticore, and the most amazing is in World of Wonders.

The use of this motif is most successful in Fifth Business because the idea is least obvious there, even though the relationship between Ramsay and Staunton is the most fully developed of the trilogy. The Manticore, where David and Matey are complimentary figures, often gives the impression of a narrative conforming to a psychological pattern rather than a narrative from which a psychological pattern emerges. This is particularly true in such an instance as the end of the "anamnesis" when David realizes why he always disliked Matey (his unrecognized mate?): "I have always projected the Shadow onto Matey; I have seen in him the worst of myself" (M, p. 266). In World of Wonders Eisengrim's and Sir John's remarkable physical like-

ness and their complete social disparity provide a striking but superficial treatment of the theme. In Fifth Business Davies does not broadcast the possibility that Ramsay and Staunton act as complementary Shadows. The reader's discovery of this facet of the novel, rather than the author's explanation of it in The Manticore or demonstration of it in World of Wonders, makes the idea much more credible and realistic. The contrast between these two men, Ramsay and Staunton, provides the most complete study of evil in the Deptford trilogy.

Fifth Business purports to be the autobiography of Dunstan Ramsay. Technically this serves to strengthen the realistic effects of the novel. Ramsay is writing a report to the Headmaster of the private school where he taught for forty-five years. He has been upset by an article portraying him as "a typical old schoolmaster doddering into retirement with tears in his eyes and a drop hanging from his nose."[48] Ramsay wants to set the record straight. He maintains that, as a teacher of history, he has a notion of what true recollection is. He will therefore attempt to avoid some of the pitfalls of autobiography: "Can I write truly of my boyhood? Or will that disgusting self-love which so often attaches itself to a man's idea of his youth creep in and falsify the story? I can but try" (F, pp. 9-10). Ramsay immediately recognizes the conflict between romance and realism in autobiography. He claims that he will present the facts; yet he admits that he intends to disprove the contention that he lived an ordinary and boring

life. By insisting that the fantastic is true and by providing factual details around the wondrous events which occur, the author is able to present his romance as a realistic novel.

There is a further element of the autobiographical style which adds to the realism of the novel: Ramsay, as a fictional character, resembles Davies the author. They both have the same initials, though reversed. They were both raised as Presbyterians, rejected its harshness, but remained most interested in religion. They both had fathers in the newspaper business; they are both polymaths, writers, and educators. These similarities actually create a sense of realism because the reader feels that the opinions, the feelings, and the actions in the novel have the ambiguity of fiction in relation to an underlying autobiographical truth.

Fifth Business treats evil in what appears to be a factual, biographical, and historical manner. The novel, however, is not realistic in the modern sense. Davies writes that Hardy might be mistaken for a realist:

> [H]is descriptions of nature, of farm life and of daily happenings are seemingly as minute as a realist could desire.... But the realist, splendid as he is, commits himself to what a reader may be persuaded to decide for himself, whereas the romantic or tragic novelist is determined to tell the reader what to think.[49]

Since Davies uses the first person point of view, he is not allowed the omniscient tone that Hardy indulges in. Davies is more subtle, but as we have read in a previous quote, he admits

to being a moralist. He may not be as dogmatic as Hardy, but as we will see, Davies also tells the reader what to think and thus qualifies as a romantic.

The first chapter of the novel provides precise information concerning the "theme of the single action that bore results for sixty years."[50] The throwing of the stone and striking of Mrs. Dempster produce radically different effects on the two boys. Ramsay feels guilt and responsibility for the act, even though he only dodged the snowball and used the Dempsters as a shield. Staunton refuses to acknowledge that he hit Mrs. Dempster with the snowball. He even threatens to harm Dunny should the truth of the matter be revealed. Staunton submerges and represses his guilt. Near the end of his life he is able to maintain with probable honesty that he does not remember the action at all. From this important incident, the two boys develop in opposite directions: one toward self-knowledge and light, the other toward self-deceit and shadows.

One aspect of these differences is the symbolic representation of the dualism between good and evil. This is not to suggest that Ramsay and Staunton are cardboard characters, representing good and evil. In their youth they are full, well-rounded, and complex characters. One matures as he comes to recognize his shortcomings; the other, however, remains stunted because he refuses to acknowledge any spiritual reality. It can be shown that their contrasted lives act as Shadows of one another. In this we can see how ambiguous evil is, for

one man's personal good can be another man's ill.

As previously noted, the idea of responsibility and accompanying guilt separates the two boys. This difference probably goes back to their respective families. Mrs. Ramsay takes an immediate and maternal interest in Paul Dempster's attempt to survive, and she helps Dr. McCausland as much as possible. The novel never mentions that Doc Staunton, the only other doctor in Deptford, ever expressed any professional curiosity about this premature birth. The Ramsays are regular church-goers and devout believers. Their Presbyterian belief in damnation as punishment for sins gives Dunny his guilty conscience. Percy's mother is a devout Methodist, but his father does not very often join the daily prayers. Percy never demonstrates any authentic religious interest, probably because he senses, from his father's example, that religion is not a manly pursuit. Staunton always wants to appear as masculine as possible, and he is later cruel to his child David when the boy displays "effeminate" behaviour.

Dunny is given a number of duties and chores to perform while Percy seems always free to indulge in recreational activities. Perhaps the most obvious example of the families' different attitudes toward civic responsibility occurs during the war-time flu epidemic. Both Ramsays die, but both refused to bow to the disease. Mr. Ramsay continues his regular work, while Mrs. Ramsay "[n]ever let up on nursing and taking soup and stuff around..." (F, p. 119). On the other hand, "Doc

Staunton moved out to one of his farms to live and sort of gave up practice" (F, p. 119). The Ramsays performed their duty, whereas Boy's father breaks his professional oath. Though the boys are brought up in the same town, attend the same school, and are taught the same values, one lives in a home which practices its beliefs while the other home shams them. These respective influences greatly affect the boys' future lives.

Perhaps as a result of their upbringing, the boys mature sexually in quite different ways. Dunny associates pleasure with sinfulness; Staunton has no such reservations. Dunny is in love with Mary Dempster, an untouchable anima-figure, but desires Leola Cruikshank. He claims to be too fastidious to want crude animal sex (F, p. 41). Percy has Leola as his steady girlfriend, and he causes a town scandal when he is caught in the sexual act with Mabel Heighington. This leads Doc Staunton to send his son to Colborne College; but Percy's act does not diminish Leola's love for him. Staunton maintains a "successful" manner with women throughout his life. Ramsay maintains that he never knew "anyone in whose life sex played such a dominating part" (F, p. 213). Though Staunton possesses many women, it is doubtful that he ever understood any, and it seems that he never felt sympathy for any woman, certainly not for his first wife.

Ramsay is scared of women because he never again wants to be a woman's "own dear laddie" (F, p. 90), as he was with his

mother. For this reason he abandons a promising relationship with Diana Marfleet. His sexual encounters are few, and Davies' choice of names (puns) for his partners — Agnes Day, Gloria Munday, and Libby Doe — suggest a flippant attitude that makes these experiences seem of minor importance. Ramsay gradually rejects his own scarred body and becomes so engrossed in his search for knowledge of sainthood and spirituality that he represses his sexual drive. The contrast is apparent: Staunton is driven by his libido and gives it full rein; Ramsay is not as dominated by his libido and, furthermore, limits its development.

The most obvious difference between the two lies in their conception of reality. Ramsay describes it in this way: "...to him [Staunton] the reality of life lay in external things, whereas for me the only reality was on the spirit — of the mind..." (F, p. 128). Staunton delights in physical possessions, in his own appearance, and in making money. Ramsay feels guilty whenever he splurges on himself, and he looks upon money as security. Staunton elects the Anglican Church for its social status, and he is impressed by such empty-headed ministers as Leadbetter. Ramsay devotes himself to the study of myth and religion. This interest is often the butt of Staunton's jokes or criticism. Percy Boyd Staunton becomes Boy Staunton "because he summed up in himself so much of the glory of youth in the postwar period" (F, p. 124). Ramsay, on the other hand, looks old for his age.

Their conception of duty is also different. Boy chooses Edward, the Prince of Wales, as his ideal. The Prince is dashing, romantic, and heroic; he represents all the outward appearances which Staunton so admires. Ramsay admires the old King because he feels that he and the monarch both recognize their responsibilities as public symbols, Ramsay as war-hero and the King as royalty. As such, they "have obligations above what is merely personal, and to let personal feelings obscure the obligations would be failing in one's duty" (F, p. 96). The Prince, of course, does not recognize this, and his marriage to a divorced commoner leads to his abdication. This, in turn, affects Boy so much that he never does find a replacement for this ideal, which had considerably inspired his life. When Ramsay is also forced to abandon his conception of reality, he proves himself different from Staunton. Ramsay is able to alter and improve his concept of reality, so that he personally continues to grow and finds new and greater meaning in life.

This contrast of the two characters permits some observations. Davies develops them as Shadows of one another to show that evil, within the realm of personal characteristics, is ambiguous. Staunton develops in a very sensual manner but lacks the intuition to recognize and sympathize with the feelings of others. Ramsay does not allow his emotions nor his physical desires to develop and lives a stunted life for an unnecessarily long time.

Liliane Frey-Rohn maintains in "The Psychological View"

in Evil that individuals with such extreme moral attitudes cause harm to others and themselves:

> Both attitudes — perfectionism and the lack of moral principles — are accompanied by symptons of severe repression, but in each case with different antecedents. In one case weakness or imperfection has been repressed; in the other, moral discipline has been disregarded....the deeper the repression, the more active the dissociated content. From its background in the unconscious, like a hidden kobold, it contrives all kinds of negative effects in the outer world.[51]

Ramsay or Staunton will be able to take the first step in overcoming their respective privations or share of evil only when they recognize their Shadows. A study of Ramsay's life suggests that the correct response consists of confronting and controlling the evil which is within the Shadow. In depth psychology the goal is not "to banish your Shadow...but only to understand it, and thereby to work a little more closely with it" (M, p. 93).

Ramsay's quest, seeking to understand the nature of good or of sainthood, leads him in a most indirect way to the recognition of his Shadow. Ramsay's search is inspired by Mary Dempster: "Loving her, I had to defend her, and when people said she was crazy I had to force myself to tell them that they were crazy themselves..." (F, p. 28). Ramsay refuses to believe that her other-worldly behaviour is insane. Even after her encounter with the tramp in the gravel pit, he believes that she lives in a world of different values from ours. He comes to believe that she has no fear and is "wholly religious" (F, p.55).

Despite her situation, alone and attached by a harness in a rotten little house, she does not feel shame. According to Ramsay, she lives by a light from within and is usually able to converse rationally with him. His secret friendship and admiration for Mary Dempster become quite irrational when he seeks her out in order to bring his supposedly dead brother back to life. Willie does recover — but was it a miracle or merely a mistake on Dunny's part? The reader is left in doubt, but Dunny is not. When he himself experiences a vision of Mary Dempster on the battle-field just before he "dies" and when he later learns that the tramp of the gravel pit has become a minister through her effect on him, Ramsay becomes convinced that she is a bona-fide saint with three miracles to her credit.

Ramsay's professional fame is not due to his teaching, or to his study of history, but rather to his study of hagiology. He has seemingly always had an interest in the occult, as witnessed by his attempts at magic, his readings about saints, and his preference for metaphor rather than fact. After his recovery he becomes obsessed with identifying the little Madonna that he saw in the ruined building just before he lost consciousness. This personal interest combined with his abilities as a polymath soon make him an expert in this new field.

Since Ramsay wants Mary Dempster to be considered a saint, he visits Father Regan, the Roman Catholic parish priest of

Deptford, but the latter does not encourage Ramsay in his mission. Regan argues that Mary Dempster cannot be a saint because she did not know what she was doing. At best she was a fool-saint, "somebody who seems to be full of holiness and loves everybody and does every good act he can, but because he's a fool it all comes to nothing — to worse than nothing, because it is virtue tainted with madness, and you can't tell where it'll end up" (F, p. 159). This fails to deter Ramsay. He continues his quest and once again resumes contact with Mary Dempster, who is now living in Weston with her aunt.

Though Ramsay is still convinced that he has found a saint, the reader is less sure. Davies has provided a number of clues which suggest that Ramsay himself may be the saint; Wilfred Cude develops this theme in two articles.[52] He argues that Ramsay was not only present at the miracles as Mary Dempster was, but that he was also the moving force in these acts. Diana Marfleet renames him Dunstan, after Saint Dunstan; Cude notes that their two lives are remarkably similar, much more similar than the few clues in Fifth Business would suggest.[53] Padre Blazon tells Ramsay to go on with his life, maybe Mary Dempster's sanity had to be sacrificed for a greater good: "Maybe God wants you for something special. Maybe so much that you are worth a woman's sanity" (F, p. 207). Blazon insists on stressing the fact that every saint had some failing or shadow as part of his make-up. This fits Ramsay, who does have a darker side and is teased by Faustina: "I do not know

St. Dunstan. Was he a bad old saint who peeps, eh? O-o-h, shame on you, St. Dunstan!" (F, p. 257). Davies seems to agree, for he maintains in "Ham and Tongue" that Ramsay is almost a saint in the inner life.[54]

For a long time Ramsay refuses to recognize this darker aspect of himself. He is so engrossed in his spiritual quest that he comes to regard Mary Dempster's "sainthood" as his own possession. He always feels guilty and responsible for her and longs to do some good which will benefit her. He becomes a regular visitor at Weston and continues to perform good works, reminiscent of the care and concern that he showed in Deptford. After Miss Shanklin's death he believes that he has the chance to atone for his guilt. Miss Shanklin's will gives him the opportunity to become Mary Dempster's guardian and also to be eventual heir to a considerable sum of money. He is overjoyed, for Mary Dempster will now be his saint, his responsibility; he will finally be able to atone for his childhood guilt. He immediately has plans to make a study of his saint and maybe "make a serious contribution to the psychology of religion..." (F, p. 187).

There is in all of this, not only a sense of guilt being eased, but also of selfishness. There are no financial worries, only benefits. He thinks of Mary Dempster as his possession, of making his contribution to hagiology, and of eliminating his guilt. There is really no great concern for her personally.

These doubts about Ramsay are confirmed when he learns

that Miss Shanklin's affairs have been mishandled. He cannot afford to place Mrs. Dempster in a private hospital because of the Depression. He refuses to ask a favour of Boy Staunton. Ramsay will not give Staunton an opportunity to patronize him or to assuage Staunton's guilt. Most of all, Ramsay does not want to lessen his own sense of guilt, which is the prime motivation for his studies: "My own motives were not clear or pure: I was determined that if I could not take care of Mrs. Dempster, nobody else should do it. She was mine" (F, pp. 210-11). Later when he attains a deeper knowledge of himself and attends her funeral, he realizes his wrong: "And then I begged forgiveness for myself because, though I had done what I imagined was best, I had not been loving enough, or wise enough, or generous enough in my dealings with her" (F, p. 288).

This is an instance where an attempt to do good —to make amends for an evil act — has gone too far and has become evil itself. Ramsay is so concerned with performing his own good that he will not allow anyone else to help him. He subjects Mary Dempster to the horrors of a public insane asylum because his pride and masochism will not allow him to ask a favour of Boy Staunton. Padre Blazon recognizes this negative trait of Ramsay's: his preference for suffering over pleasure. Blazon tells him to stop disliking himself, like a good Protestant, to forgive himself for being a human creature, and to stop thinking that torment of the spirit is a splendid thing (F, p. 208). Liesl repeats this advice as he struggles with

his infatuation with Faustina: "You are a decent chap to everybody, except one special somebody, and that is Dunstan Ramsay. How can you be really good to anybody if you are not good to yourself?...This is the revenge of the unlived life, Ramsay. Suddenly it makes a fool of you" (F, p. 265). Ramsay's ascetic nature has produced much good; he is a loyal friend, a dedicated school-master, a tireless scholar, and an heroic citizen. However, this has meant that he has only developed the rational side of his personality, not the emotional; that he has become overly concerned with his own guilt, not the welfare of Mary Dempster; and that he has recognized, studied, searched, and tried to embrace only the good, not the vision of evil.

This latter defect defeats him in his search for the good. Only when he recognizes the dialectic of good and evil is he able to develop as a whole person and become the modern-day saint we finally discover in him.

A number of characters inform Ramsay that his one-sided development is a fault in him. The most uncomplimentary and critical is Boy Staunton. This is to be expected, for Staunton sees in Ramsay those aspects of his own character which he keeps submerged in his Shadow. He is needlessly cruel to Ramsay after the war when he demotes him from his position as Headmaster, pro tem. Boy explains that there are a number of reasons for his demotion. He is too old (the same age as Boy), and he is too eccentric and shabby in appearance; Boy

says that it is especially his interest in saints that parents will not abide: "Religion in the school is one thing; there is a well-understood place for religion in education. But not this misty world of wonder-workers and holy wizards and juiceless women. Saints aren't in the picture at all" (F, p. 230). Staunton disapproves of a serious interest in religion, of inexplicable actions, and of asceticism. Ramsay disregards Staunton's advice, falling back on his own stubbornness and the natural tendency to refuse to recognize one's Shadow.

Padre Blazon is a more charitable and sympathetic soul. Ramsay is inclined to listen to him because he admires Blazon's learning and accomplishments. Blazon plays the symbolic role of mentor or guide to Ramsay. As we have seen, he informs Ramsay that all saints have some deficiency, and he advises Ramsay to enjoy life. Blazon recounts his own life; some would call it a miracle, for he was destined from birth and by ability to be a Jesuit. Yet, he too developed a shadow in middle age: he began to have questions about Christ. Blazon thinks that Christ alone is too pure, dogmatic, and certain:

> I need something that takes account of the accretion of experience, the sense of paradox and ambiguity that comes with years! I think after forty we should recognize Christ politely but turn for our comfort and guidance to God the Father, who knows the good and evil of life,.... Ithink when He comes again it will be to declare theunity of the life of the flesh and the life

> of the spirit. And then perhaps we shall make some sense of this life of marvels, cruel circumstances, obscenities, and commonplaces. (F, p. 206)

Blazon advises Ramsay to seek wisdom elsewhere, not only in his spiritual athletics, but also in life. Blazon believes that good cannot be found without a consideration of evil. He feels that a theodicy is impossible within the limitations of rational thought.

When Liesl encounters Ramsay in Mexico, she observes that his Shadow is becoming dominant in his character. He is very talkative with her instead of maintaining his usual secretiveness. His Shadow is most apparent in his hopeless infatuation with Faustina. He becomes concerned with his appearance, and only his lack of self-confidence and savoir-faire prevent him from approaching Faustina. His behaviour has become remarkably similar to Boy Staunton's. Liesl witnesses this and tries to help him. Her attempted seduction is violently repulsed, but her analysis and description of his present behaviour as "the revenge of the unlived life" do affect Ramsay. She tells him that he must explore this side of his life:

> But every man has a devil, and a man of unusual quality, like yourself, Ramsay, has an unusual devil. You must get to know your personal devil. You must even get to know his father, the Old Devil....
> Why don't you shake hands with your devil, Ramsay, and change this foolish life of yours? Why don't you, just for once, do something inexplicable, irrational, at the devil's bidding, and just for the hell of it? You would be a different man. (F, p. 266)

Ramsay promptly follows Liesl's advice, and they make love. He meets his personal devil — Liesl — and he triumphs over her. Like the historical St. Dunstan, he twists the nose of his tempter. He realizes that he can now indulge the desires of his Shadow, for he can control them.

This realization is probed in detail some years later when Ramsay visits Padre Blazon in Vienna. Without any prompting, Blazon asks him if he has met the devil yet. Ramsay tells him that he has, in the guise of a woman. He recounts his encounter while Blazon listens in mock horror: "The Devil proved to be a very good fellow. He suggested that a little compromise would not hurt me.' He even suggested that an acquaintance with Him might improve my character" (F, p. 293). Davies' use of the capital suggests that Ramsay now accords the same respect to both forces that he formerly reserved for God alone. Blazon approves of his behaviour in this encounter: "Well done, well done! You met the Devil as an equal, not cringing or frightened or begging for a trashy favour. That is the heroic life, Ramezay. You are fit to be the Devil's friend, without any fear of losing yourself to Him" (F, p. 294).

Ramsay has followed a long, tortuous path. As a boy he is scarred by the snowball incident, whereby he suffers from a feeling of guilt and assumes responsibility for Mary Dempster. In an attempt to maintain his independence and to avoid hereafter the clutches of the Devil, he does not allow his emotional side to evolve. He develops his rational nature in

the study of hagiology. His choice suggests the suppression of his Shadow — he studies what is irrational and miraculous in a rational manner. Though his life as a whole is admirable, "thinking" and spiritual masochism drive him. He is limited in his understanding of good, until he recognizes the presence of evil within himself. He then realizes that his search for the good has been harmful in some ways to Mary Dempster and even more so to himself. By recognizing his Shadow and taking it into account, Ramsay is able to fulfill his role as Fifth Business.

Boy Staunton, on the other hand, is the epitome of success in the Western world. It would seem that he has attained the good; however, he has always been concerned with appearances, and this is just another deception. Davies refers to him as a failure in the inner life.[55] This failure can be traced back to the original incident. He refuses to recognize the harm that he has done and continues to do harm unconsciously throughout his life. He not only causes evil but feels neither guilt nor responsibility for it. His behaviour toward Leola is characteristic. He cheats on her, attempts to mould her into a suitable wife, and never considers her feelings. When Leola discovers that Boy is a philanderer, he is too depressed by the King's abdication to offer her any comfort, explanations, or even lies. He is incapable of understanding other people's feelings because he is only interested in his own immediate gratification. He never examines or judges

his own actions, so he is not likely to examine other people's actions. He is not interested in history, not even the immediate past. He wants to have nothing more to do with Deptford once he has left it. Staunton refuses to recognize his past, to understand his motives, or to look inside himself.

Ramsay is insistent that Staunton is not crooked; making money is just a natural trait with him. He does not break laws or rob widows and orphans to amass a fortune. The simple manner in which he achieves wealth suggests that this type of accomplishment receives more due in our society than it deserves. Liesl refers to Staunton as "Mr. Sugar" (F, p. 265). Though Staunton is not a robber-baron, he is seen with some contempt; sugar is high in calories but has little nutritive value, and it is even harmful to one's health (dental cavities, obesity, etc.). Liesl's comment may also refer to Staunton's role as a "sugar daddy". Staunton's sugar products are similar to his own personality, glossy on the outside but empty within. When he is rebuffed in a general election because he does not heed the feelings of the people, he retreats to his first love: "Boy was through with politics and turned back to sugar, and everything sugar could be made to do, with new resolve" (F, p. 276).

Davies has also criticized sugar in A Mixture of Frailties. In this novel Mrs. Gall suffers from sugar addiction and goes on periodic sugar binges followed by an inevitable depression; sugar is also implicitly condemned as the food of gluttony,[56]

Staunton's life-work, the production and utilization of sugar, is not the positive achievement it seems to be. A close examination of Staunton reveals a friendless man, one who devotes his life to the production of a substance which makes him rich but deprives society to a good measure of its health.

Davies writes admiringly of Dickens and of his excellent depiction of the ambiguity of evil: "...what Fagin manifestly does is the worst that such a creature could do: he makes evil appear to be good..."[57] Staunton stands in the same relation to evil. He has all the outward trappings of success, but he is an instrument of evil: the stone in the snowball, the destruction of Leola, his carelessness toward everyone except himself, his desire to dominate everybody, and the questionable value of his life's work. He seems to have an inkling concerning the meaninglessness of his life, for he is quick to attack Ramsay's big book on the psychology of myth and legend. Once again, he tries to submerge his own worries by attacking his Shadow. The individuated Ramsay has grown too strong by now, and he easily dominates Staunton. The latter weakly argues that he cannot stand such a work because he is an atheist:

> "You created a God in your own image, and when you found out he was no good you abolished him. It's a quite common form of psychological suicide,"
>
> I had only meant to give him blow for blow, but to my surprise he crumpled up.
>
> "Don't nag me, Dunny," he said. "I feel rotten. I've done just about everything I've ever planned

> to do, and everybody thinks I'm a success. And of course I have Denyse now to keep me up to the mark, which is lucky — damned lucky, and don't imagine I don't feel it. But sometimes I wish I could get into a car and drive away from the whole damned thing."
>
> "A truly mythological wish," I said. "I'll save you the trouble of reading my book to find out what it means: you want to pass into oblivion with your armour on, like King Arthur, but modern medical science is too clever to allow it. You must grow old, Boy: you'll have to find out what age means, and how to be old. (F, p. 284)

This is only the second time that Boy's self-assurance fails him. The first occurred when Edward VIII abdicated; his idol failed him. He never found another such ideal, something outside of himself to live for. That is why Ramsay can say that Staunton created a God in his own image. Now that he finds this self-image lacking, he wants to run away. Ramsay offers him some of the advice that he was given and able to put to good use. Staunton refuses it, for it conflicts with the superficial manner with which he has guided his life. His desire, expressed in this conversation, is a clear fore-shawdowing of his eventual suicide.

Boy's lack of resolve is also apparent in his marriage to Denyse Hornick. She acts as a support for his slumping Persona, as Staunton admits in his conversation with Ramsay. She is a self-proclaimed realist and rationalist; Staunton refers approvingly to her mind as masculine. She provides a new goal for Boy: to become the Lieutnant-Governor of the Province of Ontario. As Ramsay later says, "if ever a man stuck his foot

in a bear-trap when he thought he was putting it into a flower-bed, it was Boy Staunton when he married Denyse Hornick."[58] She contributes to his death because Boy's self-image is destroyed when he tries on the ceremonial uniform of the Lieutnant-Governor. He realizes the truth concerning himself; he is now an old man for whom the time has come "when the pretty girls think of you not as a Boy but as an Old Boy" (W, p. 353). Boy has finally realized that he is no longer young, and he is incapable of making the necessary adjustments to adapt to his new role. He never was able to recognize his personal duties. In his new position he will be forced to perform public duties and will lose his freedom of choice. All of this weakens Boy Staunton when the Three Men from Deptford meet.

Boy's Shadow is finally beginning to emerge. Eisengrim makes Staunton admit that he has attended the show of illusions twice: "I can only assume my exhibition offered something you wanted" (F, p. 301). The rational Boy Staunton is attending magic shows; his long suppressed irrational nature is beginning to show. He is pleased to meet Eisengrim at Colborne College, and they retire with Dunny to his room. Ramsay notes that Staunton is up to one of his special displays of charm: "It was like Boy to seek to ingratiate himself with the new friend by treating the old friend with genial contempt" (F, p. 303). Eisengrim, however, does not respond positively to Staunton's jibes at Ramsay. Eisengrim surprises

Staunton by revealing that he is from Deptford and that he remembers Staunton as the "Rich Young Ruler" who called his mother "hoor". Boy professes to remember none of this. Ramsay wonders what to say: "Here it was. Either I spoke now or I kept silence forever. Dunstan Ramsay counselled against revelation, but Fifth Business would not hear" (F, p. 310). He finally returns to Staunton his share of the guilt. Ramsay will no longer selfishly glory in his own guilt and that of others. He recognizes his responsibilities, but his Shadow no longer allows him to assume the role of penitent for all of Deptford.

Staunton, however, refuses to accept responsibility, saying that he does not remember the incident and that they were just boys anyway. Davies then provides the plot with the necessary ingredient to condemn Staunton. Throughout the story Ramsay's guilt over the original incident has seemed excessive. Is it not the type of accident that could happen to any Canadian boy? Ramsay now reveals that this is not so. There are unwritten rules in boys' games, and one of them is that no serious harm should be intended. A snowball with a stone in it is in contravention of these rules. This is not the type of action that any Canadian boy would take; it is the type of action that only a malicious boy would undertake. When Ramsay hands his old paperweight to Staunton, the latter does not recognize it. Ramsay then explains that this is the stone Staunton put in the snowball he threw at Mrs. Dempster,

and now evil is finally apparent. His Fagin-like ability to make evil look good vanishes. He is no longer just a crude, uncaring, and grasping man, but one, who right from the beginning, has been willing to harm others out of mindless selfishness.

Ramsay accuses Staunton but still offers him the opportunity to change his ways:

> "Boy, for God's sake, get to know something about yourself. The stone-in-the-snowball has been characteristic of too much you've done for you to forget it forever!"
> "...I'm simply trying to recover something of the totality of your life. Don't you want to possess it as a whole — the bad with the good? I told you once you'd made a God of yourself, and the insufficiency of it forced you to become an atheist. It's time you tried to be a human being. Then maybe something bigger than yourself will come up on your horizon." (F, p. 311).

Boy rejects Ramsay's offer and treats him petulantly, claiming that he has always been jealous because of Leola. Eisengrim brings their discussion to an end when he expresses a desire to return to his hotel. Boy offers to drive him in order to black-guard Ramsay in the car. After doing this, he is in a confessional mood and admits to Eisengrim that he realizes he has grown old, that he does not want to be the Lieutenant-Governor, and that he feels humiliated because Ramsay still sees him as a mean kid. Eisengrim advises him to refuse the position, and Staunton once again falls under the spell of the man who refused to live as Edward VIII. Boy decides that

he too will abdicate. Eisengrim then advises Staunton to do something symbolic with the stone so that he can come to terms with it: "I'd do my best to swallow that stone" (W, p. 354). Staunton is incapable of maturing, of advancing to new and different interpretations of life, instead he regresses to his old, superficial views concerning duty. His Shadow finally takes command, and he commits what is considered the ultimate irrational act for rich, honoured, and privileged people — suicide.

In an address which Davies titled "The Deadliest of Sins", the author warns against Sloth and recommends that life be examined every day "in the light of feeling, rather than of intelligence".[59] He also explains that in Fifth Business he was particularly concerned with evil in the "unexamined life".[60] Staunton is an example of such behaviour. He rarely reviews his actions, which are dominated by the function of sensation. When he does, he judges his acts rationally. Have they helped him to achieve one of his materialistic goals? His behaviour toward Mrs. Dempster is the same which he later shows toward Leola. He never thinks with feeling about her, or for her, but only with consideration toward her image as wife of a successful businessman. He is the uncaring individual, the person who does not examine the consequences of his actions and who rejects accusations if they are made.

Ramsay provides a contrast to this. He is also dominated by his rational side, but his religious upbringing makes him

feel a responsibility toward duty that Staunton lacks. Ramsay strives to do good because of his guilt; this unfortunately makes his motive negative in nature. He only attains the good when his sense of feeling is activated. His righteousness becomes more mellow. He no longer harbours silent resentment in order to feel morally superior to others. He is able to assume a new, more active role. When the opportunity to play Fifth Business presents itself, Ramsay is able to act. He accuses Staunton but also offers him a chance for redemption. Ramsay wants Staunton to integrate the good and evil within him. Ramsay learns to do things which come naturally to Staunton. Dunny learns to feel good and not guilty about making love, about making money, about appreciating materialistic comforts, and about expressing emotion. He is able to overcome his Calvinist upbringing. He learns not to feel guilty for situations which are not his responsibility: he will not write Boy's official biography even though Denyse thinks it is his duty to do so.

Boy, on the other hand, never overcomes his distrust of thespiritual or his evil tendency to have his own way regardless of the consequences. He never learns how to accommodate his positive Shadow to his total character.

Fifth Business has the structure of an historical memoir. The biographical and factual aspects of the novel allow it to treat evil as a developing idea. Several complete lives are presented. We see that childhood is not necessarily a time

of innocence and delight. We see that the evil of maturity can be traced back to childhood. We see that evil is indeed ambig uous, not because society warps the true nature of good and evil, but because the two conflicting forces exist within the same breast, and each person must come to terms with this revelation.

Chapter Four

Sins of the Father

Davies had not intended to write a trilogy. He decided to continue writing about the characters in Fifth Business after its warm reception in the U.S., for he was eager to please a new public.[61] He explains the intention and method of The Manticore:

> I had told the story of the boy who felt most guilty for the unlucky flight of that snowball, and I wanted to write about the boy who had actually thrown it, and who had succeeded in avoiding any feeling of guilt whatever. But to write the story of an extravert and egotist in the first person did not appeal to me, and I decided to write it from the point of view of his son, who was compelled, as children often are, to live out the unlived portion of his father's life and to be driven to an unwanted recognition of the kind of man his father truly was. How? I recall the day and the place when it came to me that it might be done by putting the son into a Jungian analysis, during which the truth might be painfully extracted from him and the recognition made inevitable.[62]

This novel about the sins of the father which the son must bear moves on a mythic and psychological level. Even though David scorns psychiatry, he decides that he must be a good "little soldier" and seek out some treatment. Unlike his father, David decides to confront his problem, not run away from it; however, his attitude is negative and resentful. He does not want to face the truth of his own life or of his

father's death. David believes that only "leaners" can benefit from a psychiatrist and that an intelligent man can take care of himself. He intends to prove this theory rather than meekly allow a psychiatrist to manipulate him into seeing mythic patterns in his life. The stage is set for the slow, painful recognition and evaluation of his father's life and death.

Before considering the new aspect of evil referred to in the theme of this chapter, the sins of the father, it is worth noting that the author presents in The Manticore a process of individuation very similar to the one in Fifth Business. The personal progress from a limited perception to a more complete one is even more noticeable in The Manticore than in the previous novel because Dr. von Haller constantly alludes to it. The process is not haphazard as with Ramsay; rather, it is psychologically directed, for David is in analysis. Since this aspect of the novel is only too apparent, it can be dealt with briefly.

Like Ramsay, David believes in thinking and distrusts feeling. David's Persona is that of the brilliant, heroic, but dissipated lawyer; Dr. von Haller refers to him as a Sydney Carton. David maintains this mask in his personal dealings. It permits him to live in isolation and to suppress his emotions. He suffers from a number of projections: that his father was a good man, that Judy Wolff was an ideal woman, and that Pargetter (he brings his students up to par?) was a

faultless mentor. Dr. von Haller attempts to have David recognize his limited emotional development and his projections of people close to him.

David's realization of his Shadow is crucial to the process of individuation. David likes to consider himself a self-made man. The first sentence of his Zurich Notebook emphasizes the problem he encounters in accomplishing his goal: " IT IS NOT EASY to be the son of a very rich man" (M, p. 75). He wants people to recognize him as a success on his own account. David is annoyed when others imply that they had a more difficult time than he to achieve their goals because they lacked his advantages.

He finds Netty's constant championing of her once-poor brother Matey particularly annoying. David's combat with his Shadow is not the heroic battle that Ramsay's was because Matey is only a secondary character in David's life and in the novel. As we shall see, the primordial image of the Father is the archetype which most troubles David.

The final stage of individuation is more convincing than the former because it occurs outside the sitting-room; The Manticore, unlike Fifth Business, often gives the impression that the fiction is being invented to fit a predetermined pattern. This is probably because Davies has shortened and condensed what would be the actual time of an analysis.[63] The irrelevant details that would crop up in an actual treatment are not recounted. David's recognition of his Shadow

is psychologically too pat; everything falls into place too neatly. David joins Ramsay, Liesl, and Eisengrim in Sorgenfrei. In this last section of the novel Liesl encourages David to face life the heroic way; she undoubtedly brings him to the cave for this purpose.

Liesl wants to fill David with awe at the heroism of our human ancestors; however, he is too frightened by his ordeal in the cave to be amazed by what he sees. He is unable to feel wonder at the fact that prehistoric men worshipped bears and found meaning in something greater than themselves. He wants to return to the light, for he does not think of God as residing in the darkness. Liesl is disappointed in him and berates him for his lack of religious feeling. At this point David insists they return, but the electric torch no longer works. Is this accidental or is Liesl willing to risk her own life in order to provide David with the experience which will develop his feeling?

> "Liesl, am I to go into that tunnel without a glimmer of light?"
> "Yes, unless you wish to stay here in the dark. I'm going, certainly. If you are wise you will go first. And don't change your mind on the way, because if anything happens to you, Davey, I can't turn back, or wriggle backward. It's up and out for both of us, or death for both of us." (M, p. 303)

The journey is traumatic, and at one point David is unable to continue. Liesl's suggestion, to look for strength in his ancestors since he has no God, enables him to continue. He

turns not to his respected father, nor his successful grandfather, but to his courageous great-grandmother: "...something — but it's absurd to think it could have been she! — gave me the power to wriggle that last two hundred yards..." (M, p. 305). After this experience David realizes his smallness, hopes to attain something better, and longs to be Liesl's friend. She promises her love; David is willing to respond in kind. He is "renewed — yes, and it seemed to me reborn, by the terror of the cave and the great promise she had made to me a few hours before" (M, p. 306).

This insight into the dual nature of man is confirmed by Ramsay on Christmas Day (it is certainly not accidental that David is "reborn" on Christmas Eve). Ramsay gives a large, gingerbread bear to each of the household members. He recounts the legend of St. Gall and explains how his gift "reminds us even today that if we are really wise, we will make a working arrangement with the bear that lives with us, because otherwise we shall starve or perhaps be eaten by the bear" (M, p. 308). Davies obviously believes that man must know his own Persona and Shadow if he is to mature and gain a fuller comprehension of life. The above quote with its reference to both David's and Ramsay's lack of feeling (starve) and to Boy Staunton's renunciation of the spiritual life (eaten by the bear) is almost heavy-handed.

The Manticore is not as successful a novel as Fifth Business, nor is David as realistic a character as Ramsay,

because the novelist is dominated by the moralist in the second work. Judith Skelton Grant writes in her review of the Deptford trilogy: "only in Fifth Business does Davies create an organic whole from his disparate materials."[64] Davies' fiction is more successful when he is less pedagogical; however, the author's treatment of psychology and the relationship between the Shadow and evil is consistent in both works.

David's confrontations with other archetypes are more successful fictionally because they are less pedagogical than the encounter with his Shadow. The novel deals primarily with three primordial images: the Father, the Anima, and the Wizard or Mentor. The latter two have definite effects on David's stunted feeling but are only incidentally related to evil. We shall consider them only in their relation to Boy Staunton, the Father who is successful "in avoiding any feeling of guilt" throughout his life.

Davies is a collector of quotes;[65] he is likely to be familiar with those concerning the sins of the father:

> The gods
> Visit the sins of the fathers upon the children.
> Euripides - Phrixus, fragment 830
>
> For the sins of your fathers you, though guiltless, must suffer.
> Horace - Odes III, 6:1
>
> The sins of the father are to be laid upon the children.
> Shakespeare - Merchant of Venice, act III, sc.5,l.1

> I punish the children for the sins of the fathers to the third and fourth generations of those who hate me.
>
> Exodus XX:5[66]

The Manticore acts as an illustration of the above quotes and provides new insights into the nature and source of evil.

When David arrives in Zurich, his feelings toward his father are ambivalent. On the one hand, David is convinced that his father was a great man, that he was deserving of his son's love, that he was a most charming and dignified man, and that he had no reason whatsoever to commit suicide. On the other hand, David's intuition sometimes sees the truth of the matter. Early in his talks with Dr. von Haller, he recounts details of Boy's funeral and how Denyse insisted that the Staunton arms be illegally used. David is upset by this and even more angry with Bishop Woodiwiss' sermon and its constant reference to the Staunton motto. David longs to cry out: "'It's a God-damned lie; his lifelong motto wasn't En Dieu ma foy but En moi-même ma foy and that was his tragedy'" (M, p. 42).

This insight concerning his father's nature is usually repressed. This is particularly so as David recounts his life story. He emotionally returns to his childhood state of admiration for his dashing and powerful father As a child David believes that his father loves him very much and is eager to please him in order to maintain this "love". Boy tries to mould his son into a masculine, independent man —

an ideal replica of himself. Boy does so in a number of offensive ways: depriving him of his Highland doll, providing him with a pitiful allowance, and giving advice which Boy himself does not follow. Thus, David is told not to spend money on things which are not essential, to show love and respect to his parents, and never to marry his first love.

David has some of his father's characteristics. After David's romantic behaviour in the Tom Thumb Wedding, he is pleased to hear a woman compare him to his father. David's attitude toward his betrothed directly after the ceremony is even more like Boy: "When I have squeezed my orange, I throw it away; that was my attitude at the time" (M, p. 98).

David's desire for his father's approval is even stronger during his adolescence when he sees Boy as a war-time hero. He dates Judy Wolff and naively brags about his father's accomplishments as a swordsman; he mistakes Boy's sexual conquests for military ones. Boy rewards David for his interest in the opposite sex with an increase in allowance. He is, of course, most pleased; however, he does not understand his father's suggestion that he "look a little lower down" (M, p. 163).

David is a sensitive boy; he does not grasp Boy's suggestion that he use somebody to satisfy his own desires. David agrees with Father Knopwood that the great sin is "to use yourself or someone else contemptuously, as an object of convenience" (M, p. 147). David's desperate struggle to please

his father is hopeless because the son does not realize that his father's charming exterior masks an unfeeling and inconsiderate interior. It is impossible for David to please his father because Boy expects his son to have two contradictory traits — independence and imitation.

Boy's determination to have his own way is exposed when he attempts to make a swordsman out of David. Boy's charm fails to hide his crudity when he foists the experienced Myrrha Martindale upon David. The latter suppresses the suspicion that he isn't really in charge. Boy hints to David that the affair had been arranged, that this was the proper introduction to sex, that Boy also had enjoyed the pleasures of this accomplished amorist, but David refuses to suspect his father of conspiracy. When David talks with Knopwood, he exposes Boy's manipulations and explains the meaning of the word swordsman, "an expert at sticking something long and thin, or thick and curved, into other people; and always with intent to wound" (M, p. 204).

David rejects Knopwood's suggestions and clings to the image of his father as the wise and loving parent. Though the son consciously refuses to condemn his father, he unconsciously reacts to his lesson, for he never again makes love. Furthermore, Mr. Wolff restricts the amount of time that David may spend with Judy. Her father is worried that David may imitate the example which Boy sets. Thus, Boy turns David into a Joseph — the exact opposite of Boy's intention.

David does suffer from the sins of his father; he is unable to engage in sexual relations, even though his father is a sexual athlete.

This incident leads David to further doubts about his father's integrity. He knows that his father knew Mrs. Martindale before his mother's death. David has a rather quaint, moralistic attitude toward adultery: "A deceived husband is merely a cuckold, a figure of fun, whereas a deceived wife is someone who has sustained an injury" (M, p. 212). David refuses to believe that Boy might have committed adultery, because David associates it with squalor, and Boy is anything but squalid. David's adoration of Boy is now flawed with doubts. He no longer wants to be like Boy; instead, David longs "to find some realm where I could show that I was worthy of him [Boy]" (M, p. 212).

Upon hearing this, Dr. von Haller calls him a fanatic, one who overcompensates for doubt. Even with the evidence right in front of David, he is unable to condemn his father. The son refuses to look beyond his father's exterior; David accepts Boy at his own face value. David still believes that he must show himself worthy of his father's love even though Boy is responsible for Leola's death.

David attends Oxford and comes under the spell of a new father figure, David embraces and worships the values of his tutor Pargetter — his "father in art". With this decision David renounces Boy and his values. He will always have an

influence on David, but the spell has been broken: "I loved him [Boy] and feared him, but I had spied tiny chinks in his armour. He too was a manipulator and, remembering his own dictum, I did not mean to be a man who could be manipulated" (M, p. 215). Pargetter turns David into a disciple of the law; these new values make David's life very different from his father's.

David writes why he is attracted to his new profession:

> I wanted to be a master of my own craft and I wanted a great craft. Also, I wanted to know a great deal about people, and I wanted a body of knowledge that would go as far as possible to explain people. I wanted to work in a realm that would give me some insight into the spirit that I had seen at work in Bill Unsworth. (M, p. 214)

Bill Unsworth, as his name suggests, is an embodiment of crude evil. David is first attracted to him because they differ so greatly. A mild attraction of opposites takes place; this is repeated throughout David's career. David wants to be good, but he is attracted to the aura of evil. This is an example of a desire to be complete — Jung's meshing of opposites. David is a precursor to Magnus Eisengrim and his combination of good and evil within one person. David and his friends succumb to Unsworth's "charms" and vandalize a cottage; however, Bill's final act of defecation turns his companions against him. They are all repulsed by his meaningless malevolence. This final act leads David to become a

lawyer so that he can combat "whatever it was that possessed him [Unsworth]" (M, p. 169).

David's choice is still ambivalent; he does not become a prosecuting attorney but a criminal lawyer. Though he devotes himself to the law, he defends possible criminals, thereby continuing his attraction to the likes of Bill Unsworth. David realizes the contradiction inherent in his situation:

> The law gives every accused man his chance, and there must be those who do for him what he cannot do for himself; I was one of these. But I was always aware that I stood very near to the power of evil when I undertook the cases that brought me the greatest part of my reputation. I was a highly skilled, highly paid, and cunning mercenary in a fight which was as old as man and greater than man. I have consciously played the Devil's Advocate and I must say I have enjoyed it. I like the struggle, and I had better admit that I like the moral danger. I am like a man who has built his house on the lip of a volcano. Until the volcano claims me I live, in a sense, heroically. (M, p. 250)

David attempts to embody both good and evil in his Persona. He plays the part of a brilliant attorney who has connections with members of the underworld. It would be possible for them to claim David as one of their own if his personal life ever faltered. He views his Persona as heroic — a man dedicated to justice who is surrounded by the attractions of evil.

By assuming this mask, David frees himself from Boy's influence and control. David watches with disgust as Boy allows himself to be manipulated by Denyse in her quest to make him Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. David is also shocked

to hear that Pargetter died without leaving a will; David's mentor is surprisingly deficient in his own chosen domain. Once again Ramsay is allowed the final word, this time about fathers. First he puts to rest Caroline's rumour that he was David's actual father. Ramsay continues by maintaining that the natural father is not always the most important and that the chosen fathers are the significant ones. (M, p. 289)

Pargetter is David's most important chosen father. He inspires David into becoming a worthy man and a most proficient lawyer; however, David is once again a victim of fanaticism. He overcompensates and does not heed Pargetter's warning about creating his own dream world, which would be limited by his own perceptions. David's world is an intellectual one where his feeling never develops and where his image of Boy as a good man is intuitively doubted but never actually challenged. Analysis and his stay at Sorgenfrei free him of these limitations.

David's progress is a psychological one with mythic overtones, befitting a Jungian analysis. Dr. von Haller comments upon Boy's second marriage, Leola's possible murder, and the children's dislike of Boy's new wife: "Mythic pattern is common enough in contemporary life. But of course few people know the myths, and fewer still can see a pattern under a mass of detail" (M, p. 255). The title of the novel demands that David be viewed in a mythic manner; Dr. von Haller provides an interpretation of David's dream. Though David is not fa-

miliar with the idea of a manticore, the doctor argues that he can still dream of one because myths are spiritual truths and"objectivizations of images and situations that lie very deep in the human spirit" (M, p. 176).

She suggests that he is ruled by his intellect (head of a man), has undeveloped feeling (dangerous but noble animal), and is capable of wounding with verbal barbs (the tail). The aim of individuation is to make a whole of these parts. This process is mythically viewed by its devotees: "The modern hero is the man who conquers in the inner struggle" (M, p. 295). Individuation is achieved in the most symbolic part of the novel — the descent into the cave. This adventure exploits the same condition that Conrad explores in Heart of Darkness: "the ancient myth or archetypal experience of the 'night journey', of a provisional descent into the primitive and unconscious sources of being."[67]

David comes to terms with his past through this ordeal. He now recognizes the limiting elements of his Persona and the false motives primarily inspired by the faulty image of his father. This journey frees David from his particular mythic pattern — that of suffering for the sins of the father.

The artistic problem in The Manticore is David's lifelessness. David is always being manipulated: by his father, by Dr. von Haller's analysis, by Liesl's actions, and by Ramsay's summations. Interest in the novel quickens when any other character dominates the action. David himself is not actively

or overtly involved in the battle between good and evil. His claim to be a hero and to live on the lip of a volcano — always threatened by the evil around him — is sheer exaggeration. Despite his protests his life is too easy. Evil has no attraction for him: his wealth protects him from financial enticements, his emotions are immune to passions, and his cultivated taste keeps him from simple slumming. David is an average individual in terms of personality, and his sins, by most standards, are mild ones. He shows a lack of charity towards others but most of all towards himself. The successful process of individuation suggests that these wrongs will be remedied. The Manticore repeats the message of Fifth Business. Only this time it is more blatant; not only eccentrics benefit from individuation, ordinary people can also benefit from it.

The Manticore offers the least for our study of evil because it acts as a commentary on Fifth Business and is therefore repetitious. Still it does provide some new insights concerning our topic. Boy's ability to camouflage evil is completely exposed in The Manticore. The unexamined life and its evil effects are explicitly condemned; David suffers from his father's actions. Davies demonstrates how the effects of evil are not only physical but also psychological. The novel therapeutically examines the psychological evil whose origin is outside the individual. The novel also maintains that the recognition of mythic patterns can help us understand the

presence of evil in modern-day situations.

At times the novel offers hope that Davies will consider depraved evil: the bad man who knowingly chooses evil. Both Bill Unsworth and Jimmy, the convicted murderer, seem to fit in this category; however, they are not closely examined and they are merely presented as conduits through which evil acts. In The Manticore Davies confirms and develops certain ideas from Fifth Business; he also suggests some themes which will be further explored in World of Wonders.

Chapter Five
The Great Justice

Davies informs us in "The Deptford Trilogy in Retrospect" that the result of his labour in fiction in Fifth Business was quite different from his original intention. His notes suggest that one of the main characters was to have been a young parson whose pregnant wife suffers from the consequences of being hit by a snowball with a stone in it. The father becomes "queer" and teaches his son to hate the person who "killed" his mother. Revenge was to be the theme of the novel; both the father and the son seek retribution. A number of years passed, and the plan changed. Guilt became the main theme, with revenge playing a smaller part.[68]

Encouraged by the warm reception of Fifth Business, Davies continued to write about Deptford. World of Wonders conforms in a remarkable degree to the original outline of the intended first novel. Revenge is the theme of this novel; Eisengrim exacts revenge on Willard, on Staunton, and on Ingestree. Amasa Dempster never becomes an important character; however, the introduction of Willard as an evil father is an improvement upon the original design. Instead of Paul being lectured by his father about the wrong they have endured, Paul suffers daily from Willard's lust and maltreatment. The motivation for revenge is much stronger in the latter situation.

As Eisengrim recounts his life story, he places emphasis on the presence of the Devil. Paul's upbringing has been most puritanical. Satan is not portrayed as some vague ill or spiritual symbol but as an actual entity who interferes in human affairs. Eisengrim explains that, as a young child, he was depressed by the idea of going back to school and of being teased by his classmates. This mood of despair led him to consider more active wrongdoing (the stealing of fifteen cents): "Having got this far with me, Satan had me well on the path to hell" (W, p. 23).

At the fair Paul is enthralled by Willard the Wizard. The performer's very name is associated with the dark forces; his laugh is mocking and Mephistophelian. As is often the case, Paul confuses the tools of the Devil with those ofGod: "For me the Book of Revelation came alive: here was an angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory" (W, p. 28). Eisengrim later reveals to Ramsay the Devil's most insidious act. While the other Rubes were admiring Andro, the double-sexed individual, Willard fondled Paul's left buttock. Paul had no knowledge of sex, but he yielded to this first approach. Eisengrim claims that the Devil prompted him to return a smile of complicity to Willard's squeeze. Eisengrim is convinced that this act, inspired by the Devil, makes him an accomplice to the magician.

Paul's descent into hell has some similarities with Christ's Passion. Paul is sodomized in a kneeling position on a Friday:

"I thought I was being killed, and in a shameful way" (W, p. 32). Paul suffers from his wound and is not strong enough to leave the privy. Willard becomes worried and abducts Paul to conceal his crime. Paul is hidden inside Abdullah for what seems an eternity. While entombed, he does not pray, because he believes Willard has committed a "blasphemy against kneeling"; Paul now awaits God's punishment in silence. Willard and Charlie release Paul from his cell on Sunday. They both fear that he may be dead: "'Christ, he's alive,' said the strange voice; 'thank God for that'" (W, p. 46). Charlie's ironic comment and Eisengrim's account of his early life suggest that we must view Paul as some type of Antichrist - a boy who is born in the Christmas season, who experiences entombment, and who is reborn in hell.

There is an immediate suggestion that Paul will surpass his mentor. Willard would prefer Paul dead, for he doesn't know what to do with the boy: "His [Willard's] Mephistophelian air of command was gone; he looked diminished, shabby, and afraid" (W, pp. 46-7). Paul's rebirth is already draining the life out of Willard.

Willard is the most evil character in the Deptford trilogy. Paul soon realizes that the magician is unimaginative, selfish, humourless, and hateful. Only his lack of imagination prevents him from being truly diabolical. His addiction to morphine, like David's drinking, frees him from seeing his own inadequacies. His outlook is narrow and nasty: "Humanity was

divided into two groups, the Wise Guys and the Rubes, the Suckers, the Patsys. The only Wise Guys within my range were Willard and Charlie. It was the law of nature that they should prey on the others" (W, p. 114). Willard treats Paul in a manner guaranteed to produce a delinquent. He sodomizes Paul on a regular basis and forces him to spend most of his time inside the smelly confines of Abdullah where the boy's identity is erased. Paul is undernourished, filthy, vulgar, and unloved.

Willard slowly slides from one group (the Wise Guys) to the other (the Rubes) as a result of his morphine addiction. Paul realizes that he could easily ruin Abdullah's performance; however, he is too scared to implement such a design: "But do we not all play, in our minds, with terrible thoughts which we would never dare to put into action?" (W, p. 121). Paul clearly has the imagination which Willard lacks; he should be capable of greater evil than Willard or of attaining a different outlook on life.

As a moralist and as a romantic, Davies presses home his belief that "those who plough mischief and sow trouble reap as they have sown" (Job 4:8). Willard is made to pay dearly for his rape and abuse of an innocent child. In The Manticore Davies shows how a man's evil acts can cast a shadow over his reputation and over those he should have loved even after death. In World of Wonders the author shows how a man's evil acts can come to plague him even in his lifetime.

Paul exacts his revenge upon Willard when the latter is so weakened by morphine that he can no longer perform his magic show. Paul treats him with the same malevolence and lack of compassion that Willard had previously shown to Paul. He becomes the magician in the show, and Willard becomes the Wild Man in The Shame of the Old South.

Charlie and Paul have become morphine suppliers because of Willard's habit, and they are inevitably captured by the police. Eisengrim does not provide details, but he makes it quite obvious that he squealed on Charlie in order to avoid imprisonment. Thus, Paul has his revenge on Charlie for the part he played in the kidnapping.

Paul does not turn Willard in to the police, for he is not yet through with his former mentor. At considerable risk and expense Paul takes him to Europe. Eisengrim suggests that he does so because he had come to feel sympathy and responsibility for Willard: "Explain it as you will, by saying that my conscience overcame my prudence, or that there had grown up a real affection between us during all those years when I was his slave" (W, p. 142).

Paul, now Jules LeGrand, continues his career as a magician in France, where He exhibits Willard, first as a geek, then as Le Solitaire des forêts in a small circus. Eisengrim admits to his private audience that revenge was his reason for keeping Willard alive. He enjoyed controlling his oppressor, "the man who let me live hungry and dirty, who used my body

shamefully and never let me lift my head above the shame" (W, p. 144). Paul believes his opportunity for revenge to have been divinely inspired: "The lord rewarded me richly, and it seemed to me the Lord's face was dark and gleeful as he did so" (W, p. 145). It seems that Paul is once again mistaking the Devil for God:

> I was revenging myself on Willard, and I'm not going to pretend to you that when he crunched into a grass snake to give a thrill to a stable filled with dull peasants, who despised him for doing it, I didn't have a warm sense of satisfaction. The Lord was rewarding me. (W, p. 145)

Paul is now playing the role of Mephistopheles and enjoying it.

Paul even refuses Willard's request to be given a morphine overdose. Paul extends Willard's death-in-life as long as possible. Eisengrim states that there was a remarkable look of horror in Willard's face just before he died; Eisengrim wonders if he had glimpsed the horrors of the hell he was about to enter. Eisengrim is vague about the passage of years, but his account suggests that Paul spent seven years under Willard and was given seven years to take his revenge. We must remember that poetic justice is one of the pleasures of melodrama.

According to Jungian belief, Paul should become a thoroughly evil character; "Too little morality is just as damaging to the psyche as too much!"[69] Paul has suffered from both

of these extremes. Amasa Dempster was intent upon Paul becoming morally perfect. Since this is impossible, Jungians maintain that neurotic and evil effects will follow. A lack of moral principles will produce similar results. Paul's tutelage under Willard is certainly an example of the latter case. Eisengrim says of Willard: "Never steal anything trivial. This was perhaps the only moral precept Willard ever impressed on me" (W, p. 105).

Eisengrim maintains that upon Willard's death he felt himself to be "truly free, and I hoped, that I might throw off some of the unpleasant characteristics I had taken upon myself but not, I hoped forever taken within myself" (W, p. 147). It is unlikely that Paul really felt such an inclination. He is attempting to present a more pleasant picture of himself than the truth would allow. I think that Eisengrim is lying here much in the same way that he originally lies about his intention toward Willard and later lies to Ingestree when Eisengrim denies that he wanted to devour Sir John. Paul did improve, but the intention is not likely to have appeared until after he encountered Milady.

The long second section of the novel is mainly concerned with the description of a drama troupe's tour across Canada. During this time Paul improves his character. This transformation occurs mainly through the influence of two archetypes — the Anima and the Shadow. Paul's attraction to Milady is not motivated by sexual desire. He does not want to do to a woman

he likes what has been done repeatedly to him. His attraction to Milady is immediate, spiritual, and thankful (this reaction is credible when one remembers that only the women, particularly Mrs. Constantinescu, showed any sympathy to Paul in Wanless's World of Wonders). Paul admires Milady's devotion to Sir John, for such selfless love surprises him. Paul is overwhelmed by her belief that he has talent and luck; he is willing to do anything to please her. When Paul is failing in his attempt to double for Sir John, only her encouragement allows Paul to understand what is expected: "you must quite simply be him [Sir John]" (W, p. 187). With Milady's guidance Paul becomes Sir John's Doppel-Ganger. Without her, Paul would never have been able to learn from his Shadow.

As previously noted in our summary of Jung's psychology, some people's Shadows are positive because their Egos are evil. Eisengrim's description of himself, as a young tough, a pickpocket, a dope pusher, and a dirty fighter, allows us to consider him as one whose Ego is dominated by the negative. Ramsay's encounter with Jules LeGrand in France, where Ramsay was treated rudely and robbed of his wallet, further corroborates this judgement. Paul's encounter with his Shadow, Sir John, permits him to see his hidden positive attributes.

Other characters repeatedly mention the fact that Paul is the spitting image of a young Sir John; Paul gains the name Mungo Fetch as a direct result. Sir John, on the other hand, is not anxious to recognize such an unpleasant double. Milady

gives Paul lessons in voice and manners so that his outward appearance becomes more acceptable. He begins to model his private self upon Sir John. Ingestree describes Paul's adulation as "a terrible, vampire-like feeding on his personality and his spirit" (W, p. 237). Though Paul's manner is wolfish, he assumes Sir John's characteristics in much the same way as Sir John obtained his from Irving; furthermore, Paul is devoted to Sir John. He and Milady are Paul's "parents in art" — she provides the affection and he, the example. Under their tutelage Paul becomes an acceptable and responsible member of society.

Eisengrim's final stage of education occurs when he encounters Liesl. According to Jung, man strives for perfection and woman for totality.[70] Paul achieves a type of perfection in the measured and private world of a clockmaker. He is not anxious to abandon it; like Ramsay, Paul has a physical fight with Liesl before they make love. By uniting with her, he opens himself to the feminine mysteries, and he reaches Jungian wholeness. As a magician he intuitively recognizes and understands the opposite forces which are at work in the world — masculine and feminine, thinking and feeling, good and evil. With Liesl's help he produces a show which deals with these mysteries. Eisengrim is presented in a demonic light, and particular illusions, such as "The Vision of Dr. Faustus", explore the paradox of opposite and equally appealing forces.

In World of Wonders Davies is working on a level different from either of the first two novels. He is creating mythic characters so that good and evil can be treated in archetypal terms. As a child Paul has two fathers; one is devoted entirely to the good, the other, to evil. Paul goes through a learning period when he is deeply affected by an older member of the opposite sex; he is later introduced to the sexual mysteries by an ogress. This latter section is entitled "Merlin's Laugh". Eisengrim grows from a Mephistophelian wizard, one associated with evil, to a magician like Merlin, one working for the forces of good, but cognizant of evil, sometimes associated with it, and sometimes willing to use it in order to achieve the greater good.

Liesl is another archetypal figure. Ramsay identifies her as the devil in his life. She has many satanic attributes — ugliness, promiscuity, physical strength, and surprising charms. However, is she truly evil? How can she be when her acts allow Dunny, David, and Paul to realize their respective destinies? She herself undergoes a process of individuation opposite to that of Dunny and David. She is dominated by feeling; she destroys her grandfather's toy collection because of her fury. She matures when Eisengrim imposes his clockwork rationalism upon her. Her knowledge is not intuitive like his but learned. She is able to guide a hagiologist in physical torment and a lawyer in Jungian analysis to their needs because she has the feeling and the

knowledge to make them accept and understand their needs.

Liesl is Ramsay's devil because she is his opposite; Ramsay is just as much her devil. They are more representative of the tension between feeling and reason than between good and evil. She assumes the Persona of a devil and the name Vitzliputzli, "the least of the demons attending on the great magician" (W, p. 332), in the old German play, Faust, in order to be constantly reminded of this aspect of her nature.[71] She believes that it is impossible to live only for the good.

Her physique and sexual inclinations immediately suggest her role as an archetype. She is larger-than-life and does not behave according to accepted norms. She manages to be an unlikely combination of ogress, femme fatale, and earth mother. Eisengrim, on the other hand, assumes lordly airs to dominate those in his presence. His role as a magician and his association with the demonic define his archetypal role. Eisengrim and Liesl act in god-like fashion, so their dealings with morality lift the conflict between good and evil to a higher sphere.

Paul's stage name, Eisengrim, refers to his wholeness, the Jungian ideal of united opposites. Liesl chose this name from a beast-legend. Eisengrim is a great wolf, "whom everyone fears, but who is not such a bad fellow, really" (W, p. 331). The reason for the name is similar to Liesl's; it recognizes the self as a source of evil. The name also emphasizes

Eisengrim's wholeness, in this case, being liked and being feared.

The most interesting aspect of Eisengrim's wholeness in relation to our study is his personal morality or code of ethics. He no longer indulges in criminal activities; he even returns with interest the money he stole from Ramsay. He has not however become a meek and fawning Christian, willing to turn the other cheek. On both occasions when fate offers Eisengrim the opportunities for revenge, he eagerly accepts them.

Eisengrim expands upon the meaning of his name when he justifies his actions to Ramsay the historian. Eisengrim explains why he is sometimes cruel and the difference between his evil and Boy Staunton's:

> ...the name really means the sinister hardness, the cruelty of iron itself. I took the name, and recognized the fact, and thereby got it up out of my depths so that at least I could be aware of it and take a look at it, now and then. I won't say I domesticated the wolf, but I knew where his lair was, and what he might do. Not Boy Staunton. He had lived facing the sun, and he had no real comprehension of the shadow-wolf that loped after him. (W, p. 347)

Eisengrim's description of himself as a being ruled by opposite forces and aware of this fact is very similar to Jung's modern conception of God.

Eisengrim does treat Boy in a very god-like fashion. Boy fails to charm Eisengrim, to metaphorically devour him, because he recognized the wolf in Boy. The latter becomes

depressed and tells his new acquaintance about his worries concerning his duties as a Lieutenant-Governor. Eisengrim does not sympathize with Boy, for this is not the manner of a fellow wolf. Eisengrim knows that Boy is ultimately responsible for Mrs. Dempster's insanity, the miseries of his own early childhood, and his sordid experiences with the carnival. Though there is the suggestion that Eisengrim may have hypnotized Boy in Fifth Business, the former maintains in his account of that fatal night that he had no prior knowledge of the latter's intention to commit suicide. Even if Eisengrim is once again lying, a hypnotist cannot force somebody to act against his own wishes. Eisengrim claims not to have taken an active role in Boy's death and this is likely, but he also did nothing to prevent it.

Eisengrim believes in something called the Great Justice. It is very similar to Davies' belief about people reaping what they sow: "Everybody gets their lumps and their bouquets and it goes on for quite a while after death" (W, p. 355). Eisengrim senses that Boy is about to meet the Great Justice, and he does not want to interfere with its workings out of a misguided sense of compassion. He does not worry about the death of a man who was so careless about his own birth. Thus, Eisengrim justifies his behaviour both personally and universally.

Eisengrim treats Ingestree in a similar fashion. It is not as serious an incident as the former, for he merely wants

to humiliate Ingestree much in the same way as Sir John was humiliated. One interesting aspect of this encounter is the magician's continued identification with the Devil. During a discussion about the connection between humour and evil, Ingestree toasts the Devil. Both Lind and Ramsay are upset by this. Ramsay suggests that Ingestree may be the butt of one of the Devil's jokes. Ingestree, annoyed by this, mocks Ramsay's suggestion. Eisengrim is not present, but he has recognized his old foe and is already plotting his revenge. His darker side will make Ingestree the butt of a number of jokes.

Later Eisengrim offers to be tactful in the telling of his story. Once again Ingestree defies fate and requests "the brutalities of truth" (W, p. 221). Eisengrim does so and presents Roly in the most damaging light possible. The magician justifies such behaviour as natural and part of the Great Justice: "I try not to judge people, though when I meet an enemy and he's within arm's length, I'm not above giving him a smart clout, just to larn him. As I did with Roly" (W, p. 355).

Eisengrim has an intuitive grasp of what Liesl calls the Magian World View. She adopted this world outlook of the Middle Ages from Spengler's works. It is a world where wonder and beauty exist side by side with roughness and cruelty. Eisengrim's early life is dominated by the former, but his later life is dominated by the latter. He is willing to

accept these opposites as necessary, and he even sees good resulting from evil. If Boy had not thrown the snowball and if Willard had not abducted a little boy, Eisengrim doubts that he would ever have become a world famous magician.

The progress of Eisengrim's consciousness is similar to Jung's theory concerning God's evolution. In the beginning Paul is dominated by feeling and is anxious to gain revenge upon Willard. Eisengrim later learns to control his urges. Though he no longer seeks revenge, he does not deny an opportunity to gain revenge. He prefers to think that he is partaking in the Great Justice — a very god-like belief. He does not forgive sins out of compassion, for his outlook on this matter is medieval and not contemporary. He holds individuals responsible for their acts, and he does not accept the theory that outside forces control the individuals and deprive them of any free choice or action. Paul's upbringing encourages a natural tendency for evil and undisciplined action: however, when manners and morals are impressed upon him, he is able to control the two opposing forces within himself and to assume the role of a divine archetype.

I do not believe that Eisengrim's behaviour is meant to be a model for moral behaviour; after all, he is supernatural and we are human. History and contemporary events demonstrate that it is presumptuous and dangerous for someone to decide he knows God's will. Davies uses these archetypes, Eisengrim and Liesl, to combat the contemporary belief that compassion

is preferable to a strict code of ethics. Compassion would have allowed wrongdoers to escape their just punishment. Davies creates a world where harmful consequences result if too great an emphasis is placed on either evil or good. Willard's acts of immediate gratification cause harm to others and bring about his ultimate ruin. Ramsay's driving desire to make amends creates some new problems and limits his emotional growth.

Davies does deal with the problem of depraved evil in World of Wonders. Willard chooses evil because it is the easiest way for him to satisfy his desires. This escapism also prevents him from improving his art and attaining his desire of making the big-time. His choices lead to a vile end, for his failure to recognize conflicts in nature brings about individual stasis. World of Wonders repeats in archetypal terms the message Jung first proclaimed:

> And just as the conscious mind can put the question, "Why is there this frightful conflict between good and evil?," so the unconscious can reply, "Look closer! Each needs the other. The best, just because it is the best, holds the seed of evil, and there is nothing so bad but good can come of it."[72]

Chapter Six

Conclusion

The lives of the characters in the Deptford trilogy span this century. When they are contrasted with contemporaries from the novels surveyed in the introductory chapter of this thesis, we note Davies' superior consideration of our topic and his view of Canadian society through these earlier decades.

Deptford is, both geographically and imaginatively, miles removed from Avonlea. Dunny and Percy are ten years old when thy are involved in the snowball incident. Anne, in her world, is eleven when Matthew picks her up at the railway station. Though Anne is an orphan and has been vaguely mistreated by a drunken step-father, she is bubbly, innocent, and optimistic. The Anglican religion and the Prince Edward Island community very likely contributed to this attitude. Her religion is forward-looking, positive, and somewhat naive; Anne even argues for women ministers at one point in the story — an issue that has been taken up in recent times. Deptford is more realistic than Avonlea and much more typical of Canadian experience. The Catholic and Calvinist philosophy of damnation was preached to more and larger congregations than the Anglican message of salvation. Dunny's guilt, his fear of sensual pleasure, and his repressed sexuality were more common to Canada than Anne's "normal" development.

The authors choose to dwell on different aspects and possibilities in life. Montgomery sees good and innocence; Anne is adopted by stern but loving parents. Davies sees evil and depravity; Paul is abducted by a foul and cruel mountebank. Anne of Green Gables is a regional idyll; the community is good and the future rosy. Montgomery writes about life as it could or should be; not as it is. The Deptford trilogy is a realistic romance; some in the community are basically good, others are bad. Davies writes about life as it is, but he believes in and provides for poetic justice. We will have to decide later if this latter trait is akin to Montgomery — writing about life as it should be.

The most noticeable difference between Mariposa and Deptford turns on the question of sin. Josh Smith's comic wrongdoings never have any serious harmful results, not even incidental ones; nobody is injured when the over-insured church burns down. The publican is slyly condemned in the work, but Josh's acts are probably considered meritorious by most readers because these deeds seem useful. In Deptford, on the other hand, an intention to harm brings severe consequences. Dunny is injured much more by using the Dempsters as a shield than if he had been hit by the snowball; furthermore, the Dempsters, innocent bystanders, are destroyed. If one of Davies' characters kept a bar open after closing hours, this would surely lead to a car accident or a family quarrel or a serious brawl.

Davies illustrates the double effects of an act. If one person (Josh or Boy) must get his way, then others will be deprived of their rights. Defrauding an insurance company may serve the local interest, but it is surely a provincial or a national wrong. Somebody is paying for this too expensive church. Leacock glosses over this fact, and he allows Josh's charm and Judge Pepperleigh's warped sense of justice to treat arson as justifiable — a case of the little guy duping the city-slicker. Davies refuses to turn a similar blind eye. Boy is much more charming and debonair than Josh; yet this does not redeem or justify Boy's selfish acts, for they are shown to have harmful consequences.

Light-hearted evil does not exist in Deptford. It did exist in Salterton, but Davies' outlook probably changed as he aged. According to Jung, man goes through a transformation in mid-life, "the change is an intellectual and spiritual one of profound consequence, and this is something observable in the careers of virtually all writers of the kind we are talking about here — the committed writers, the servants of the writer's conscience."[73] Davies' main criticism about Leacock centers on this point. Davies argues that Leacock was never allowed or never allowed himself to change his style so that it reflected a more mature consciousness. Instead he continued writing in his whimsical, commercially successful, but artistically unevolved manner.[74] Davies, however, recognized the need to change and was criticized for doing so:

> When the book [Fifth Business] appeared, first of all, in Canada, I was wryly amused by its reception. Canadian reviewers on the whole did not like it, and a few of them seemed almost affronted by what they thought of as a change in my tone. I had been, they said, a comic novelist, and they gave their readers to understand that a comic novelist was not a very considerable creature. I could have said to them, in Dr. Johnson's words, that "it was bitterness which they mistook for frolick," but I do not suppose they would have understood. The seriousness of Fifth Business showed an instability in my character of which they could not approve. One of them referred to me as "an old-timer" who seemed to have quitted the field of novel-writing and was now seeking to make a comeback.[75]

This change in tone helps to explain why Mariposa is a sunny town with some hidden wrongs, and Deptford is a shadowy town with some gleams of good. Davies maintains that Leacock reached a self-knowledge which he never revealed in his humorous works; his last work, the autobiographical fragment The Boy I Left Behind Me, brings to light his hidden perception.[76] Since Leacock did not deal with the darker aspect of human nature in his fiction, he failed to grow as an artist. Most, if not all, of his later work is inferior to Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town because he shies away from truths which he began to explore in Mariposa. Davies' work, on the other hand, shows a marked improvement. Humour is used occasionally in the Deptford trilogy but never as an end in itself. Davies is willing to risk his former readers' approbation in order to deal seriously with concerns that demand more than just a light treatment.

In Wild Geese Ostenso displayed some of the melodramatic mechanics of retribution that we find in Davies. He is, in fact, more precise (considering the chronology of the two authors' works) in providing Old Testament patterns of revenge. Willard is made to suffer for his past misdeeds when Paul indulges in the philosophy of "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand and foot for foot" (Exodus 21:24). Ostenso merely provides for Caleb's ironic death; Caleb neither suffers nor realizes the harm he has committed.

Though both Davies and Ostenso provide obvious villains, the authors differ in their treatment of the presence of evil. The ending of Wild Geese suggests that Caleb's death completely removes the pervasive influence of evil; the lovers marry, the family enjoys some physical comforts, and the atmosphere becomes idyllic. Davies, on the other hand, stresses that a Shadow is present within all people and that one person's demise does not bring peace of mind to others. Willard's death does not free Paul from his own past. Boy's suicide is his final and fitting comment on the worth of his own inner life. His death further complicates David's confused feelings toward his father, and it does not bring any relief of guilt to Ramsay. Indeed only Ramsay's previous realization of his limited guilt allowed him to play the role of Fifth Business. Davies is insistent on a constant balance between good and evil, so the latter can never be made to disappear as it apparently does in Wild Geese.

The villains' motives are also quite different. Caleb's malevolence is not convincingly accounted for; it is presented as some type of aberration. The novel suggests that Caleb would have been quite different had Amelia been a virgin when they married. Boy, in contrast, is always selfish. In order to get his own way as a boy, he is willing to cheat: note the stone in the snowball, his school-role as a bully, and his affair with Mabel when he is going steady with Leola. He follows this pattern throughout His life. Willard is similar, for he has no self-discipline; he indulges his immediate desires without any consideration for others or of the future. Davies' characters are not unaware of being possessed by evil, a striking contrast to Caleb, who uses the Bible to justify his acts.

Callaghan's Such Is My Beloved is the work in our survey which would likely receive the least sympathy from Davies, since he is not fond of the purely realistic school of writing.[77] Callaghan is the Canadian most associated with realism and the "notion (concept is too definite a word) of man as a derelict and irresponsible creature existing in a world where no moral values apply."[78] Davies prefers the classic point of view: "[the] Judaeo-Christian concept of Man as a being with freedom of choice, responsible to the God who created him."[79] Davies writes approvingly of Edmund Fuller's Man in Modern Fiction:

> He [Fuller] particualrly attacks the sentimental attitude which their creators [James Jones, Norman Mailer and their ilk] take toward characters who are demonstrably criminal, representing them as victims of a society much worse than they; this leads to the sentimentality which exalts the genial rapist, and finds in the keeper of a bawdy house a philosopher and perhaps a saint.[80]

This statement does not refer specifically to Such Is My Beloved, but it is surprisingly applicable to this novel. The two prostitutes are depicted as victims; the society, represented by the Bishop, the lawyer, and his wife, is portrayed as considerably worse than these two wretches. Callaghan tries to elevate two drab and basically boring prostitutes into meaningful symbols; the author is sentimental in his attempt to have them viewed as martyrs. Davies may hold that fate often guides our lives; but he also argues that we should pay attention to what some people call luck, for such instances may be signs to follow a particular path. Such openmindedness, combined with the process of individuation, and a belief in the Great Justice free man from viewing life as predetermined.

Davies believes in free will; however, he illustrates how unexamined lives can become preordained. Boy never questions the direction of his life, so it is not surprising that he becomes a creature of habit and repetition. Willard, a very convincing criminal, is not a victim of society; he is a victim of his own whims and vices. He allows himself to become a slave to morphine — his life is truly in his hands at this

point in time. As the morphine takes over his will, he ceases to reflect, and his life slides into Paul's hands. Ramsay, David, Eisengrim, and Liesl are all victims at some point in their life. They do not succumb to their situation. They suffer, they reflect, they accept and react to positive signs, they attain individuation, and they control their lives to the extent that they believe themselves responsible for the consequences of their actions.

Davies rejects the dominant attitude of the novel of social realism, that is, compassion. This feeling is too often used to upset the scales of the Great Justice. Evil is forgiven without admission of guilt; evil is even condoned because the concept of free will is viewed as illusory. Such beliefs allow villains to escape punishment and to be sometimes considered victims or antiheroes. No such moral confusion exists in the Deptford trilogy.

Like Davies, Hugh MacLennan is a didactic novelist. He added a section to conclude his novel Two Solitudes in order to provide an optimistic ending. It was more important for the author to make a positive statement concerning the political future of Canada, in a possibly flawed work, than to risk being misinterpreted in a more unified one.[81] John Moss sees a similar tendency in Davies' work: "Fifth Business alone stands as a major achievement. The other two are exercises of an author determined to write with meaning and import no matter what the cost to art."[82] This penchant for moral-

izing, which the two authors share, may help explain Davies' warm reviews of a number of MacLennan's novels.[83]

The first section of Two Solitudes is representative of its time — a plea for compassion and understanding. MacLennan provides an historical context for the confrontation between the two cultures; he traces the racial conflict back to its sources. He demonstrates how Tallard is made a pawn to powers he neither understands nor recognizes. Tallard receives no pity from his tormentors. MacLennan here is different from Callaghan, for though we feel compassion for Tallard, we also realize that he himself is partly responsible for his plight, whereas the two prostitutes in Callaghan's novel seem blameless for their predicament.

The second section of Two Solitudes provides an alternate method for coping with life, a way of life not dependent on other people's good will. Self-knowledge is necessary if we are to have any hope of understanding the consequences of our actions. Davies formalizes this belief by identifying it with the process of individuation. He also has his villains lead unreflected lives; this further associates evil with ignorance. Davies would seem to agree with MacLennan's general moral direction, but he is even more explicit than MacLennan in showing how people are responsible for their own acts, and he is less willing than MacLennan to apportion blame to society, tradition, or any other outside force.

Davies' style is well suited to his purpose; it has been

called the Tory Mode, a style which makes some affirmation of the values of the past.[84] MacLulich builds on this idea and writes: "This term designates a style marked by a high incidence of slightly old-fashioned syntactic habits. Its tone is formal and dignified, touched occasionally by pedantry or stuffiness."[85] MacLulich further argues that this mode is the stylistic norm in Canada and that it reveals a marked difference between Canadian and American writing. He chooses MacLennan and Davies as the main exemplars of the Tory Mode and Callaghan as the major representative of the American colloquial style. MacLennan and Davies share a similar style, purpose, and moral outlook in their novels.

These two authors also share an historical perspective. MacLennan's novel is the first in our survey to cover an extensive time span and to provide more than fleeting glimpses of a character's past. Davies' biographical manner provides an even more complete picture of each character's life. It particularly provides insights concerning the behaviour of the negative characters. Two Solitudes probes Paul's soul but not that of his half-brother Marius; the Deptford trilogy probes both Ramsay's soul and that of his Shadow Boy Staunton.

We have previously noted the similarity between Klein's theodicy and Davies'. Eisengrim's Great Justice examplifies their common belief — we may not understand God's will, but we do wrong to hinder it or to question it. Davies' characters, however, do not reach this decision through an accep-

tance of traditional religion; they attain wisdom through self-reflection and through the consideration of many myths. The Judaic religion is but one of many sources for these myths.

Davies' biographical manner allows his novels to consider the problem of evil in a more comprehensive manner than the earlier Canadian works reviewed in our survey. His works represent a continuation and not a break with Canadian tradition, since he writes in the Tory Mode. He is a moralist, as most Canadians tend to be. This very fact presupposes the action in the Deptford trilogy. Justice exists, so the good man will be rewarded and the bad man will be punished. There is even an optimistic view of evil — its ultimate role is to produce good.

If Davies were a cynic instead of a moralist, evil might triumph in his works, or the outcome between the contrary forces might be left in doubt. In such a case his moral philosophy might turn on a tragic ambiguity or an existential doubt. Davies, of course, does not have a universal answer to the problem of pain and evil, nor does he make such a claim, yet he holds to an orthodox moral position. He writes in a letter:

> Jung's attitude appears to me to be that Ultimate Good and Ultimate Evil are beyond human comprehension or control; the best we can do is put the best of our carefully adjusted selves at the service of what appears to us, under given circumstances, to

> be Good — but we must never make the mistake of thinking we have some final answer to what Goodness may be.[86]

Davies treats evil in a particularly Canadian way; extreme, global evil is not part of his consideration. Except for the disgraceful treatment of the native peoples, Canada's History (in contrast to others) is not particularly marked by wars, corruptions, debauches, genocide, or other large-scale wrongs. When Davies does deal with war, he suggests that rationalism cannot make sense of it: "For three years I [Ramsay] had kept my nerve by stifling my intelligence..." (F, p. 83). Perhaps Davies does not deal with real horrors in his novels, evil on a grand scale, because he cannot understand such disasters, he can only feel them.

Davies chooses to believe that a propitious design allows good to result from even the vilest wrong (Willard's mistreatment of Paul contributes to his career as a magician). This belief separates Davies from the dark school of modern realism where despair reigns. Davies occasionally seems to force a false view of life on his readers much as Montgomery did in Anne of Green Gables. These occasions, however, are only personal examples of a world-wide balance, and they are much more credible if viewed universally rather than individually. Some people are portrayed as victims and remain victims throughout the work. Mary Dempster is such an exam-

ple, even Ramsay ceases to insist that she is a saint. Padre Blazon cannot explain her situation except to suggest that it may have been necessary to allow for a greater good. Davies' contention, that man reaps what he sows, colours all his fiction, and some may find it too didactic for this reason; however, his further contention, that the harvest is not always recognizable, protects his fiction from becoming mere moralizing, and the world which is described in his novels cannot be reduced to a simple formula (or even a complex one) as it can be in Montgomery's world.

World of Wonders deals extensively with this theme of poetic justice, of reaping what you sow, and of good resulting from the vilest evil. Paul's personal mistreatment compares with that suffered in concentration camps. He is Nobody, physically mistreated, and deprived of his individuality. The wonder of the novel is not his survival but his moral growth. The cynic may scoff, but this effect is real, for it has occurred with inmates who have survived the horrors of a death camp or with poor people who live in the lowest of hovels. Such instances, both actual and fictional, are illustrations for the Beatitudes as principles for human behaviour.

Though Davies is bound by a traditional view of the outcome of the battle between the two opposing forces, his description of the actual conflict is not orthodox. He rejects the doctrinaire theory that good is to be embraced

and its opposite is to be shunned. Influenced by Jungian psychology, which, in turn, had been influenced by Nietzsche and his rejection of moral systems, Davies flirts with the idea of the Superman (Eisengrim) beyond the constraints of morality. History has shown that such a theory is easy to misinterpret and dangerous when misapplied.

Perhaps partly for the above reason Davies maintains that his novels should not be taken as a guide to conduct.[87] He is also insistent that Jungian psychology is not a moral system.[88] Still, one of our tasks must be to examine individuation and its possible moral effects. One of the aims of individuation, to recognize and work a little closer with the personal Shadow, may be enlightening, but it also seems dangerous. Not one of the characters who undergoes individuation in the Deptford trilogy accepts evil as his master; and yet such a possibility is suggested by this Jungian situation. Is this not why orthodox religion guides man in one direction only? Surely it would be better for mankind if an individual were to remain repressed rather than that he should discover his natural tendency to do wrong. If Willard had become individuated, would he have become a better person or a heightened, more diabolical villain? These questions are not answered in the Deptford trilogy; but the imagination is intrigued by such potentialities.

Davies' most recent novel, The Rebel Angels, deals with some of these questions. The central character, Parlabane,

would seem to be a bad person who knowingly chooses evil — an individuated villain. Some themes, pertinent to our topic and present in the Deptford trilogy, reappear in this new work. The Great Justice is Balance, a Gypsy woman's view of the world; a naive, one-sided view of charity and goodness produces a "patsy", not a Christian; and misplaced compassion is likewise condemned.[89] Davies' continued interest and concern with this problem suggests that this inquiry is ongoing and probably unanswerable.

Perhaps Davies' emphasis on duty prevents any of the individuated characters in theDeptford trilogy from following such a path as Parlabane's. Ramsay's sense of responsibility sets him off from Staunton at an early age; this difference, more than any other, explains their divergent paths. As a result of the guilt that Ramsay feels, he takes on responsibilities and duties which lead him to self-understanding. Once he has attained this state, he is able to indulge in positive acts (love-making and plain-speaking), which he previously would have condemned. Eisengrim is an even sterner example of self-discipline; recognition of one's Shadow does not mean domination by the Shadow. Though Eisengrim enjoys his satanic airs, he does not allow himself to be ruled by the wolf within himself. He believes and obeys something greater than himself — the Great Justice.

The novel suggests that accepted moral conduct should be followed unless one understands why one should deviate from

it. Even the strange denizens of Wanless's World of Wonders follow conventional morality; they prefer not be be suspicious of Willard's young "cousin" for fear of what they may learn. Willard breaks the moral code, and he has no justification for such behaviour. Eisengrim, who also breaks the moral code, knows exactly what he is doing and why. Eisengrim's and Ramsay's acts might be excused by one of Christ's apocryphal sayings, one which Davies is surely familiar with, for it appears in Jung's Answer to Job: "Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and a transgressor of the law."[90]

Davies does not have his positive characters indulge in moral experimentation. They reach a consciousness which is easily misunderstood because it seeks a balance rather than a goal. They believe in moral duty and some unidentifiable thing which is greater than they; this prevents their lives from ever becoming wasted in self-indulgence. The novel suggests that one should follow traditional behaviour if one cannot or chooses not to reach individuation. The orthodox moral code contains truths of myth, archetype, and religion; it is allied with the Great Justice. Man disobeys the moral code at his own risk.

The source of evil is within man, within his historical unconsciousness, and within the dualism of God. Since it is impossible to fully comprehend even the first of these entities, it is impossible to be sure of ever completely under-

standing the nature of evil. One of Man's archetypal traits, the habit of partaking in impossible quests, raises man's consciousness. Davies is in this long line of adventurers who add to mankind's knowledge; he struggles with the problem of evil in his novels while knowing that certitude is impossible in this domain. He portrays man as once again a responsible being; however, he breaks with this earlier Christian tradition by maintaining that the basic choices are not outside our being but within our very soul.

Notes

1 Desmond Pacey, Creative Writing in Canada, 2nd ed. (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1961), pp. 269-70.

2 Robertson Davies, "The Devil's Burning Throne," in One Half of Robertson Davies (New York: Penguin Books, 1978), p. 199, hereafter cited as One Half.

3 Pacey, p. 102.

4 L.M. Montgomery, Anne of Green Gables (1908; rpt. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1942), p. 84.

5 Montgomery, p. 254.

6 Claude T. Bissell, "Literary Taste in Central Canada during the late Nineteenth Century," in Twentieth Century Essays on Confederation Literature, ed. Lorraine McMullen (Ottawa: The Tecumseh Press, 1976), p. 32.

7 Ronald Cameron, "The Enchanted Houses: Leacock's Irony," in The Canadian Novel in the Twentieth Century, ed. George Woodcock (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1975), pp. 1-3. The author and Malcolm Ross argue that Leacock is an ironist, not as satiric as Davies claims, but also not as sympathetic as Pacey maintains.

8 Stephen Leacock, Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town (1912; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1960), p. 13.

9 Leacock, p. 12.

10 Robertson Davies, Feast of Stephen (Toronto: McClelland and Steward Ltd., 1970), p. 19.

11 Martha Ostenso, Wild Geese (1925; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Steward Ltd., 1961), p. 17.

12 Ostenso, p. 19.

13 Ostenso, pp. 19-20.

14 Carlyle King, "Introduction," in The Wild Geese (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1961), p. X.

15 Ostenso, p. 102.

16 Ostenso, pp. 34, 42, 77, 119, 130, and 193.

17 Ostenso, p. 233.

18 Davies, "The Devil's Burning Throne," p. 198.

19 Morley Callaghan, Such Is My Beloved (1934; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1957), p. 46.

20 Callaghan, p. 123

21 Pacey, p. 211.

22 A.M. Klein, The Second Scroll (1951; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1969), p. 22.

23 Klein, p. 100.

24 Klein, pp. 88-89.

25 Klein, pp. 92-93.

26 Pacey, pp. 102-103.

27 W.D. Niven, "Good and Evil," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 1913 ed. VI, 318. "There is the evil which befalls us, which we suffer and endure, on the other hand, there is evil which we do."

28 Leroy E. Loenker, "Theodicy," Dictionary of the History of Ideas, 1973 ed. IV, 378-383.

29 Robertson Davies, "The Conscience of the Writer," in One Half, p. 131.

30 Loenker, pp. 380-81.

31 C.G. Jung, Answer to Job in The Portable Jung, trans. R.F.C. Hull, ed. Joseph Campbell (New York: Penguin Books, 1971), p. 520.

32 Personal interview with Robertson Davies, 12 February 1981. Professor Davies discourages people from applying a too academic reading of his works (i.e. Davies borrowed certain thoughts, themes, models from previous writers); however, he did advise me to read Answer to Job in order to understand his feelings on the problem of evil.

33 Jung, Answer to Job, p. 534.

34 Jung, Answer to Job, p. 556.

35 Jung, Answer to Job, pp. 572-73.

36 Robertson Davies, "Gleams and Glooms," in One Half, p. 243.

37 Robertson Davies, "Phantasmagoria and Dream Grotto," in One Half, p. 208.

38 Robertson Davies, "Thunder Without Rain," in One Half, p. 266.

39 Robertson Davies, "Thunder Without Rain," p. 269.

40 Robertson Davies, The Manticore (London: Macmillan London Ltd., 1973), p. 92. Further references to this work appear in the text, hereafter cited as M.

41 Liliane Frey-Rohn, "The Psychological View," in Evil, The Curatorium of the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967), pp. 167-68.

42 Frey-Rohn, p. 175.

43 C.G. Jung, "The Relations Between the Ego and the Unconscious," in The Portable Jung, pp. 121-22.

44 Jung, "The Relations Between the Ego and the Unconscious," p. 123.

45 Joseph Campbell, "Editor's Introduction," in The Portable Jung, p. XXVI.

46 Campbell, p. XXVII.

47 Robertson Davies, "Ham and Tongue," in One Half, pp. 16-17.

48 Robertson Davies, Fifth Business (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada Ltd., 1970), p. 6. Further references to this work appear in the text, hereafter cited as F.

49 Robertson Davies, "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," Saturday Night (22 June 1957), rpt. in The Enthusiasms of Robertson Davies, by Robertson Davies, ed. Judith Skelton Grant (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1979), p. 173.

50 Davies, "Ham and Tongue," p. 17.

51 Frey-Rohn, pp. 161-62.

52 Wilfred Cude, "Historiography and Those Damned Saints: Shadow and Light in Fifth Business," Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 47-67 and "Miracle and Art in Fifth Business; or, Who the Devil is Liselotte Vitzliputzli?" Journal of Canadian Studies, 9, No. 4 (1974), pp. 3-16.

53 Cude, "Miracle and Art," pp. 10-15.

54 Davies, "Ham and Tongue," p. 17.

55 Davies, "Ham and Tongue," p. 17.

56 Robertson Davies, A Mixture of Frailties (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1958), pp. 71-75.

57 Davies, "Phantasmagoria and Dream Grotto," p. 214.

58 Robertson Davies, World of Wonders (New York: The Viking Press, 1976), p. 340. Further references to this work appear in the text, hereafter cited as W.

59 Robertson Davies, "The Deadliest of Sins" in One Half, p.66.

60 Personal interview with Robertson Davies, 12 February 1981.

61 Robertson Davies, "The Deptford Trilogy in Retrospect," in Studies in Robertson Davies' Deptford Trilogy, ed. Robert G. Lawrence and Samuel L. Macey (Victoria: University of Victoria, 1980), pp. 8-9.

62 Davies, "The Deptford Trilogy in Retrospect," p. 9.

63 Personal interview with Robertson Davies, 12 February 1981.

64 Judith Skelton Grant, Robertson Davies (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1978), p. 37.

65 Robertson Davies, "Bartlett's Familiar Quotations," in The Enthusiasms of Robertson Davies, pp. 113-115.

66 John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations, ed. Emily Morison Berk, 15th ed. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), p. 77.

67 Albert J. Guerard, "Introduction," in Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness and The Secret Sharer (Toronto: The New American Library, 1950), p. 9

68 Davies, "The Deptford Trilogy in Retrospect," pp. 7-8.

69 Frey-Rohn, p. 160.

70 Jung, Answer to Job, p. 561.

71 Marilyn Chapman, "Female Archetypes in Fifth Business," Canadian Literature, No. 80 (Spring, 1979), pp. 131-38. This article notes that Huitzilopchtli is an Aztec god noted for his aggressive, war-like nature, and "Heinrich Heine Germanized Huitzilopchtli to Vitzliputzli in his poem by the same name". This fact further confirms Liesl's desire to remember and not repress the violent aspect of her nature.

72 Jung, "The Relations Between the Ego and the Unconscious," p. 133.

73 Davies, "The Conscience of the Writer," p. 126.

74 Davies, "The Conscience of the Writer," p. 129.

75 Davies, "The Deptford Trilogy in Retrospect," p. 8.

76 Davies, "The Conscience of the Writer," p. 129.

77 Personal interview with Robertson Davies, 12 February 1981. Davies informed me that he personally admires Morley Callaghan but has not read much of his work. Davies explained that he was not much attracted to "tough-guy", realistic writing.

78 Robertson Davies, A Voice from the Attic (New York: The Viking Press, 1972), p 343.

79 Davies, A Voice from the Attic, p. 343.

80 Davies, A Voice from the Attic, p. 344.

81 Personal interview with Hugh MacLennan, 19 October 1981.

82 John Moss, Sex and Violence in the Canadian Novel (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), p. 108.

83 Robertson Davies, "Disaster and a Canadian Family," Saturday Night (11 October 1941) and "MacLennan's Rising Sun," Saturday Night (28 March 1959), both rpt. in the Well-Tempered Critic: One Man's View of Theatre and Letters in Canada, by Robertson Davies, ed. Judith Skelton Grant (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1981), pp. 148-49 and pp. 213-16.

84 Robert Cluett, "Robertson Davies: The Tory Mode," Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), p. 41.

85 T.D. MacLulich, "Colloquial Style and the Tory Mode," Canadian Literature, No. 89 (1981), p. 7.

86 Letter received from Robertson Davies, 13 October 1981.

87 Letter received from Robertson Davies, 13 October 1981. "I am a novelist, not a philosopher, or a Jungian

analyst, and what I write in my novels is primarily fiction, and must be examined as fiction —that is to say, not trivial or irresponsible utterance, but certainly not a guide to good conduct or a final answer to problems of the uttermost difficulty."

88 Letter received from Robertson Davies, 21 August 1981. "Do not mistake Jungian psychology for a moral system: it is an investigation of what is, not an adjuration to virtue."

89 Robertson Davies, The Rebel Angels (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1981), p. 268, p. 117 and p. 296.

90 Jung, Answer to Job, p.606.

Works Consulted

Primary Sources

Davies, Robertson. The Diary of Samuel Marchbanks. Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1947.

---------. The Enthusiasms of Robertson Davies. Ed. Judith Skelton Grant. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1979.

---------. Fifth Business. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1970.

---------. Leaven of Malice. 1954; rpt. Markham: Penguin Books, 1980.

---------. The Manticore. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1973.

---------. Marchbanks' Almanac. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967.

---------. A Mixture of Frailties. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1958.

---------. One Half of Robertson Davies. New York: Penguin Books, 1978.

---------. Question Time. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1975.

---------. The Rebel Angels. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1981.

---------. The Table Talk of Samuel Marchbanks. Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1949.

---------. Tempest-Tost. 1951; rpt. Markham: Penguin Books, 1980.

---------. A Voice from the Attic. 1960; rpt. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.

---------. The Well-Tempered Critic: One Man's View of Theatre and Letters in Canada. Ed. Judith Skelton Grant. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1981.

---------. World of Wonders. New York: The Viking Press, 1975.

Secondary Sources

Ahern, M.B. The Problem of Evil. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Bartlett, John. Familiar Quotations. Ed. Emily Morison Beck. 15th ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980.

Baltensperger, Peter. "Battle with the Trolls." Canadian Literature, No. 71 (1976), pp. 59-67.

Bonnycastle, Stephen. "Robertson Davies and the Ethics of Monologue." Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 20-40.

Brown, E.K. Responses and Evaluations: Essays on Canada, D. Staines, Ed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1977.

Buber, Martin. Good and Evil, Two Interpretations: I, Right and Wrong. II, Images of Good and Evil. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Buitenhuis, Elspeth MacGregor. Robertson Davies. Toronto: Forum House, 1972.

Callaghan, Morley. Such Is My Beloved. 1934; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1957.

Cameron, Donald. Conversations with Canadian Novelists. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1973.

Cavendish, Richard. The Powers of Evil: in Western Religion, Magic and Folk Belief. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Chapman, Marilyn. "Female Archetypes in Fifth Business" Canadian Literature, No. 80 (1979), pp. 131-138.

Cluett, Robert. "Robertson Davies: The Tory Mode." Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 41-46.

Conrad, Joseph. Heart of Darkness and The Secret Sharer. Toronto: The New American Library, 1950.

Cude, Wilfrid. "'Fake as Harlots' Oaths' — Dunny Ramsay Looks at Huck Finn." Studies in Canadian Literature, 2 (1977), pp. 164-187.

---------. "Historiography and Those Damned Saints: Shadow and Light in Fifth Business." Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 47-67.

---------. "Miracle and Art in Fifth Business; or, Who the Devil is Liselotte Vitzliputzli?" Journal of Canadian Studies, 9, No. 4 (1974), pp. 3-16.

Davy, Paul. "The Structure of Davies's Deptford Trilogy." Essays on Canadian Literature, No. 9 (Winter 1977-1978), pp. 123-133.

Dombrowski, Theo and Eileen. "'Every Man's Judgement': Robertson Davies's Courtroom." Studies in Canadian Literature, 3 (1978), pp. 47-61.

Duckett, Eleanor Shipley. Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars. Hamden, Conn.: Archor Books, 1967.

---------. Saint Dunstan of Canterbury. New York: Norton, 1955.

Edinborough, Arnold. "Davies Speaks on Problem of Evil." Canadian Churchman, 103, 1 (Jan. 1977), p. 25.

English, Zoe Collins. "Internal Worlds: a Thematic Study of the later Novels of Robertson Davies" Diss. M.A. McGill University, 1976.

Fuller, Edmund. Man in Modern Fiction. New York: Random House, 1958.

Gerson, Carole. "Dunstan Ramsay's Personal Mythology." Essays on Canadian Writing, No. 6 (1977), pp. 100-108.

Goetsch, Paul (ed.). HUGH MACLENNAN IN Critical Views on Canadian Writers. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson, 1973.

Grant, Judith Skelton. Robertson Davies. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1978.

Hastings, James (ed.). Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 13 vols. Edinburg : T. and T. Clark, 1913.

Heintzman, Ralph. "The Virtues of Reverence." Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 1, 2, 92-95.

Jung, C.G. The Portable Jung. Trans. R.F.C. Hull, Ed. Joseph Campbell, New York: Penguin Books, 1971.

Jung, C.G. and von Franz, M.L. (eds.), Man and His Symbols. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1972.

Jung Institute Zurich (ed). Evil: Essays, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

Keith, W.J. "The Manticore: Psychology and Fictional Technique." Studies in Canadian Literature, 3 (1978), pp. 47-61.

Klein, A.M. The Second Scroll, 1951; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1969.

Klinck, Carl F. (ed.). Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English. 3 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Knowles, David. Saints and Scholars: Twenty-Five Medieval Portraits. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1962.

Lawrence, Robert G. and Macey, Samuel L. (eds.). Studies in Robertson Davies' Deptford Trilogy. Victoria: University of Victoria, 1980.

Leacock, Stephen. Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town. 1912; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1960.

Legate, David M. Stephen Leacock: A Biography. Toronto: Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1970.

Lewis, C.S. The Problem of Pain. 1940; rpt. Glasgow: William Collins Sons, 1980.

Lucas, Alec. Hugh MacLennan. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1970.

MacLennan, Hugh. Two Solitudes, 1944; rpt. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1957.

MacLulich, T.D. "Colloquial Style and the Tory Mode." Canadian Literature, No. 89 (1981), pp. 7-21.

McCloskey, Henry John. God and Evil. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974.

McMullen, Lorraine (ed.). Twentieth Century Essays on Confederation Literature. Ottawa: The Tecumseh Press, 1976.

McPherson, Hugo. "The Mask of Satire: Character and Symbolic Pattern in Robertson Davies's Fiction." Canadian Literature, No. 4 (1960), pp. 18-30.

Monaghan, David M. "Metaphors and Confusions." Canadian Literature, No. 67 (1976), pp. 64-73.

Monk, Patricia. "Psychology and Myth in The Manticore." Studies in Canadian Literature, 2 (1977) pp. 69-81.

Montgomery, Lucy Maud. Anne of Green Gables. 1908; rpt. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1942.

Morley, Patricia. Robertson Davies. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, 1977.

Moss, John. Patterns of Isolation in English Canadian Fiction. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.

---------. Sex and Violence in the Canadian Novel: The Ancestral Present. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

Neufield, James. "Structural Unity in the Deptford Trilogy: Robertson Davies as Egoist." Journal of Canadian Studies, 12, No. 1 (1977), pp. 68-74.

Ostenso, Martha. Wild Geese. 1925; rpt. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1961.

Pacey, Desmond. Creative Writing in Canada. 2nd ed. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1961.

Roper, Gordon. "Robertson Davies' Fifth Business and 'That Old Fantastical Duke of Dark Corners, C.G. Jung'." Journal of Canadian Studies, 1, No. 1 (1972), pp. 33-39.

Schmieder, Peter Sebastien. "A Conflict between Mask and Shadow: A Study of Robertson Davies's Fifth Business," Diss. M.A. Concordia University, 1976.

Scott, Nathan A. Jr. Negative Capability: Studies in the New Literature and the Religious Situation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Staines, David (ed.). The Canadian Imagination. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Steinberg, M.W. "Don Quixote and the Puppets: Theme and Structure in Robertson Davies's Drama." Canadian Literature, No. 7 (1961), pp. 45-53.

---------. "A Twentieth Century Pentateuch — A.M. Klein's The Second Scroll." Canadian Literature. No. 2 (1961), pp. 72-77.

Sutherland, Ronald. Second Image. Toronto: New Press, 1971.

Weiner, Philip P. (ed.). Dictionary of History and Ideas. 5 vols. NewYork: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.

Woodcock, Geroge (ed.). The Canadian Novel in the Twentieth Century. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.

---------. Hugh MacLennan. Toronto: Copp Clark Pub. Co., 1969.