

Up Against the Mending Wall
The Psychoanalysis of Poetry by Frost, Shakespeare, and Others

College English (April, 1973), pp. 934-51
also Negative Poetics, chap. 4
University of Iowa Press, 1992
revised August, 2005

Edward Jayne

Poetry can be psychoanalyzed since it is human behavior, and this is finally and without exception accessible to psychological interpretation. Nothing experiential can or ought to be rejected from consideration in deference to any kind of a metacritical injunction, especially the so-called Intentional and Affective Fallacies invented by W.K. Wimsatt for exactly this purpose. For ALL verbal behavior may be interpreted as a manifestation of personality, however limited its evidence might seem. Of course what a patient confesses to his psychologist is a good deal more adequate for this purpose than literary criticism, but it also remains a partial fragment of behavior, and its comparable limitations should be taken into account. What lawyers advise their clients, what teachers tell their students, and what authors write for their readers might seem a good deal more limited for psychological interpretation, but the difference is simply a matter of degree. Enough does get expressed (tics, repetition, the groping for words, etc.) to justify at least a tentative effort toward assessment, as anybody would be glad to explain who has taken a math course or consulted a lawyer or a psychologist (mine for example--all five of them during my youth--most of whom had had very little idea of my thinking at the time). The more data the better, but the whole personality need not--indeed cannot--be submitted to examination. On the other hand, psychological analysis remains a possibility in the most limited instances, and what single performance is more susceptible to interpretation than competent poetry almost out of control? For the very act of poetry--every word, every phrase--puts into play intensely personal feelings, hence the opportunity for psychological interpretation. Poetics and psychoanalysis thus converge, and for this we can be grateful. Here, therefore, to illustrate how this happens, I submit to explication the intense struggle between homosexual confession and its homophobic denial in three remarkable texts: Coleridge's "Rime of the Ancient Mariner," Shakespeare's "Hamlet," and finally, and most obviously, Frost's "Mending Wall." Ambivalence is intensified to an amazing degree in all of these, and with wonderful success depicting not simply homosexuality, nor its denial, but an inextricable combination of the two.

Imagery with disturbing connotations, for example of repressed homosexual temptation, provides an excellent example of unconscious expression. The same is true of metaphor when its image (or "vehicle") conveys similar disturbing connotations. To the extent that this additional meaning exceeds the text's conscious intentions, it may be said to provide "open-system" expressiveness that necessitates a "closed-system" narrative organization to deny its vagrant implications by means of closure, i.e., an acceptable outcome. Usually metaphor's verbal economy helps to obscure its threatening connotations well enough for them to be felt without drawing too much attention. Figurative expressiveness accordingly verges on recognition but is soon crowded from the reader's short-term memory by the cumulative impact of everything that follows as the text's narrative organization continues to advance toward closure. Soon forgotten, however,

metaphor does have the advantage that it conveys a subtext of genuine feelings both felt and overlooked that might not otherwise be expressed. This freedom often bears striking results when a number of these vagrant metaphors cluster with each other over the duration of the text, disclosing a subtext at a different level of experience. Of course the overt control of ideas finally prevails by producing, in the words of Mencken, the poet's acceptable "better-than-truths." However, a sense of discomfort persists, at least among close readers, caused by the conflict between metaphoric honesty and narrative assurances. The same countervailing relationship is also possible with symbols, puns, and ambiguity since they all provide comparable opportunity for conveying unconscious implications the poet is otherwise reluctant to admit

Metaphoric honesty? Yes, in fact. Through figurative overdetermination the poet's most intimate feelings have the freedom to erupt into his/her verbal flow, after which they can almost as quickly disappear from consideration as the reader's attention continues to be drawn forward toward closure. Without realizing it, both poets and readers can enjoy the opportunity to explore forbidden possibilities that they themselves might be the last to acknowledge. When confronted with such a possibility, however, they are capable of righteous indignation at the suggestion that anything of the sort might have been intended either consciously or unconsciously. I can remember, for example, a female creative writing student years ago whose supposedly innocent account about sitting with her boyfriend on the beach to watch a glorious sunset was riddled with penetration imagery. Most memorable was a hotdog pushed in a mustard jar, but a half dozen other images bore the same blatant implications. My student was understandably mortified when these were pointed out to her in class, and it was my relative inexperience as a teacher that permitted me to encourage interpretation at this level. To this day I continue to regret my professional insensitivity, but my embarrassment is somewhat offset by my sense that this regrettable incident was more than anything else the clue that launched my investigation of literary repression on a dialectic basis. If a talented creative writing student stumbles into such a problem, why not major poets as well, and perhaps with even more threatening connotations brought under control in this manner. For, like it or not, poets do say what they say, and the supposedly incidental implications of their sentences, often in their very best poetry, too often resonate with wonderful dissonance relative to the central meaning of their texts.

Usually latent expressiveness is fully congruent with the texts's dominant meaning, so its interpretation is simple--even boring, as in the poetry of Longfellow, Tennyson, and many of their post-Wordsworthian contemporaries. On the other hand, latent expressiveness at times seems totally at cross purposes with the text's dominant meaning, and the standoff between the two cannot be easily resolved, as for example in the poetry of Hart Crane and John Ashbery. However, the resulting confusion can be tolerated as long as what might be described as metaphoric "overload" is absorbed and denied in a rapid flow of words controlled by the dominant context of narrative form.² According to Freud's theory of dream symbolism, metaphor accordingly provides an excellent vehicle of "primary process" dynamics potentially in conflict with a more effectively organized "secondary elaboration"--story, as it were--that serves to mitigate its connotations on a linear basis. The two vectors of poetic experience come to depend on each other, metaphor justified by story, and story rendered mysteriously attractive by the metaphor it helps to disguise. On one hand, it might seem that the figurative use of language does little more than provide superficial embellishments to a literary text. On the other, figurative language frequently conveys the most essential meaning intended by poets, whether they or anybody else realizes it. In these

instances, the predictable four-lane narrative highway forward in time seems limited to a very secondary role in justifying and rationalizing all the wonderful excesses of metaphor and imagery. As Nietzsche explained in his *Birth of Tragedy*, slightly reformulated, the Apollonian clarity of narrative form ultimately denies the Dionysian intensity of metaphoric extravagance, but it is this intensity that maximizes pleasure in the narrative dynamics toward closure. This, I would argue, is the matrix and essence of the poet's motivation--also, as a matter of fact, the reader's motivation as well.

Philip Wheelwright also explains this dialectic between story and aesthetic innuendo conveyed by its imagery:

One of the most powerfully expressive kinds of poetic tension is that which exists between the story or scenario of a poem and the suggestions thrown off by its imagery--a tension between statement and aesthetic innuendo. Such tensions are dramatic by their very nature, and give a certain dramatic character, an inherent dialectic, to the poem in which they occur.³

Exactly to the point. A psychoanalytic explanation of this conflict can also be proposed by combining Ernst Kris's theory of metaphor and Norman Holland's theory of form and idea (or theme) as a psychological defense. In his article "Aesthetic Ambiguity," Kris demonstrates that metaphor "serves as a stimulus to functional regression" because the primary process itself is metaphoric and imagistic. In *The Dynamics of Literary Response*, on the other hand, Holland explains at length how form, plot, theme, and language serve as defenses that allow primary process fantasy content to be transformed into a pattern of expression acceptable to the ego and superego.⁴ Both theories are useful, and a synthesis seems appropriate that features the formal and thematic dynamics featured by Holland as defenses against the metaphoric innuendo featured by Kris. What results is a new kind of *psychomachia*, a dialogue of sorts between obvious conventional truths and metaphoric expressiveness only partially understood. Each dimension effectively gives lie to the other, and their continuing struggle both justifies and is defined by literary form.

1.

This dialectic may be observed in Donne's "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning" on a strictly heterosexual basis. Here metaphors of death-throes, tantrum storms, gold filament which is beaten so thin that it all but disappears, and a compass that can only complete its circle on separate legs, repeatedly suggest that Donne might find some gratification in abandoning his pregnant wife for a year or two, contrary to the thematic expressions of extreme distress at their parting. At one level Donne declares his reluctance to depart, but at another his images and analogies imply his eagerness to do just that, and it is the tension between these levels of interpretation that gives vitality to his poem. A more threatening dialectic unfolds in Keats's "Ode to a Grecian Urn," in which the urn's depiction of eternal youth denies the imminence of death. Static figures in the prime of life presumably epitomize its permanence, and an irrefutable equation between truth and beauty presumably guarantees aesthetic permanence, perhaps a perpetuation of life itself. "That is all ye need to know," Keats claims, refusing to acknowledge his concern about his mortal illness exactly at the time he writes the poem. By concentrating on the urn's immortality as a fixed tableau

devoid of life, he denies his real feelings about himself. once again providing an appropriate theme that absorbs and denies his poem's metaphoric content implicit in its imagery.

The dialectic may also be observed at a more complex level in Arnold's "Dover Beach," in which pervasive metaphors of heterosexual seduction successfully undermine the poet's declaration of Platonic fidelity to his companion, "Ah, love, let us be true to one another!"⁵ Not evident until the final stanza, the dominant human relationship described by the poem is between the poet and a woman at his side (probably his fiancée), so the obvious sexual implications of the imagery must first and foremost be recognized to bear upon their relationship. In the first stanza, Dover cliffs play an obvious masculine role (but with barrier implications), and the water just as obviously plays a complementary feminine role, with the ebb and flow of the waves providing an obvious suggestion of sexual consummation. In the same vein the third stanza implies undressing ("a girdle . . . I only hear its . . . withdrawing roar," etc.), and the final stanza confesses the fear of their "clash by night" that would next occur, which would lead to "neither joy, nor love, nor light, nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain." It is not exactly clear what is meant by *true* after this abundance of imagery whose sequence can be revised with little difficulty to trace the normal seduction experience. Does the couple's intense rapport lets them undress and go to bed together, or does it oblige them to stay dressed and remain Platonic friends. Apparently the poet settles for the Platonic option in order to bring to a close his half-hearted seduction attempt, suddenly featuring the barrier implications of the Dover cliffs as opposed to their vertical thrust complementary to the sea. Why else his fear of the "land of dreams" (i.e. bed), or of ignorant armies that "clash by night," a pun suggesting awkward arms (undoubtedly the poet's) in the act of making love. Permanent faithfulness between man and woman seems to be proposed as the only enduring value in the threatened civilization of England toward the end of the nineteenth century, but this high thematic appeal, fully justified by current political, cultural, and economic trends, offsets the more immediate choice between Victorian chastity and the sensuous abandonment suggested by blatant metaphoric overdetermination. The final "truths" declared by Arnold thus rationalize anxieties that derive from Arnold's timidity as a seducer, providing what seems best described as an anti-epithalamion, a poem of consummation deferred despite the earlier imagery.

Coleridge's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" illustrates a moderately disguised version of homophobic satisfaction in which both the heterosexual and homosexual alternatives are rejected. Heterosexual marriage is declined, but so, too, is homosexual gratification, obliging cloistered innocence as the only acceptable alternative. At its most obvious thematic level, the poem is dominated by its subversiveness as an anti-epithalamium that diverts male wedding guests (hence by implication bridegrooms too) from wedding ceremonies. If the bridegroom himself instead of the wedding guest were detained by the mariner, the rejection of heterosexual marriage would be obvious, so the avoidance of marriage is displaced to the inaccessibility to other people's marriages, just as Grimm's fairy tales transform fathers into woodsmen or giants and mothers into step-mothers or witches. Once this elemental disguise has been imposed, the poet can express his ambivalence toward marriage by the story he tells of the Ancient Mariner's voyage and its rampant but presumably inexplicable symbolism. At its face value, there seems to be no moral to the Ancient Mariner's story beyond his guilt for the seemingly motiveless killing of an albatross and his redemption once he can bless sea creatures. However, the bizarre symbolism of his voyage provides an indirect explanation of both his crime and his later effort to detain wedding guests--also of Coleridge's intentions in writing the poem. At the nadir of the Ancient Mariner's

ordeal, after his destruction of the albatross, he meets Life-in-Death, the only individualized female in the poem besides the bride of the frame story. Just as Hansel and Gretel are driven into the woods at the behest of their evil stepmother, only to be confronted by her even more threatening incarnation as a witch, the mariner leaves a world dominated by such conventional observances as the marriage ceremony, only to encounter on the high seas after he kills the albatross, marriage's nightmarish incarnation as the sun's imprisonment by a hideous female figure described as Life-in-Death. In effect, Life-in-Death emerges as the bride's oneiric other-world depiction, a temptress of classical origins (suggestive of Ishtar, Eve, Circe, the Wife of Bath, Error, etc.) who epitomizes not temptation itself, but female entrapment that presumably results from conjugal union, from which the mariner is trying to save the wedding guest. The masts of her Life-'in-Death's death ship are seen as prison bars behind which the sun is confined, apparently symbolizing the obligation to marriage and suggesting that the killing of the albatross--i.e. not leaving well enough alone--had symbolized getting married as opposed to remaining a bachelor

A better and more attractive alternative is suggested by the crew, whose death and resurrection ritualize the mariner's redemption. The androgynous, anti-epithalamic implications of their sacrifice become obvious in the extended comparison between their corpses and slimy sea serpents:

The many men, so beautiful!
 And they all dead did lie:
 And a thousand thousand slimy things
 Lived on; and so did I.

I looked upon the rotting sea
 And drew my eyes away;
 I looked upon the rotting deck
 And there the dead men lay . . .

Once the mariner can finally bless these water snakes, he is baptized by a stream of rain and lightning from a phallic moon-cloud formation symbolizing true patriarchal redemption. He is then served by the dead crew who have immediately been resurrected and transformed into seraph-like figures, purified "slimy things" able to fly to heaven--as opposed to the patriarchal sun that remains locked behind bars. The crew's new power of levitation also helps to explain the mariner's moral crisis, for, as seraphs, they fly like the albatross (whose gratuitous murder symbolizes his guilt), while resembling the sea serpents whose acceptance brings his redemption. Happily, they can fly together, and their destination is a better world where Life-in-Death no longer poses any threat.

The poem's neglected frame story absorbs and denies these implications by its theme of the ancient mariner's eternal effort to expose selected young men to the truths implicit in his story. Enlightened by his ordeal, the mariner advises the wedding guest that it would be far sweeter "to walk together to the kirk with goodly company" than to enter the kirk to get married (i.e. trapped by Life-in-Death). Such a journey together parallels the homoerotic voyage, the flight of the seraphim, and the mariner's quest for young men who might be diverted by his glittering eye. However, instead of flight, innocent perambulation is recommended--the shared experience of sensitive men who can walk together through the countryside, just as Coleridge and Wordsworth

did when "The Ancient Mariner" was written and Coleridge was becoming increasingly dissatisfied with his marriage. Not unexpectedly, the mariner indicates this "goodly" company consists mostly of men, since the only women included are specified to be virgins, young women who have not yet imposed life-in-death on their future husbands. Once again the mariner repeats his moral, "He prayeth best, who loveth best all things both great and small," a distinct phallic reference that links sea serpents with his cosmic baptism. Then he forcibly restrains the young wedding guest from crossing the threshold to the wedding party. Apparently he succeeds, since the wedding guest is convinced to forsake marriage altogether. However, instead of turning to the homosexuality implied by the fused imagery of the crew and sea creatures, he opts for celibacy as implied by his waking up alone the next morning, and probably all mornings thereafter, a sadder but supposedly wiser man.

2.

Shakespeare's Hamlet may also be explored to demonstrate the dialectic tension between metaphor and closure. According to Ernest Jones, Hamlet was Shakespeare's most autobiographical play, with referential implications bearing upon a variety of issues relevant to his experience at the time, not least his father's death. Also important, however, I would suggest, was Shakespeare's homosexual ambivalence, and, typical of the dialectic model I am proposing, the play's tragic dénouement brings under control a swarm of latent homosexual images and metaphors that are almost entirely out of control. These provide an almost infinite interplay of androgynous significations, only to be answered and denied by a tragic resolution that imposes homophobic retribution through the destruction of Hamlet as well as most everybody else. Because of the conventional dynamics of revenge tragedy, a positive-feedback metaphoric intensity expressive of gender confusion culminates in closure through negative feedback that confirms the tendency in a suicidal orgy of destruction that prevents its fulfillment. Homophobic demands finally prevail, but only because of Hamlet's self-destruction as a tragic hero unable to transcend the crisis implied by his use of images and metaphors. Like both "Dover Beach" and "The Ancient Mariner," Hamlet's story provides an anti-epithalamium, but its images and metaphors of role confusion can be resolved by tragic action, letting tragic closure both confirm and deny what has already been implied by metaphor. Like Coleridge's wedding guest, Hamlet turns away from marriage, but his choice bears mortal consequences, ultimately resulting in the destruction of his prospective wife, Ophelia, her entire family, the king and queen (the only married couple in the play), and Hamlet himself. The Menandrine formula that culminates in a joyous wedding is utterly shattered. All vestiges of marriage and the nuclear family are terminated, but so, too, as a result, is Hamlet, the almost completely passive agent of this outcome. Unable to confront heterosexual maturity, he almost fails in satisfying his "good" father's demand to be revenged, and in fact he only succeeds in doing this by falling into a trap set by his "bad" father and getting killed himself.

Dominant throughout the text of Hamlet, as maintained by W. H. Clemen in *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*, are image clusters that seem to take on a life of their own.⁶ What Clemen conveniently overlooks is the "sex nausea" implicit in this imagery which bears a very important role in helping to explain the sexual relationships that are resolved over the duration of the play. One of the most frequently repeated images, for example, is of an infectious and essentially vaginal cavity, an ulcer filmed with skin "whiles rank corruption, mining all within,

infects unseen." From this "abscess-vagina," a central image of sexual revulsion, other metaphors of the play radiate in a multitude of new combinations, often with the vehicle of one metaphor becoming the tenor of the next. This metaleptic complexity (the vehicle of one metaphor becoming the tenor of the next) imposes open-system implications that are almost entirely out of control, extending from vaginal hell ("Rebellious hell, if thou canst mutiny in a matron's bones") to blackness ("that his soul may be as damned and black as hell, whereto it goes"), and thence to night, melancholy, and Hamlet's indecisiveness. It also extends from the symbolic pregnancy of Ophelia by Hamlet ("For if the sun breeds maggots in a dead dog"), to the sun, light, death, and worms, and from there to flowers blighted by worms, and holes in the ground penetrated by other burrowing creatures such as the mole, rat, mouse, and fox. One of these, the mole, becomes a tragic flaw, "some vicious mole of nature," as well as the king's ghost when Hamlet exclaims, "Well said, old mole," suggesting his responsibility for Hamlet's indecision, at one level, at least, comprising his tragic flaw.

Obsessive imagery of the ear also amplifies the image of the abscess vagina, for example in the king's remark, "And wants not buzzers to infect his ear" or the queen's plea, "The words like daggers enter my ear." Other versions of this cavity include the nasty sty, the grave, the oven of the baker's daughter, the basket that tumbles a monkey to its destruction, and of course nothing, the suicidal possibility of extinction (a "not to be") that Hamlet finds between the legs of Ophelia. Hamlet amplifies upon this meaning when he expresses his disgust with Claudius--despite his crime a good husband--by his cryptic remark, "The King is a thing," followed by his explanation, "Of nothing," suggesting he is the dominant but uxorious sex slave of Gertrude. The sword, dagger, cannonball, "offense's guilded hand," and the massy wheel of fortune drawn into a gulf of destruction are phallic instruments to penetrate this void. Moreover, the king declares the plot itself, both as story and conspiracy, to be an effort to penetrate it when he declares, "But, to the quick of the ulcer." On the other hand, the homosexual alternative is suggested when Hamlet says to Horatio, "Give me that man that is not passion's slave, and I will wear him in my heart's core, ay, in my heart of heart, as I do thee." Hamlet also taunts Claudius, "Nothing, but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar," having already described himself much earlier, "Beggard that I am." As opposed to Ophelia's recurring depiction as a helpless flower threatened by the worm, Hamlet's depiction is relatedly of a dark mystery that others must try to penetrate. Even the situation of the play seems to feature the cavity metaphor. For example, the original crime was poison poured into the king's ear. Similarly, the first scene begins with confused men standing on a vertical parapet in the midst of darkness, and the central conflict is brought to its climax in the "very witching time of night," when the king must cry out for light having watched his crime reenacted of poisoning the ear. Later, Hamlet and Laertes are locked in struggle over Ophelia at the bottom of her empty grave, an abscess cavity in the earth itself.

Metaphor has almost exhausted itself by Act Five, when Claudius rather than Hamlet initiates the final catastrophe. By now Hamlet's identity crisis has been amply demonstrated by his inability to revenge his mother's seduction and his true father's death. He cannot shake off his melancholy and revenge his father's murder, as Laertes tries (and eventually succeeds in his eagerness to punish Hamlet for killing Polonius. For many critics, this reluctance seems to be Hamlet's essential flaw, and it is best clarified by metaphors of sexual disorientation which declare Hamlet's fundamental problem and call for its rejection by means of tragic *dénouement*, as

occurs in the play's conventional revenge tableau that brings the tragedy to its completion, in which all the characters incidentally meet their destruction based on the symbolism of the sword and chalice. Not by accident Ophelia drowns alone earlier in the play in her garland of flowers, as opposed to the fate of Juliet, Antigone, and other tragic heroines who somehow join their true lovers in death. Gertrude, on the other hand, takes poison, also a feminine death, but one that lets her share with Claudius the chalice supposedly intended for Hamlet. In contrast, Hamlet and Laertes use swords to envenom each other, and Hamlet dies in the arms of Horatio, to whom he has dedicated his heart of heart. Offstage Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are beheaded, likewise dying as a pair, so, among the men, only Claudius is destroyed in full heterosexual fashion, by both the sword and chalice, falling united with Gertrude in conjugal shame. A prototypical Oedipal tableau thus occurs: the "bad" father compromises and then destroys his wife by trying to destroy her son, giving the son the last minute opportunity to revenge both his fallen mother and "good" father by killing the killer--his "bad" father, the evil patriarchal figure with whom he refuses to identify. Not incidentally, all three parents are exterminated (the mother as well as the two complementary identities of fatherhood), and marriage itself, the ultimate issue relevant to Oedipal identification, has been disgraced and nullified. Hamlet actually perishes by Laertes, for Fortinbras, and in the arms of Horatio in what seems a triumph of latent homosexual catharsis. Homosexuality is accordingly both consummated and rejected in this orgy of destruction, but Hamlet's victory compels his death, after which flights of angels (like the Ancient Mariner's seraphim) sing him to his rest.

But the play also represents metaphoric denial through closure at a different and perhaps more basic level relevant to religious doubt, actually combining sexual ambivalence with the religious uncertainty experienced during the Renaissance by such figures as Pomponazzi, Bruno, Montaigne, Marlowe, and Raleigh, among others. What makes Hamlet's ordeal particularly disturbing--at the edge of utter nihilism--is his rejection of both life itself and the possibility of his existence after death additional to his doubts about his masculinity. The uncompromising skepticism rampant in Italy and France earlier in the sixteenth century is actually matched and exceeded in this one remarkable play by Shakespeare unique in British tradition at the time. If the Renaissance may be said to have begun with Petrarch's fascination with Cicero, it may also be seen to have culminated with the example of Hamlet, who, like Cicero, turned out to be willing to embrace his murder by others. Not only does Hamlet deny his masculinity, but also his identity, indeed his existence, entirely obliterated from the physical universe once he attains death. Just as the celebrated Italian philosopher Pomponazzi had challenged the notion of an afterlife early in the sixteenth century and Montaigne had later hinted such a possibility in his ambivalently description of death as a lifeless "consummation," Hamlet seems to have come to the same conclusion with his final line, "the rest is silence," quite aside from Horatio's jarring orthodox rejoinder promising his accompaniment to heaven by flights of angels. In the fullest sense of the word, Hamlet, more than Claudius, becomes a "thing of nothing," in his case through nihilism that only begins with the metaphoric doubts about gender identity.

In his fourth soliloquy, "To be or not to be" (3.1. 57-88), a deservedly famous passage whose portmanteau relationship to the rest of the play otherwise seems unclear, Hamlet uses metaphors describing death as an active quest ("Take arms against a sea of troubles," etc.) as opposed to the passive, even masochistic, acceptance of life ("Bear the whips and scorns of time," etc.) The reason he resigns himself to the burden of life, he claims, is that he cannot tell whether

by dying he would totally perish or experience an afterlife described as the "dreams" that would come "in that sleep of death." As in Shakespeare's final play, *The Tempest*, in which Prospero declares, "We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep" (4.1.156), sleep is equated with death, but with dreams specifically referring to an afterlife, suggesting the difference between heaven and hell (i.e., nightmares). Obviously, if hell exists, according to Christian doctrine, Hamlet could only suffer eternal punishment if he attempts suicide. Later Hamlet expresses his eagerness to consign Claudius's soul to such a fate, but this late in the play he apparently continues to want to risk this fate for himself in "the undiscover'd country from whose bourn no traveler returns," as he has already explained in the soliloquy. Unable to commit suicide ("his quietus make with a bare bodkin [dagger]"), he must live on to become the agent of death, it turns out, for almost everybody else culminating with his own. In the final scene, however, Hamlet discourages Horatio's attempted suicide to join him in death by warning him, "Absent thee from felicity awhile." What Hamlet means here is his desire that Horatio not to kill himself, but the word *felicity* also totally clashes with Hamlet's treatment of death in his "To be or not to be" soliloquy, except for the initial use of Montaigne's word *consummation* to suggest the pleasure of total obliteration. Why such a blatant change of mind? The answer comes with Hamlet's final laconic certainty, "The rest is silence." Indeed, everything that follows will be silence, since Hamlet can no longer talk, and his future after death will likewise be characterized by silence--in effect the silence of the spheres.

As already indicated, Horatio's response to Hamlet's final line regarding flights of angels might suggest something otherwise, but we cannot forget that Hamlet's warning earlier in the play that there are more "things" in heaven and earth than Horatio realizes, with the caveat at the very end of the play that *more* in this instance means *less*, specifically the absence of an afterlife. Moreover, we cannot forget that Hamlet's identity throughout the play almost entirely consists of words ("words, words, words," he says at one point). Shakespeare actually gave Hamlet roughly forty percent of the lines in his tragedy, many more than he did for any of his other characters throughout his career--more lines, in fact, than to be found in his entire tragedy *Macbeth*. On the other hand, Hamlet totally fails in getting things done. The ability to plan and carry through behavior (*praxis*) is obtained by others in the play, not by Hamlet, who does little more than suffer his enemies' machinations as they bring about the final tragic outcome. Hamlet primarily dedicates himself to his passionate rhetoric, his very *raison d'être*, that links misogyny with suicidal fantasies. So by implying his expectation that silence is his destiny after he dies he is in effect denying his earlier fears of what might happen in an afterlife, and here is where skepticism and sexual ambivalence converge. No language: no existence, no obligation to submit to heterosexual demands, and nothing to worry about. There will be no afterlife, he concludes, so his death becomes sheer felicity--exactly as he had hoped when he spoke of "a consummation devoutly to be wished." Hamlet actually covets total extinction as his preference to the futile existence he has been living--his gender, his status, his mortal obligations at last fulfilled by means of killing his killers. The bitterness implicit in Hamlet's metaphors is finally resolved entirely to his satisfaction, for he has altogether talked himself out. His failure as a man, as a prince, as his father's problematic son, dissolves into felicitous oblivion, his preferred choice. Hamlet's revenge accordingly reverses *praxis*, followed by silence.

Robert Frost was far more wary of unpleasant temptations than either Coleridge or Shakespeare. His most effective strategy was to waiver between two alternatives, tantalizing himself and his readers with forbidden implications asserted by metaphor and imagery, but only to reject these for "good" reasons based on acquired rural profundity. Lawrence Thompson has said of Frost, "How to express and how to defend oneself became two inseparable themes for him."⁸ Myth and tragedy are not brought into play, as in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and *Hamlet*, but Frost's confessional approach permits a combination of defense and expressiveness that similarly advances from metaphoric expressiveness to its denial through thematic sagacity. First there is nostalgia for an inexplicably attractive earlier experience, and then it is rejected by a profound message of abstinence based on a closer examination of this experience. This shift from nostalgia to denial, somewhat akin to tragic recognition, is what primarily gives Frost's poetry the effect of wisdom. Frost's narrator (ostensibly Frost himself) explores forbidden inclinations within the context of poetry and then denies them there as well. As opposed to Nietzsche's vision of tragedy, Frost briefly tests his Dionysian inclinations, but finds good reasons for retreating to safety in the Apollonian world of appearances. Positive feedback primarily intrudes as a suggestion of possibilities to be denied by negative feedback "truths" that guarantee intellectual repose. This pattern of discovery and denial can be attributed to a persona assumed for the occasion of the poem, but it is difficult to distinguish Frost's persona from the real poet who hides behind it.

Perhaps the most schematic example of this ambivalence can be found in "The Road not Taken," in which Frost makes the ironic discovery that one pursuit must be forsaken to undertake the experience of another. He uses affectation ("I shall be telling this with a sigh") to suggest motives he cannot entirely accept, undoubtedly at the expense of Edward Thomas, a friend who often took him hiking in England. Mr. Thomas chose their trails, profusely apologizing for those they had to bypass, and Frost transforms this mannerism into ambivalent insight with universal significance pertaining to the different routes to be found through life.⁹ In "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening," Frost goes through the same steps by making the pragmatic decision to continue his course in life rather than letting himself freeze to death in the woods. In "After Apple Picking" he similarly reconciles himself to imperfect harvests in which abortive projects must be sacrificed like bruised apples sent to the cider heap. And in "Bending Birches" he nostalgically recalls youthful solitude in nature before he was burdened by inflexibility of his mature years. Masturbation is possibly suggested by the game he describes of climbing birches, then bringing them down to earth, "the right place for love." Only later do girls provide the "truth" that "broke in" his fantasy world.¹⁰

Perhaps the most threatening latent implications may be found in "Mending Wall," which Frost featured as the initial poem of his first successful volume of poetry, *North of Boston*. As in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and *Hamlet*, sexual ambivalence takes precedence, but with a happy ending guaranteed by the homo-aversive symbolism of building and maintaining walls. Male bonding between the two men involved in this neighborly task is repeatedly implied by an abundance of puns, images, metaphors, and grammatical ambiguities that are answered and resolved by emphasizing the value of barriers. For, paradoxically, the wall that draws them together also separates them. In fact, they only join each other once a year with the sole task of guaranteeing their isolation from each other. While engaged in this activity, the poet reflects for a moment that he might prefer eliminating the constraints between them, and then he just as quickly

recognizes the imprudence of such a choice. The overt lesson (or message) is that generosity of spirit cannot be taken to an extreme through the loss of boundary between two men--hence the shared obligation of maintaining an appropriate boundary. On a strictly latent basis, however, a much more threatening concern poses itself: that homosexuality cannot be acknowledged, much less fulfilled, so the wall must be kept up to reinforce the shared commitment to homophobia. This dialectic interaction between metaphoric attraction and thematic revulsion is implicit throughout "Mending Wall." The two neighbors rebuilding the wall, for example, are constrained to "walk the line" parallel to each other, but they must also swing back and forth to fit stones together with shapes disconcertingly phallic ("And some are loaves and some so nearly balls"). They rhythmically work together, but their purpose is to separate themselves from each other. In the same light, scattered stones must be heaped in a single pile, symbolizing close cooperation in separating the two. Shared experience occurs, but to guarantee isolation.

Norman Holland has proposed that Frost's temporary inclination to break down the wall suggests the oral fixation to penetrate a veil of isolation and incorporate experience otherwise excluded from possibility.¹¹ But with what can the narrator achieve oral fusion if there is no wall? Nature is the same on both sides except for the apple and pine trees. The only major difference is the presence of the two men, so the question of fusion necessarily bears upon their relationship, and this possibility seems to predominate in the poem's insistent metaphoric overdetermination. This begins, for example, with the first four lines, which may be interpreted as a scrambled invocation to the possibility of homosexual consummation:

Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
That sends the frozen ground-swell under it,
And spills the upper boulders in the sun;
And makes gaps even two can pass abreast.

There has been much speculation about the significance of the word "something." Existential and theological explanations have been offered as well as the oral interpretation of Holland and the archetypal explanation proposed by Northrop Frye. None of these can be ruled out, but the latent implications of thing seem obviously phallic (like Coleridge's "all things both great and small" and Shakespeare's "thing of nothing"). In Frost's poem, something is capable of penetration, paradoxically, as a denial of love, since "doesn't love" indicates both opposition to the wall and love's failure to break through it. In the second line the word "swell" implies masculine arousal; and since the frozen ground swell is commonly described in New England as a "frost heave," the poet himself (Frost, by name) is implied to be aroused. The swell spreads under the wall, but with the "spilling" of the boulders, phallic imagery is dislocated so the boulders no longer represents a surface penetrated, but sexual consummation. That rocks are spilled "in the sun" also bears homosexual connotations based on the sun-son pun which is also employed in both Hamlet and "Rime of the Ancient Mariner." In the fourth line, the "gaps" something "makes" also seem personified as reinforced by the remark "two can pass abreast."

The double entendre of shared isolation is sustained throughout the rest of the poem with almost the proportions of allegory. Later the poet expresses his disgust with hunters who pursue "another thing," or perhaps whose "thing" prefers another object-choice, specifically the rabbit:

The work of hunters is another thing:
 I have come after them and made repair
 Where they have left not one stone on a stone,
 But they would have the rabbit out of hiding,
 To please the yelping dogs.

Here metaphor apparently shifts to heterosexual relations. A primordial insistence on dominance and the hunt is implied by helpless rabbits, guns more potent than rocks, and the bestial appetite of "yelping dogs" when they devour rabbits once flushed from their holes. Significantly, the hunters can "have" the rabbits only by leaving "not one stone on a stone," thereby undoing the work of the neighbors. Because of their destructiveness, hunters deny the ambivalence that haunts the narrator, but with the paradoxical result that they enable him to "come after them"--i.e. gain his own satisfaction after they do theirs. The awkward combination "made repair" may also be decomposed into two parts, "made" as a verb of seduction and "re-pair" as a reunion--possibly the reunion between the two neighbors who have once again come to rebuild the wall. The destruction of rabbits had occurred in late fall, season of death, but in the spring the poet once again calls his neighbor to their annual ritual of harvesting rocks. Once again they can resort to magic ("to use a spell to make them balance") in piling stone upon stone.

In lines 9-10 the poet suddenly shifts from "yelping dogs" to what seems more important to him, "the gaps, I mean," perhaps because it is the gaps which bring the neighbors together. In line 20 he says, "We wear our fingers rough with handling them," and then goes on to explain casually, "Oh, just another kind of outdoor game, one on a side." Here the poet himself seems almost aware of what he was suggesting. In lines 24-26 he asserts that his personified apple trees ("and I am apple orchard") would not "eat his neighbor's pine cones," though, vice versa, a threat merely suggested, the equally symbolic but less civilized pine trees ("he is all pine") might be inclined to devour his apples. Pine cones and apples again evoke the vertical displacement of loaves and balls. In line 27 Frost declares, "Spring is the mischief in me," implying the season is internalized and to be discharged in a prohibited act of mischief. Such an act might involve jumping, as indicated by the pun "spring," presumably over the wall to join his startled neighbor. To convey such an inclination to his neighbor is ambiguously described as "putting a notion in his head."

In lines 30-31 the poet argues the two can safely eliminate the barrier between them because no cows are present (perhaps a reference to women as mothers), leaving the two neighbors unobserved by spectators. In line 34 he resorts to another pun, saying that before he built a wall he would want to know "to whom I was like to give offence." The last word is clearly divisible into the components "a fence"--suggesting, as Holland indicates, that Frost's narrator wouldn't want to fence his neighbor out. In line 36 he speculates that whatever it is that could lead his neighbor to overcome his inhibitions might be identified as elves. But then he makes it a point to qualify himself, "But it's not elves exactly." Instead, the word "fairies" comes to mind, a pejorative reference to homosexuals. Coincidentally, elves and fairies also suggest Coleridge's "seraphim" and Hamlet's "flights of angels." Frost also associates elves with fairies in at least two other poems, "Mowing" and "Spoils of the Dead." In the latter he identifies himself with a corpse in the woods whose ring and chain lying beside him are "glittering things" removed to "play with" by creatures interchangeably described as both elves and fairies.¹²

The poet also admonishes the personified stones, "Stay where you are until our backs are turned," and finally says of his silent neighbor, who seems attractive but terrible with a stone in each hand, that "he will not go behind his father's saying," though he "moves in darkness" where such inclinations might be fulfilled. Here the paternal wisdom offensive to the poet suggests homophobic demands connected with the Oedipus complex. The neighbor speaks with patriarchal authority because, unlike Hamlet, he fully identifies with his father (both in his good and bad personae), and consequently with his lineage of fathers receding into a prehistory characterized by darkness. He has successfully internalized his father's wisdom, which the poet finds it difficult to do, affording his mysterious appeal to the poet, who is separated by a wall from the right choice, but knows that to cross the wall is the wrong choice. Still, it is the poet's whim to do so, and he must be discouraged by guilt feelings without the benefit of being able to call them his own.

The issue of unresolved Oedipal identification explains the poem's homosexual ambivalence as well as its basically paranoid displacements of denial and projection ("the neighbor's decision, not mine") for suppressing this anxiety. In Hamlet, Oedipal crisis is dealt with by splitting the good and bad fathers, the latter coincidentally a good husband; and in "The Ancient Mariner" it is symbolized by the cosmic struggle between the sun's paternal authority and absolution through the power of the moon, a conflict resolved by the mariner's preference for universal love at the expense of marriage. Frost likewise grapples with filial ambivalence, but he comes up with entirely different results, since the tried and true filial relationship is projected to his neighbor on the other side, while its difficulties are represented by his frustrated wish to reach out to him, a fused inclination that combines homosexual attraction with homophobic restraint that prevents its consummation.

The thematic resolution of "Mending Wall" denies its metaphoric implications by means of the already mentioned conventional paradox that the poet's shared experience with his neighbor actually divides them. Frost concludes by quoting his neighbor's truism to the effect that "good fences make good neighbors," letting this sentence speak for itself as well as implying its perhaps more significant obverse principle that good neighbors make good fences. Yet the line's repetition and the emphasis of its terminal position leave us with no alternative conclusion relevant to both virtue and the appropriate level of rapport between neighbors. The first line has also been repeated, so there is narrative transition from its stressed exploratory willingness ("something there is," etc.) to the inhibition of the last line that is more decisive in its commitment to maintaining effective barriers. The possibilities of each option are explored by the poet, but in the end restraint overrides exploratory freedom. The two "make good" by constructing effective barriers ("good" fences) to preserve their virtue. Moral de-fenses thereby guarantee moral relationships, allowing the not quite liberated poet to accept with thankfulness his neighbor's inhibitions. His poetic sensibility might have led him astray for a moment in his choice of words, but it brings him back again to the primitive universal truth evident to his neighbor all along, and with the additional profundity available to a poet. In fact, it is poetry that helps him to recover his equanimity by sublimating his ambivalence within the safe context of theme and metaphor. His strategy of expressive form has encouraged him to test edges, and then to back off again with good reasons for doing so, and without having directly confronted the question. Even his renunciation is unacknowledged.

But an additional dimension of complexity must be taken into account, since Frost does not seem to have suffered from acute latent homosexual anxieties. Few of his other poems imply sexual ambivalence, at least to this degree. Beyond his strong attachment to his mother, there seem to be no reports, either published or unpublished, that would suggest latent feminine identification strong enough to have obliged this degree of compensatory homophobic denial.¹³ Consequently, it can be speculated that the sexual ambivalence of "Mending Wall" was probably triggered by particular circumstances associated with Napoleon Guay (pronounced "gay"), Frost's French-Canadian neighbor at Derry, New Hampshire, with whom Frost once rebuilt a wall separating their property. It was undoubtedly Guay who was depicted as Frost's taciturn neighbor on the other side of the wall. However, Guay's personality was, if anything, excessively friendly rather than reclusive, as would be suggested by his depiction in the poem. Lawrence Thompson's biography of Frost suggests, in fact, that the relationship between Frost and Guay in real life exactly reversed their relationship in the poem. Throughout their experience as neighbors, Guay was persistent in his "continuing and friendly assistance" despite Frost's continued aloofness. Guay often dropped by to visit and just as often invited Frost and his family to visit, but Frost never reciprocated with similar visits and invitations of his own. Once Guay crept up behind Frost to catch his axe in mid-air while he was chopping wood--a remarkable gesture of physical superiority--then held the ax back while lecturing Frost about its use. It seems Guay posed a continuing threat to Frost's privacy and compensatory sense of masculine sufficiency.

In "Mending Wall," Frost apparently responded to this threat by switching roles, giving each the persona of the other. In a complicated exchange of identities, he attributed his own reserve to his neighbor and accepted for himself the onus of excessive friendliness.¹⁴ The behavior of Guay brought carefully guarded and perhaps dormant homosexual anxieties to the threshold of recognition, to which Frost reacted with defensive irony by writing as if he himself contemplated the elimination of barriers. His expansiveness could thus be rejected by exactly the individual who caused him this anxiety. Frost then legitimized the transposition on a literary basis by conventionalizing their roles. He became effusively imaginative in his borrowed identity, as might be expected of a poet, while attributing his own reservations to his neighbor as a romanticized New England intractability. His inhibition became his neighbor's patriarchal authority asserted in a single truism that fixed the boundaries beyond which they could not transgress. However, in his poetic license he transcended these boundaries anyway--the ironic necessity of his task--by merging their identities. Only Frost-Guay could reject Guay-Frost, supposedly to put an end to the matter in a poetry of renunciation, but with affirmation at least in identity confusion. Frost is quoted by C. L. Barber and cited by Holland as once having confided, "As if I weren't on both sides of the wall!" Divided by a wall, one identity could respond to the appeal made by the other with a supposedly self-sufficient truism rejecting unconscious feelings too dangerous to acknowledge.

The American public has revered Frost, this century's most important hearthside poet, but without taking into account the undercurrent of needs and inhibitions in his poetry. "Mending Wall" in particular has been widely appreciated for its innocence as a transcendental inquiry into the meaning of barriers. Once deciphered, however, the mystery on the other side poses a challenge to innocence so threatening that even its rejection cannot be acknowledged. An ambivalent restraint emerges which is fully as complicated as the verse of Coleridge and Arnold, or of Donne and Keats. Frost's poem invents a doubly inverted theme of homosexual courtship

denied which draws upon the American archetype of pastoral fraternity that Leslie Fiedler has found between Natty Bumppo and Chingachgoo, Ishmael and Queequeg, Huckleberry Finn and Jim. Here, though, virginal friendship is challenged by imagery, figuration, organ speech, puns both intentional and unintentional, and every other conceivable use of language to complicate the landscape of Frost's imagination. The transitory inclination to tear down a wall gives place to the decision to retain the wall as a barrier, but without necessarily clarifying what it defends against. *Animus* is isolated from *anima*, the poet from his neighbor, and ultimately the two of them from us, the readers, because we cannot quite penetrate the secret of their unfulfilled tableau. The account of two men doing a wall (hence "men-ding wall") introduces ambiguities it takes forty-five lines to explore and deny--thus the fascination of Frost's poem, which seems to have been composed at the brink of consciousness. As with Shakespeare, Coleridge, and so many others, it has been his ignorance of himself combined with his wonderful sensitivity to forbidden implications that has sealed his reputation as an accomplished poet.

© 2005 by Edward Jayne. This document may be reproduced in any non-profit form without permission of the author; however, for-profit reproduction requires written permission.

<http://www.edwardjayne.com>

Footnotes

1. The tenor/vehicle interaction is proposed by I. A. Richards in chap. 5 of The Philosophy of Rhetoric (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936). Unfortunately, he refrains from dividing the tenor (or intended meaning) into its conscious and unconscious components.
2. The sequence suggested here reverses the sequence proposed by critics of the deviationist school. Their explanation of stylistic "devices" (or surprises) almost entirely features the interaction between these devices and their local contexts. While I concede the importance of this interaction, I subordinate it to a more inclusive interaction between these devices situated in their local contexts and narrative closure. In the final analysis, a text's impact depends, I think, on the cumulative impact of these devices (metaphor, etc.) in setting the stage for thematic closure.
4. Ernst Kris, Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art (New York: International Universities Press, 1952), pp. 243-64; Norman Holland, The Dynamics of Literary Response (New York: Oxford, 1968), chaps. 4 and 6.
5. Holland's thorough explication of "Dover Beach" in The Dynamics of Literary Response (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1968) reduces this sexual content to the primal scene fantasy of sexual intercourse between a father and mother figure, in effect treating Oedipal fixations as one type of oral spectacle.
6. W. H. Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951).
7. Here I am obviously drawing upon the theory of Ernest Jones in Hamlet and Oedipus: A Classic Study in the Psychoanalysis of Literature (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1949). Beyond Jones, it seems useful to recognize how the Oedipus complex helps to define the difference between tragedy and comedy based on the unsuccessful displacement from mother attraction to father identification associated with heterosexual love and its ritual consummation in marriage. Oedipus Rex, for example, is pure tragedy restricted to early Oedipal struggle preceding the presence of a prospective bride to compete with Jocasta, the mother. In Antigone and Ghosts, Aricia and Regine unsuccessfully compete with their prospective mothers-in-law, while in Romeo and Juliet, described as comedy with a tragic conclusion, the mother plays a minor role and the prospective bride wins her husband, but only in death. In comedy such as The Tempest, the impending ritual of marriage dominates the story and the mother disappears, replaced by the father able to bestow his blessings on marriage. Prospero, the bride's father, makes the necessary arrangements for marriage while the mother figure is all but forgotten. The tragedy of Hamlet is more disturbing than any of these because he cannot locate himself in this fundamental transition from frustrated love of his mother to identification with a father figure through his pursuit of Ophelia. One father is too perfect to emulate and the other too wicked. Moreover, Hamlet cannot be attracted to his mother any longer because of her relationship with his wicked father, or to Ophelia because of her similarity to his mother. A homosexual alternative might be possible, as suggested by his friendship with Horatio, but to consummate this relationship means identifying with his mother, who both draws and disgusts him. The result is severe ambivalence asserted

through metaphor and tentatively resolved by means of tragic denouement.

8. Selected Letters of Robert Frost (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964), p. x. In his introduction Thompson also declares that the central insight of Frost was that one should "confront, recognize, and accept the circular relationship between constructive and destructive forces of personality." He quotes Frost to the effect that creativity provides "a momentary stay against confusion," and that form protected him from the "larger excruciations." A more challenging remark of Frost, and one to which this might be considered a reply, is his cryptic statement, "I have written to keep the over-curious out of the secret places of my mind both in my verse and in my letters." Paradoxically, it is this effort that exposes his strategy to the over-curious.

9. Frost's subtlety in doing so escaped even Thomas when Frost sent him the poem, but his ironic shift in tone (and thus role) was actually intended to be the crux of the poem, more important than its moral that either choice would do. Nevertheless, the shift in tone is explained by its moral, for like the two paths either role would do (ref. Frost, Selected Letters, pp. xiv-xv).

10. The explication of "Bending Birches" can be almost as elaborate as that which follows of "Mending Wall." Frost's preferences for boyhood when fetching cows, his description of the solitary boy at play who rides trees until he takes the "stiffness" out of them, his comparison between climbing these trees and filling a cup over the brim—all these images can be explained too easily as extended double entendres.

11. Norman Holland, "The Unconscious of Literature: The Psychoanalytic Approach," Contemporary Criticism, Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 12 (London: Edward Arnold, 1970): 130-53; The Brain of Robert Frost: A Cognitive Approach to Literature (New York: Routledge, 1988), pp. 23-33.

12. Frost's frequent practice of linking fairies and elves in the tales he told his children is cited by Thompson in Robert Frost: The Early Years (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966), pp. 302-304. Also to be noticed in "Spoils of the Dead" (uncollected but included in Thompson's biography on p. 558) is the connection between homosexual anxiety and death, the latter a fundamental concern in "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening." In fact "Spoils of the Dead" may be treated as a sequel in the event the poet had decided to stay and die in the snow instead of returning home to his heterosexual obligations.

13. During the frequent and prolonged absences of his father, Frost slept in the same bed with his mother until about eleven years old, and then in a cot at the side of her bed throughout his high school years (ref. Robert Frost: The Early Years, p. 205). Frost's close attachment to his mother is possibly significant based on Freud's attribution of homosexuality to the influence of a dominant mother in the absence of the father (ref. Freud's Leonardo da Vinci: A Study in Psychosexuality, trans. by A.A. Brill, New York: Random House, 1947, Chapter 3). Current research has traced homosexuality to other causes too, but Oedipal confusion seems to predominate in fiction, especially if homophobic reservations occur.

14. By making this switch, Frost compounded the projective mechanism that makes myth

(or story) a paranoid structure as explained by Otto Rank. See Otto Rank, The Myth of the Birth of the Hero (New York: Vintage, 1932), p. 78. Likewise, both Jung in Aion trans. by R.F.C. Hull, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), and Bachelard in The Poetics of Reverie (New York: Orion Press, 1969), treat art as a means of coming to terms with "anima" by means of fantasy. However, neither takes paranoia into account as perhaps the most effective means of organizing fantasy for this purpose.