The LOYOLA COLLEGE FORUM

spring, 1979

The Loyola College Forum--A forum for the exchange of ideas by the students of Loyola College, to be published semi-annually.

Vol. I, No. 1

The staff of The Loyola College Forum hopes to see many more submissions from the students in the future, especially from those in the maths and sciences. If any paper should be too technical or specialized for the average, concerned student, we encourage the author to rewrite the paper, adding explanatory text, making the topic more palatable to the unitiated reader.

A note on the next text: These papers contained endnotes and footnotes. For the sake of brevity, we have omitted most. If any reader is interested as to the source of any quote or reference, they may contact the author of the paper.

Have a safe, recreative, and happy summer!

NIETZSCHE, SARTRE, AMD KIERKEGAARD ON GOD AND FREEDOM

by Matthew McKenna

"'But', said Moses to God, "when I got to the Israelites and say to them, 'The God of your fathers has sent me to you,' if they ask me, 'what is his name?' what am I to tell them?" God replied "I am who am." Then he added, "This is what you shall tell the Israelites: I AM sent me to you." (Exodus 3.13-14)

This name which God gave to himself in the Old Testament has become so revered by the Jewish religion that for human lips to even utter the sound of the Tetragrammaton borders on the sacrilegious. This name is the one God gave to himself according to the Judao-Christian tradition; however, throughout the history of Philosophy man has found it necessary to assign the concept of 'God' a myriad of other titles including "the unmoved mover", "that greater than which nothing can be conceived", "the divine architect", *"the* first cause", "the final cause", "The Good", "The One".

Authors of philosophical treatises that are concerned with metaphysics seem to find themselves christening the divine idea with whatever title seems appropriate in the context of which they are writing. Yet, these scholarly works, which often lead the reader through a labyrinth of esoteric-language and abstract, speculative reasoning, arrive at this concept as a sort of dead end, an explanation for what the brilliant author finds inexplicable in terms of reason.

Therefore, it seems as though the philosophical names for the divine becomes more a rubric for man's incapability to understand than of an immediate, concrete entity as is the "I AM". A common by-product of the work done on this ambiguous concept of God is that the fact man finds himself to be a free being is often made an illusion.

To elucidate on what this statement means one need only investigate the metaphysical position of one of these men. The one who seems to deprive man of his freedom most effectively is an Arab named Avicenna. Avicenna was chosen to illustrate the approach of a deterministic divinity because he was a religious man; therefore, God has to be the unavoidable focal point of his system, he was a brilliant man who actually made his living as a physician rather than as a philosopher, he was very well trained in the works of most of the Greek philosophers who began western philosophy, and he is somewhat removed from the Judao-Christian tradition since his source of religious revelation was the Islamic Koran rather than the Bible.

Avicenna's philosophical system grounds itself on the notion of necessity. Things are not necessary because they come into existence and then pass away; this approach to existence is contingent upon the infinite number of phenomena that produce an entity's being. However, Avicenna posits that these series of phenomena have, underlying them, the necessary action of an external cause; therefore, all existents are necessary. This leads him to conclude that the series of cause, determined by necessity are not infinite but end in a first cause which is necessary in itself. This being, is, of course, God.

This being for Avicenna was absolute goodness and in its goodness it diffuses or emanates goodness. This action of diffusiveness is not an act of free choice on the part of God but a necessary overflowing, as unavoidable as water pouring over the sides of a cup which has been filled beyond its capacity. This emanation produces a series of spiritual entities which gradually degenerate in their natures the farther they are from God. Finally, the 10th being (or intelligence as Avicenna called them) is the actual creator of the world and man.

This 10th intelligent also acts as the reasoning power (Avicenna called it the active intellect) common to all men. Men gain their individuality not through the powers of the active intellect but through the passive intellect which is the basic source of emotions and that power which allows man to control his body.

There are some very interesting ramifications to such a system in terms of free will. Man's reasoning power becomes an absolute; however, not under the control of the individual but the conclusions it arrives at are the necessary results of an external process of emanations. Therefore, if man acts for reasons then he does not act for what he, as an individual believes is true, but because of a universal active intellect. Also, in this system God has no free will and acts not because of divine wishes but due to a necessary (and reasonable) emanation of his goodness. God has no knowledge of man's or the world's existence because the only thing worthy of divine cogitation is the divine itself. Therefore, God becomes isolated from the creation of the world by a sequence of ten intelligences and enslaved to self-reflection because of his absolute, apotheosized reasoning powers.

This is a system of thought that was actually so greatly admired by such Christians as St. Thomas Aquinas that it was seen as a definite threat to the intellectual synthesis of Faith and Reason that was the cornerstone of Medieval Christian Philosophy.

However, in terms of how man experiences his world and the common man of faith thinks about his God, this system becomes a caricature of the type of philosophical treatises describes earlier. It is a pinnacle of man's reasoning ability, as internally consistent as Euclidean Geometry, yet makes man and God seem to be round pegs in square slots, forced in by the hammer of reason, yet splintered and destroyed in the context of experience.

The rebellion against this highly speculative, theoretical and abstract form of scholarly investigation called 'Existentialism" provides three men who give positions on how to handle God and freedom in terms of the way man finds himself in the world, rather than how reason finds man should be in the world. They are Soren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche and Jean-Paul Sartre.

Nietszsche and Sartre find the concepts of man's freedom of choice and God mutually exclusive.

Sartre articulates why this is so quite clearly in his essay *Existentialism is a Humanism:* "When we think of God as the inventor, we are thinking of him, most of the time, as a supernatural artisan...God makes man according to a procedure and a conception following a definition and a formula. Thus, each individual man is the realization of a certain conception which dwells in the divine understanding." However, if this is so then man has an essence or nature which God conceives of and then creates in terms of. This is totally adverse to Sartre's claim, made in the same essay,

that for man "existence comes before essence." or "man first of all exists, encounters himself, surges up in the world - and defines himse1f afterward." This is Sartre's definition of how man experiences freedom in that for this Frenchman man is freedom with no predetermined determining nature and the necessary result is "Thus, there is no human nature, because there is no God to have a conception of it."

With this thesis Sartre has posited the strictly descriptive part of this essay and tries to develop a humanistic ethic from it by indicating that man should regard "freedom as the foundation of all values." This is a noble attempt on the part of Sartre to try and give normative guidelines in terms of his existential philosophy, but ultimately a problem he poses earlier in the essay becomes irreconcilable with any ethic much less his. This is "Dostoevsky once wrote 'If God did not exist, everything would be permitted'" and that, for existentialism, is the starting point. Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist."

Nietzsche, who was also an atheist and is most famous for his three word epigram "God is dead" states the problem in literary form with hauntingly more emotional clarity in *The Gay Science.* A madman (who is mad only because he is abnormal) enters a street full of people and proclaims "God is dead" and "We have killed him" he says "Are we not plunging continually? Backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there any up or down left? Are we not straying as through an infinite nothing? Do we not feel the breath of empty space?...Do we not hear anything yet of the noise of the grave-diggers who are burying God? Do we not smell anything yet of God's decomposition?" Though these are supposed to be rhetorical questions which Nietzsche would answer with emphatic yeses, the crowd to which the madman speaks does not understand. What this all means is that the crowd, symbolizing man, has effectively killed God through scinece. The world can be explained in terms of molecules, energy and other scientific concepts; therefore, man finds the introduction of God's manipulative powers no longer necessary. However, man has not come to realize what this means, he doesn't smell the corpse, or as Sartre would say he does not yet feel "abandonment" which accompanies the realization that "anything is possible." In terms of his ethics and values man still believes God lives just as he once believed God worked the world rather than molecules and energy.

Nietzsche's conclusion is that man must overcome this loss and create anew, except this time not lies, like God, but new values of greatness. The man who does this is what Nietzsche calls the "Overman." This activistic approach to the atheistic existential problem is also followed by Sartre who says that "Upon this level (where a man is defined by his actions) therefore, what we are considering is an ethic of action and self-commitment."

This approach supplies no real imperative to action. If God is dead and all that matters is life then man may reflect and say "Nothing matters." The average life span of men is about 70 years and in terms of an eternity it really is nothing. With Sartre and Nietzsche's type of Existentialism no real difference is made, subjectively, whether a person decides to overcome actively or submit to apathy and hedonism. Therefore, the probability is great that most men would perceive such atheism as offering nothing other than despair or a life of "carpe diem" with very little consideration given to creating greatness.

Nietzsche recognized the danger of his doctrine and in *Thus Spake Zarathustra,* Zarathustra tells a crowd about the coming of such a person: "Alas the time is coming when man will give birth to no more stars. Alas! The time of the most contemptible man is coming, the man who can no longer despise himself.

Behold! I shall show you the *Last Man."*

Obviously, Nietzsche was not enamored with the concept of a world covered with last men. But, as Nietzsche says, such men would not despise themselves; therefore, the respective systems of ethics of both Nietzsche and Sartre leave a disconcerting deficiency.

Kierkegaard simply demolishes this deficiency by reintroducing God into the scheme of things. He also views man as unable to really discern, reasonably, what is ethical. His entire work on the story of Isaac and Abraham in *Fear and Trembling* is an exposition of this problem. Here Abraham even has God telling him what to do but with his free will Abraham must still choose, as an individual, by himself, whether to obey God or his reason, which of course tells him that the murder of his son is despicable. What Abraham decides is what Kierkegaard would have us all decide, ignore reason and obey the will of God.

This offers man a definite imperative to act, if he becomes the last man he will be damned before his God and suffer eternal torment. However, Kierkegaard supplies no system of ethics wither humanistic such as Sartre or a glorification of the powerful such as Nietzsche. He merely states that the individual should adhere to his own absolute, eternal and subjective truth "for the truth consists precisely in that conception of life expressed by the individual." This leaves almost any behavior, even the murder of one's own son, justifiable in the name of God; however, it does not allow for passivism. To be saved, one must act; merely existing, like the last man, is inadmissable to Kierkegaard's deity.

For three men who seem to agree on the very basis of human existence being man's freedom to choose, as an individual, it seems strange that two of them find God irreconcilable with such a system whereas the other finds him a necessity.

One could simply say that Sartre and Nietzsche are against Avicenna's God and are unable to arrive at any other conception of Him: Therefore, they find atheism to be the only answer. However, Kierkegaard would have found the God of Avicenna equally as abhorrent. He disliked any philosophical considerations of God. To him it destroyed the very beauty of religious faith. "Any thing that is almost probable, or probable, or extremely and emphatically probable, is something he (meaning one who is trying to attain faith) can almost know, or as good as know, or extremely and emphatically *know.* - but it is impossible to *believe*. For the absurd is the object of faith, and the only object that can be believed..." Here Kierkegaard agrees with Sartre and Nietzsche, to believe in God is absurd. But the only individual who attains to truth is the believer. Therefore, in many ways it appears Kierkegaard, the melancholy Dane, remains imminently more consistent in his rebellion against reason than either Nietzsche or Sartre. The German and the Frenchman find God unreasonable in terms of the free will of man and, therefore, have to kill God to accommodate man's license to choose. The Dane embraces a God who gives man the license and also realizes the absurdity of such

a God.

Therefore, if one could have asked Kierkegaard to explain exactly what his concept of God was (supreme architect, or what?) his answer would probably have been no explanation at all. He has no concept of God other than what God told Moses with the Tetragrammaton. He is. Therefore, a man's duty is to make himself freely before Him, so that the individual can also proclaim I am.

Caroline Herschel — First Woman of Astronomy
by Helen Bezold

When an astronomer speaks of "the first woman of astronomy," he is referring to Caroline Lucretia Herschel. Her role in opening a new era of astronomy was primarily as the supportive sister to Sir William Herschel, discoverer of Uranus. While at work studying the heavens, Caroline was his ever-ready-assistant, his help-mate, his "first woman." Moreover, Caroline also earned her title by proving to be an astronomer in her own right. Her independent exp oration of the sky led to the discovery of several nebulae and at least seven comets.

Undoubtedly, Caroline's early experiences served to shape her into the dedicated astronomer for which she is known. Evidently, the strong bond that existed between Sir William Herschel and his assistant was established in their childhood. For, Caroline reflected on their affectionate ties in her memoirs:

> My Mother being very busy in preparing dinner had suffered me go to a parade to meet my Father, but I missed him, and continued my search till I was spent with cold and fatigue; and on coming home I found them all at table; nobody greeting me but my brother William, who came running and crouched dwon to me, which made me forget all my grievances.

In contrast to William's kindness, her mother scarcely demonstrated her affection for Caroline. Her mother was "an industrious hausfrau, frugal," and "hard-working." Furthermore, she "demanded arduous household duties" of Caroline. Although her mother's demands prevented Caroline from attending school, and acquiring the skills that she would need to become a governess, her mother was the model of perseverance that Caroline eventually emulated. Caroline later exhibited her industrious characteristics in her assistance to her brother.

To be sure, Caroline's own reactions to the circumstances of her background influenced her decision to dedicate her life assisting her brother and to astronomy. For, as a result of contracting smallpox at age four, she had a lingering sense of disfigurement. Later, she wrote, "'Although recovered, I did not escape being totally disfigured and suffering some injury to my left eye.'"

Furthermore, Caroline heeded her father's warning that she should not expect to receive a proposal of marriage, for she lacked physical beauty and fortune. Indeed, after her father's death in 1767, Caroline had to consider her options. Her father had been a musician in the Hanoverian guard and he had encouraged the development of his children's musical talents. Consequently, from her father, Caroline had some musical training, and from her mother, she learned how to do housework. Caroline realized that immediately after her father's death, she did not have the skills to become a self-supporting individual. In her autobiography she wrote the following,

> I saw that all my exertions would not save me from becoming a burden to my brothers; and I had by this time imbibed too much pride for submitting to take a place as a Ladiesmaid, and for a Governess I was not qualified for want of knowledge of languages. And I never forgot the caution my dear Father gave me; against all thoughts of marrying, saying as I was neither hansom nor rich, it was not likely that anyone would make me an offer, till perhaps, when far advanced in life, some old man might take me for my good qualities.

Caroline was determined to avoid "'becoming a burden'" to William when she joined him in 1972 at his residence in Bath and as a result, she became a dedicated assistant when he undertook his astronomical studies.

Although Caroline's mother objected to her going, because she did not want to lose Caroline's help, she finally consented after William promised to send regular funds to provide for a maid to take Caroline's place. Once she joined William, he provided a way for her to realize her dream of being self-supporting. William was a musical conductor, and he encouraged Caroline to enroll in vocal lessons and "to practice on the harpsichord so that she could be a part of his musical performances." By the time she was twenty-seven years old, Caroline was an established popular vocalist.

From the years 1773 to 1782, the Herschels went through a busy period in which they gradually turned from music to astronomy. Without a doubt, William "would have been the first to acknowledge that the indulgence of his sister Caroline made the trasnition possible, and she in turn must have realized that her collaboration with William was the inspiration" of her own lively interest in astronomy. When William decided that he wanted to study the heavens, Caroline became his chief observing assistant. Together they spent hours night after night at the immense home-made telescopes, exploring theskies.

Herschel took "sweeps" of the heavens with his home-made telescopes. These sweeps were systematic surveys of "all noteworthy objects — star clusters, nebulae, double stars, and so forth — in successive zones of the sky; the results were recorded in a catalogue." While William observed the skies, Caroline recorded his notes in the catalogue and worked on the calculations.

Caroline trained herself to be a competent assistant to William by "studying geometry, collecting formulas, learning logarithmic tables, and learning about the relationship of sidereal time to solar time." She took care of all the laborious numerical calculations and reductions, all the record keeping, "and the other tedious minutiae that required a trained mind but would have consumed too much of Sir William's time." Furthermore, she and her brother Alexander worked at the grinding and polishing of specula in order to aid William in the making of the telescopes.

In 1781, the discovery of Uranus changed the character of William Herschel's professional life, and the Herschels no longer found it "necessary to augment their finances by musical performances." William named the planet "Georgium Sidus" in honor of the king. In appreciation, the regent appointed William Herschel to the position of court astronomer the following year. This appointment

brought with it an annual salary of 200 pounds. Five years later, Caroline was appointed as his assistant with a stipend of 50 pounds annually.

Caroline's appointment made her the first woman to be honored with such a position in the government service. To be sure, "it is 1ikely that never before nor since has any government purchased such a dedicated servant for such relatively low cost of hire."

In 1782, Caroline Herschel began independent studies of the heavens. She detected, in early 1783, such nebulae as Andromeda and Cetus, and, by the end of the year, "she had added fourteen nebulae to the number already catalogued." She was the first woman credited with detecting a comet; between the years 1789 and 1797, she detected at least seven.

Undoubtedly, the night watches with William entailed much patience, alertness and physical exertion. Also, Caroline's pursuit of comet hunting required of her an "encyclopedia" knowledge of the skies. Moreover, Caroline could not have discovered seven comets accidentally. In order to have discovered that many comets, she must have patiently observed a selected area of the sky. Furthermore, once a comet is found, skill is needed in measuring its position with respect to the stars and to find out how it is moving. Caroline certainly exhibited these skills, and proved to be an excellent astronomer.

In her later years, many honors were bestowed on Caroline. In 1828 she was elected an honorary member of the Royal Astronomical Society and she received their Gold Medal for one of her greatest services, the reorganization of Flamsteed's *British Catalogue* (a listing of nearly 3000 stars) into zones of one-degree width. This catalogue enabled astronomers to search the skies by a more systematic method. Also, in 1848, the King of Prussia bestowed on her a gold medal for science. Furthermore, a crater on the moon has been named for Caroline Herschel.

After her brother's death in 1822, Caroline left England and returned to Hanover. She had a small pension, and William had provided a legacy on which she lived. Also, the royal family continued to take interest in her welfare, even after George IV died and Hanover was separated from the English crown. In Hanover she reorganized William's observations for her nephew, Sir John Herschel, who planned to continue his father's work in observing the heavens. And, in 1848, she died. Yet, her epitaph, which she wrote herself, reaffirms her dedication to astronomy and to her brother:

Here rests the earthly veil of
Caroline Herschel
Born at Hanover, March 16, 1750
Died January 9, 1948

The eyes of her who passed to glory, while below turned to the starry heavens; her own discoveries of the comets and her share in the immortal labors of her Brother, William Herschel, bear witness of this to later ages. The Royal Academy of Dublin and the Royal Astronomical Society of London numbered her among their members. At the age of 97 years and ten months she fell asleep in happy peace and in full possession of her faculties; following to a better life her father, Isaac Herschel, who lived to the age of 60 years 7 months and lies buried near this spot since the 25th March, 1767 (Scripta Mathematica 21, June 1955, p. 251).
31

The Knowledge Behind Ignorance
or

'St. Mark's view of Growth'

(An interpretation of the disciples
in the Gosple according to St. Mark)

by Peter Fisher

"It is in the nature of mankind and the corollary of our
success to ask and answer questions, and the deeper the
questions the more characteristically human the activity."
Carl Sagan

The theme of growth through questions is present in the Gospel of Saint Mark. The disciples, as portrayed by the author of the book of Mark, change. They begin as fishermen and common people and become leaders in a mission of God.

The contemporary theological view, found in Form Criticism, holds that the disciples (according to Mark) were ignorant, blind, and faithless; but this is not entirely true. To say that the disciples were ignorant is a mistake. The cause of the error is an attitude that everything which Jesus was could have been nothing less than obvious. It also discounts a basic fact: the disciples are people. With someone as different as Jesus they could only question. The disciples stumble onto His identity after numerous questions. With these questions they broaden their knowledge. As a blind man learns more of the identity of a person's face with each stroke of his hand, so does a man learn about God—both throughout his life and throughout the history of man.

The disciples are interpreted as dense because of their continuous questions, but it is by these very questions that they develop. They begin as unquestioning, blind, and faithless followers. They end as loyal, aware and faithful leaders. By their productive, active, and human change we can learn much.

Before dealing with the questions that the disciples ask, one might note how the gospel begins. The disciples do not ask questions. They are merely followers. They do not inquire about anything that they see because in the beginning, what they see is not so unusual as to be unintelligible. An example of this is the manner in which the disciples respond to their calling. When Jesus calls them, they simply follow. Without questions, the disciples leave their livelihoods, sever family ties [1], and even forego their old ways and habits [2]. These actions require some certainty. In the case of the first four disciples, Jesus has yet to do anything unusual enough to provoke questioning.

The disciples do not ask questions until after Jesus appoints the Twelve in 3:14. Their inquiry begins after the first parable. When Jesus has finished teaching a large crowd and is alone "...the Twelve and others who were around him question him about the parables." (4:10)

Later, in 4:33, Mark informs us that these "question periods" were frequent. They recur throughout the whole gospel. (i.e., 7:18; 9:28). As John R. Donahue points out, "Undoubtedly Mark as author was familiar with the tradition of Jesus as teacher." Conversely, the disciples are His students and they require special explanations. Mark's point is that the disciples do not understand what Jesus meant by the parable. The Twelve do not see what Jesus' words mean by His parable because they do not know what His intention or mission is. At this point the disciples do not have an inkling as to the true identity of Jesus, but they can see that he is different, by his teaching and authority. Two reactions to His teachings without knowing His identity are: rejection or "hardness of heart," or inquiry—the questions of the disciples. The disciples have only begun to seek out the answers!

"...'Master, we are sinking! Do you not care?'" (4:38) Exasperated by the unconcerned and slumbering Christ, the disciples awaken Him. The men in that boat are very worried for their lives. The boat's situation appears critical; for "...it was all but swamped," as it tosses about in a heavy storm. The disciples know what would happen if the boat sank and they are puzzled as to why Jesus remains calm in the face of impending death. They do not understand why this man does not fear for his life.

This puzzling over Jesus shows their lack of faith [3] and a failure to understand Jesus' faith [4]. This failure to understand Jesus is related to how the disciples view themselves. They are pragmatic men who think in terms of what is immediate. They understand their mortality more than God. they identify Jesus as being a man who should respond to the fear of death in a way the disciples would expect. What is in jeopardy is their understanding of Jesus as a new teacher and what they see as Jesus as a wonder-worker.

Jesus calmed the sea, stopped the winds, and rebuked the disciples. The disciples, awestruck and befuddled by the power they have just seen, ask, "Who can this be? Even the winds and sea obey him." (4:41) They have questioned Jesus' very humanity by this. They have shown themselves to be entirely mistaken about His identity. Their questioning brings them to ponder the fundamental questions: "who" and "what" is Jesus?

This same wonderment is repeated in Chapter five. The disciples answer Jesus with the question, "You see the crowd pressing upon you and yet you ask, 'who touched me?'" The tone of this question seems a bit arrogant and sarcastic, but it is asked more out of frustration and ignorance. The disciples again question His humanity. They say, "Why can't you see the obvious?" The crowd is close all around, and they could not tell who touched Him. The difference between the question and the last is that formerly they asked out of an awe of the divine power He displayed; here the same man who calmed the sea is powerless to tell who touched Him. They do not understand His concern, nor how He knew that He was touched. They can't figure out waht kind of request Jesus makes of them so they repeat His own question. This is not as direct as the questions from chapter four. By repeating Jesus' question they do not pose their own, but they have thrown the question back at Jesus as if to get a further explanation. They still do not know Jesus' true identity. Yet they continue to follow, and have just begun to seek understanding.

The Twelve do not know who or what Jesus is. They do not understand His manner or teaching. They have grown from unquestioning followers of a novel and impressive rabbi to a disoriented understanding that this teacher is something much more.

In the multiplication of the loaves the disciples show that they continue to "think as men do.' Their question demonstrates many doubts about the man they follow. When they ask, "Are we to go and spend twenty pounds on bread to give them a meal?" they do so with a practical spirit. Indeed, it is their pragmatism that makes them suggest to Jesus that He send the people away to find shelter for the evening. (6:36) They 'know' the value of money, and ask Jesus to make a choice between money or an attempt to feed the multitude. It is the first time they question a command of His. They ask if they are to carry out this task. In this respect, they must decide between serving the people or not. The Twelve express problems with Jesus' intentions in addition to His teachings. The point of their questioning has shifted from the identity of Jesus to a search for the meaning of His mission.

Their search for understanding continues with another private lesson at 7:18. Here they question the meaning of parables that teach against the particularism of Judaism [5]. It is obvious that they would inquire about teachings that challenge what they have learned by tradition. They challenge everything that the disciples know as Jews. St. Mark writes to show the disciples trying to overcome a major stumbling block and to understand Jesus' message. The passage depicts the Twelve attempting to come to grips with what is to them baffling and new.

Within the second multiplication story, the disciples again appear ignorant by their uncertainty. This time Jesus laments at the impoverished crowd and points this out to the disciples. They respond with a question posed on a material, practical level. Almost defensively they answer, "How can anyone provide all these people with bread in this lonely place?" (8:4) By their words they fail to recognize the spiritual nature of Jesus, but there is an extremely important change in their questions since the last bread feeding. They do not cast doubt on the mission, or the orders to serve, or on what is more important. They ask how it can be done. Jesus replies by repeating His action. True, they quickly forgot the first example, but the whole point of their questioning has turned around. Their query attempts to get at how they are to carry out this mission. This marks a change in the disciples understanding of Jesus. They have accepted His mission.

Jesus tries to remove their major obstruction. He tells the disciples that their immediate, single-minded and practical view of the world is misleading them. He confronts their blindness directly by taking issue with them. "Knowing what was on their minds, he asked them, 'Why do you talk about havinq no bread?'" (8:17) What is on their minds is a question of mortality and practicality. They were worried about their next meal. Jesus hotly rebukes them for their closed minds, blindness, and lack of understanding. It was an attempt to remove them from their earthly ways.

Directly after the above passage comes a parallel, microcosmic story--the healing of the blind man of Bethsaida. It contains an ironic meaning. While this narrative alludes to show "...us consistently, and with increasing emphasis, the blindness of the disciples,..." [6], it more strongly tells us about the relationship between the disciples and Jesus and how they come to see. Nineham is right in suggestiong that this story is closely related to the feeding stories [7]. Lightfoot is also correct in saying that the blind man represent the disciples [8]. What these Form Critics overlook is how this passage serves to illustrate the manner by which Jesus tries to make the disciple 'see'. Jesus, the Teacher/Healer [9] needs to make repeated attempts to bring them to 'sight.' The disciples realize visiongradually. It is only gradually that the disciples, after (two) repeated attempts by Jesus, come to see the significance of bread in the feeding narratives. In this manner this passage acts as a short summary of the whole relationship between Jesus and the disciples up to this point in the gospel.

The Transfiguration story marks the disciples' turning point. From here to the end of the book the nature of their questions change. "Peter spoke: '...Shall we make three shelters, one for you, one for Moses, and one for Elijah?' (For they did not know what to say)." (9:3) This statement shows a lack of perception on Peter's part [10], but it also shows a grasping of the power and importance of Jesus. Peter's suggestion is wrong, but not his perception of Jesus' divinity. Peter recognizes His divinity by placing Him in context with Elijah and Moses. His offer to worship is in a Jewish fashion. His reaction has no practical concerns, only religious. Peter no longer "...thinks as men think..." (8:33) Peter, representing the disciples, no longer misses the point of the bread or the spiritual nature of Jesus. He acknowledges the meaning and identity of the Messiah. His question asks to find out how they are to act toward the divine Messiah.

The first question after the Transfiguration is of what Jesus means by his words about rising from the dead. When they question this subject, they ask in the context of their traditional teachings [11] on the prophecy of the Messiah. In 9:10, they question Jesus about the prophesy looking to find how Jesus, as the Messiah [12], corresponds to what He tells them. Their questioning seeks to find how everything that Jesus tells them is part of what they see as men.

The Twelve make another change of inquiry. At their next private lesson they ask, "...why could we not cast it (a devil) out?'" (9:28) This time their question concerns their inadequacies. They want to know what they have done wrong[13] and how they may change so that they can be fully able.

When Jesus predicts his death the disciples have a concern in their minds but are afraid to inquire. (9:32) They have linked their fate to their leader's. [14]. Their own mortality worries them, but it is not their earthly concerns that they have asked about in the bread narratives. They worry over their own existence. Also, this question is left unspoken. It remains a doubt in their minds. This is the first time they with-hold a question from Jesus. It may signify an attempt to resolve a dubt on their own or, at least, they internalize their lack of understanding. The point is that they do not depend on Jesus for an answer.

An implied question follows the above when Jesus asks, "...What were you arguing about on the way?" (9:33) The fact that they argue implies some disagreement or a topic that is

questionable. They make no attempt to put the issue to Jesus. He must ask them. The disciples try to solve for themselves a question in their minds about who is the greatest. This problem is not only kept to themselves, but is about themselves. The organization or status among their group is a question about themselves as a nucleus community. The teacinq they receive does not tell them who is to be leader among Christ's followers, but tells them how they should act toward each other. It is their question that leads them to inquire and learn a new way of treating each other.

The Twelve receive another private lesson in 10:10. Unlike their first lesson, which clarifies how the word is accepted, this lesson is on the Jewish marriage laws. Their private interrogation looks for a clear definition of these new interpretations given by Jesus to the old laws. They know that their whole upbringing is at issue here.

The redefining that occurs in this question is brought further at 13:1. One of the disciples presents a question in the form of a statement when he says, "'Look Master, what huge stones! What fine buildings!'" He marveled at the wonderous sight of the temple and the materially oriented Jewish leaders [15] .

The last three questions delve into topics and attitudes that are to become the foundation of the church. The disciples have inquiries into the nature of its organization, its laws, and its substance. By this time they have learned and developed from followers to leaders.

A number of the disciples ask for a sign of when the temple and the whole material world will come to pass away. Jesus answers with an apocalyptic account of the end of the world. With this inquiry the disciples are shown when they are to expect all that they have worked for to be realized. They are given a number of warnings to be a guide in carrying out their mission. They have finished their growing and have learned all that Jesus has to teach them to administer what will become the church.

The old law and new interpretations are put into perspective in the disciples' next question. They simply ask where they should prepare the Passover meal. (14:12) Here they did not inquire whether or not they should observe Passover; that is assumed. They did not question Jesus' instructions. Their question is a matter of how they are to observe the feast. They understand that they should follow this law. In this question they have come to understand what has happened in the first half of the book. They are to bring the God of Israel to all nations. They are aware of everything they need to know to administer the kingdom Jesus has started. They have grown to be able to accept the ceremony of that new kingdom. Their question just asked where they were to prepare for it.

The disciples' last question is the infamous "Not I, surely?" (14:19) This question centers on the followers' own doubts about themselves. It shows self-reflection. None can believe that they would betray Jesus. Each doubts his own faith. They want to show themselves unquestioning in their loyalty to, and belief in Jesus. They are trying not to question themselves, but their self-critical uncertainty forces them to ask. The awareness of their faults gives them qualities of true leaders.

This concludes how the Twelve disciples change. They, through the topics of their questions and their reasons for asking them, have shown their development. When they are called by Jesus they do not ask questions. They simply follow. They begin wondering about what Jesus says, who He is, and what He is. We see here a shift in the content of their questions to how they may carry out His teachings. Eventually they overcome their shortsighted view and learn what God thinks. Their questions move to explore the new teachings on the law which will become the church. Finally, the Twelve question themselves and their own loyalty to , and faith in Jesus.

Understanding the change that occurs by their questions leads to the understanding of them and their doubts as they experience Jesus. One obvious but often neglected point is that the disciples were men. Jesus is a different sort of man from themselves. The difference is great enough that he did not conform to any of their normal concepts. They had no reference by which to understand Him.

When men do not understand, they ask questions. As they learn more their questions grow. Eventually, they understand His identity and can accept His authority.

This guidance is evolutionary. Each step requires the one before it so that progress is made. They could not come to know Jesus in a flash of divine recognition. This can be seen when we consider what Jesus desired to teach us by his suffering (14:36), and by not taking Himself down from the cross (15:30), and by not wanting to be known (1:34). He knew that the use of power could not win the hearts of men. Such signs and unnatural acts would be forceful, and force could only defeat Jesus' mission. He must train His emissaries within their limitations. First the cloth is shrunk; then it is sewn to the garment. Time is required for the men to be formed into the seeds of the kingdom. It is in their least uncertainty, when they doubt themselves, that they acquire self-criticism, and it is that which enables them to confirm their belief in their ability to lead His church.

The developmental view of the Twelve provides a valuable example for contemporary man. Because their inquisitiveness is a human reaction, it transcends time and culture to become a similar reaction of any man. Their human experience of spiritual guidance becomes an example of present human experience. By knowing these men we can better recognize the subtlety involved as man stumbles on to glimpse the truth. They show how an individual may find God.

Considering the disciples this way also shows how a community develops. It is consistent with the idea of tradition in the Judeo--Christian theologies. Their time with Jesus illustrates how communities, generations, and mankind probes to find answers, bit by bit, each time catching another feature of God.

In this way the followers of Jesus are a model for both the individual and society. By taking their example, the Church can know how it will have to approach its current problems. If the Church is in doubt, it need only to pose a question and stumble a little further onward so it can better see the face of God.

FOOTNOTES

1. This refers to James and John who left their father.
2. This indication comes from the calling of Levy, who, being a tax collector,was considered to be engaged in a contaminated and sinful life.
3. Nineham says: "By contrast the disciples showed themselves, as on other occasions, to be men of little faith." The Gospel of Saint Mark by D.E. Nineham, Penguin Books, London, 1963, pg. 147
4. "The ability to sleep peacefully and untroubled is a sign of perfect trust in the sustaining and protective power of God;..." Ibid
5. Op. cit., Nineham
6. Ibid
7. Ibid
8. Ibid
9. Op. cit., J.R. Donahue
10. Op. cit., Nineham; contrary to this Nineham assures us that St. Mark meant Peter's response to be completely inappropriate.
11. Ibid., Nineham adequately describes Jewish expectations of the Messiah.
12. The disciples know that he is Messiah from 8:29.
13. The disciples had the power to drive out devils as early as 3:15. This makes their lack of ability doubly hard for them to understand.
14. Op. cit., Nineham; He interprets this identification of Jesus' future with that of the disciples' from the passage 3:27-9:1, where Peter names Jesus 'Messiah.'
15. What I mean by material is the early material that causes Jesus to rebuke the Pharisees; "you neglect the commandment of God, in order to maintain the tradition of men." (7:8)

Sophocles and Aristotle: *Oedipus the King* and *the Poetics*

by Jack Edwards

The essential attributes of an ideal tragedy, according to Aristotle, are best woven into a unified whoel by Sophocles in *Oedipus the King.* At the core of much of Aristotle's thinking is the concept of "the organic whole," especially in his treatise *On Poetry and Music,* and Sophocles best illustrates the utilization of the organs of the whole as enunciated by Aristotle, making them function as one. The elements of tragedy thus converge as one to focus, by Sophocles, in this, the essence of the perfect tragedy.

I intend toshow what it is that makes this play great, according to the guidelines and criteria set up by Aristotle in *The Poetics.* My emphasis will be on the three "internal elements" of tragedy, ratherthan the external, as the latter elements lose much of their form by the demands of translation, and the reading of the play tends to tone down any "spectacular presentment" that might be contained therein.

Of the three internal elements, plot is the most important, for it is in this element that the core of tragedy is contained, while character and thought are the elements subordinate to it. The plot is ideal in that it consists of a unified action; namely, the sincere effort and desire of Oedipus to rid Thebes of the murderer of Laius. Ideal is the play also in its magnitude, the imitated action being in accordance with the necessities of any play, namely, that it be neither too small for the eye (of the audience) to discern detail, nor too big to be taken in by one swift glance (i.e. the play is not so long as to tax the memory of the spectator, losing, to him, the essential attributes of the tragedy).

Along with this unity of action, or plot, a well-constructed plot is the most pertinent element to "the perfect tragedy" if it is complex, i.e. it is the kind of tragedy which depends entirely on "reversal of the situation" (peripeteia) and "recognition". It is the former which I will speak of at length here.

The play itself, in the unity of its plot, bespeaks at least two main reversals, one contained within the drama proper, one outside the parameters of plot in the normal sense. The interior reversal is the unified actions of the play, this being that the man Oedipus, in his fondest desire to find and banish (or kill) the scourge of Thebes, finds *he* is the "carrier" of the plague, and that *his* curse and that of the Oracle have found and turned on him. It is this reversal (or "irony") thatis central to the tragedy which befalls Oedipus. The exterior reversal is the young man Oedipus, (before the opening scene of the play) who flees Corinth to prevent fulfillment of the prophecy that he would bring harm to his parents, and goes to Thebes, his real native-land, and to his real parents. These two situations compose the essence of this particular play, but made more tragic by its other reversals.

The most grandiose reversal is brought about by smaller, component reversals, one being the arrival of Tiresias, the one believed to become savior of the land by revealing the identity of the culprit, but instead marks the end of the complication, and the beginning of the unravelling (denouement), these composing the two parts of the perfect tragedy. Another is Jocasta's attempt to set Oedipus' mind at rest only to give him greater cause to worry (a further unravelling). Another is the arrival of the messenger, who believes himself to be a bringer on good news by telling of Oedipus' inheritance of a kingdom, and that Polybus and Merope are not his true parents.

The complication is achieved almost totally extraneous to the presented plot, but revealed in the recounting of past incidents in the play, and the tragedy is Oedipus' desire to know truth being the casual link to his downfall, depicted by the unravelling of the plot, which is nearly the whole of the play. The very height of good tragedy, according to Aristotle, is what follows, the fall of a good and prosperous man to depravity, due to circumstances beyond his control.

One of the five kinds of recognition enunciated by Aristotle, Sophocles utilizes the best, that being a recognition arising from the incidents themselves; a startling discovery made by natural means. Perfection is achieved by Sophocles, in that he is able to make recognition one with the denouement. As recognition comes about gradually, (Oedipus' knowledge of his being a murderer of Laius, then his coming to know of his true parentage) at the same time, and as gradually, does the unravelling take place, which only appears as an unravelling to the majority of the characters in the play, as Sophocles' audience was already familiar with the facts.

The purpose (end, aim) of tragedy is to achieve a *katharsis*, a purgation of pity and fear, brought about by the arousal of these emotions by the incidents in the play. A good tragedy then, is to be judged by whether these emotions are aroused, and by what means. Aristotle tells us that in the perfect tragedy, pity is to be aroused by "unmerited misfortune", and fear by "the misfortune of a man like ourselves", and that these are ideally to be raised, not by means of the spectacle but from the inner structure of the piece." This inner structure can be seen in the plot of the play, and the thought and character of Oedipus.

Tragedy is epitomized by Oedipus, the very embodiment of the tragic hero. His character, his situation, his whole being makes the height from which he falls that much greater, thus providing for the sharpest contrast to his lowly state after his fall. The action occurs between people very near to one another, namely, Oedipus and his parents, who remain very near despite Oedipus' attempt to flee from a potentially dangerous situation. These circumstances are made more tragic by the fact that Oedipus discovers this truth afterwards, when it is too late. Tragedy is assured by the painting of Oedipus' good nature, his desire to do right by his country in trying to purge it of its pollution, whose effort is repaid by the sight of truth, a sight so bright it blinds him. He is well-renowned and prosperous, his wisdom brings him a kingdom; all these things conspire against him, wearing the rug of illusion which fate (*moira*) will pull out from under him. Oedipus is consistent in his persistence to know the truth, and this is his strange *hubris,* a kind of overweening pride in his human capability which determines his downfall. His tragic flaw is in thinking that he might escape his fate, escape Apollo, and through his own effort, be "the luckiest man on earth". Instead, he is hated by the gods, who were thought by him to favor him, and banished by his countrymen.

Oedipus the King is constructed so carefully, so artistically integrated into a complete whole that it hardly bears component analysis. To do so is to take out the integral p rts of an organic unity, when necessity dictates thier inclusion, that the whole be left intact.

We pity Oedipus, because in the play, we see an objective representation (not a re-presentation, as in historical accounts) of a man more like us in character than unlike, and we are afraid because he, for reasons unknown to us or him, was singled out by the gods, who determined this, his tragic fate.

GOYA: THE SEARCH FOR A PERSONAL SANCTUARY

by William Kotansky

It seems that when an artist wants to express some personal message through his work, he sometimes must seek a political sanctuary. For most artists of the late nineteenth century, Paris was that place. But if the artist lived before this world of Paris, he either had to repress the message or find some personal sanctuary in which to express it. For the early nineteenth century artist, Francisco Goya, it was not only a matter of finding this personal refuge, it was also a matter of creating it. Goya was already the veteran artist when he started to work on this sanctuary. But in order for one to fully understand its creation, it is first necessary to view its development through the earlier years' works of Goya and his world in early nineteenth century Spain.

Spain was not settled at the dawn of this new century. The watery Court of Carlos IV had been replaced by the reactionary Ferdinand VII during the Napoleonic invasion. And in the years following, the Franco-Spanish War brought the turmoil of the times to every town. The Spanish world was twitching with damaged political nerves. Before this uneasy period, Goya as an artist, had reached the summit of the Spanish political pedestal. In 1786, he had been appointed Painter to the King under Carlos IV. Later he recieved the titles of Painter of the Royal Household (1789) and First Court Painter (1799). In his career as the royal painter, Goya became intimately involved with the Court, but he remained artistically aloof. He was an observer in the Spanish Court. He recorded the external world of politics and society. And it was his realistic portrayal of this world which brought fame to Francisco Goya.

Artistically, he may have continued on the path of realism had it not been for one significant event—on March 24, 1814, Ferdinand VII was established as the Spanish monarch. It was not that Goya abhorred the monarchy; it was that he abhorred the monarchy of Ferdinand VII. In order to understand his contempt, it is necessary to look to Europe. In the late eighteenth century, the continent had undergone a dramatic metamorphasis. The Age of Enlightenment had brought to France and England new ideas about the freedom of man and new constitutions were being spread by new political winds. It was during the Franco-Spanish War that Goya had hoped these winds would reach Spain. But when these injustices continued to be nurtured inside the country after the war, Goya's hopes began to dissolve; for then the artist knew that the reactionary storm of Ferdinand VII had conquered the liberal ideas. Not only did the storm quash the new constitution which had been drafted, it even went so far as to establish a new Inquisition. And for the first time in his long career, Goya could taste the bitter defeat.

Now with his hopes dissolved and his contempt for the monarchy growing, the artist began to change. He became disillusioned with man and his inability to control his destiny. For Goya, man became a tottering tightrope walker being blown by the reactionary storm. Around him, the external world was changing. And the artist could no longer express it only in terms of realism; he had to find an outlet for his personal interpretations, his personal messages. For Goya, the first outlet was a series of small black and white etchings completed during his years in the Court of Ferdinand VII (l8l4-19). Although the etchings are small, one immediately senses Goya's transition from the realistic world to an inner one.

The series is entitled "Disparates" (Proverbs) and unlike his previous series such as the "Disasters of War" or "Tauromachia," its content is fantastic and its theme has only the barest unity. The series appears as a mishmash of personal messages, "messages written in code." And even though these messages reveal no overall theme, individual ones seem to appear in certain plates. For example, Goya begins the series with the theme of human fear and anxiety. In the second etching, "Folly of Fear," Fear is shown confronting man. The artist, reflecting back to the Franco-Spanish War, has placed two groups of struggling soldiers on a battlefield. Both are fully exposed to all the elements.

There is a trio in the foreground twisting in combat when they suddenly notice a phantsmal giant calling them. They cannot comprehend waht it is. They only know it calls. They see only a jet-black face and a cutting appendage aimed straight at them. Their faces are contorted with the pain of anxiety. They begin to freeze. Nearby a fourth soldier stands trying to flee; but with his white eyes popping from fear, one senses that soon he too will be frozen. Instinctively he tries to raise a stubby sword, but this battle is already lost. For all of them have already been defeated by the element of Fear.

In the background of the "Disparate," a lone tree stands as the only reflection of the natural world. Near its trunk, the second group of soldiers huddle, clinging to the only recognizable object. And it is as if this tree is there to counter the image of Fear in the etching just as the natural world counters the supernatural inner world in the lives of the soldiers. With this idea, the soldiers suddenly become more than nineteenth century Spaniards. They became all men, at all times; for the fear they feel is an instinctive quality of man, a universal quality. This is the first of the externalized messages from the inner world of Goya. From here, Goya continues down the road of universals. Next he tries to express something even more abstract than fear—the uncertainty of human life. The "Disparate" is entitled "Strange Folly."

Like the previous etching, the environment in "Strange Folly" is dark. But it is also a more bizarre environment for the only recognizable image in it is a lone, dead branch. A group of figures sit perched on the branch and for them it is the only terrain. Again, the artist seems to repeat his idea of man clinging to the security of the natural world. But this tiie the natural world is really insecure for there is the feeling that the dry dead branch can crack at any time. One senses that the figures on the branch can also feel the insecurity. They huddle tightly on the branch and listen to the only figure which speaks—a hooded, robed, one faintly reminiscent of the figure Fear. As he speaks, the fugure gestures with confident fingers. He seems to be the controller of the branch, of the environment. For the artist, he represents the politician and the priest all in one. And as the group listens to the controller, the individual characters on the branch begin to emerge. The old man on the right wants to sleep. One woman smiles. Some are intent on his message. And the child on the extreme left seems unconcerned. Perhaps a normal group; but upon closer examination the group appears more abnormal. The old man on the right seems to have the facial and body hair of a dog. The woman seated in front of him resembles an old cat. On this branch, these two come to represent a certain part of mankind—the part which is reduced to the role of a creature in the animal kingdom. Then the figures begin to change. A human head is placed between the cat-woman, and the woman smiling. But this head has the face of a human idiot. It is the face of the man who cannot control his destiny, the face of modern man. Next to him, the smiling woman sits with a certainty of death in her eyes. Behind her a young child seems to be almost pushing her off of the branch as if into the grave.

For Goya, this branch became a symbol of the modern world and all its characters—the children, the dying, the idiots, the controllers and the sub-humans. And in the uncertainty of this modern world, all the characters can do is sit and watch and wait.

Later in the "Disparates" the theme of human uncertainty surfaces once more. This tiie it is explicitly expressed in its relation to the animal kingdom. In the etching entitled "Folly of Bulls" five bulls are seen hurling through a black abyss. As they travel the uncertain course, their bodies twist in unnatural contortions

and their faces carry a certain anxiety. These characteristics are most exp1icitly portrayed in the figure of the center bull. Of the positions, his is the most contorted. His legs seem to pull out in opposite directions, while his belly stretches downward. His expression shows a feeble fear; the eyes bulge as he goes along. The bull becomes man in his modern state, unable to control his destiny, eyes popping at every twist and turn. This was the state that Ferdinand VII had created. His reactionary Court had transformed the spirit of man to the spirit of bulls.

But deep inside, Goya believed that the spirit of man was stronger than that of an animal. He believed in man's survival, and to show it, he paralleled the etching of the five bulls with one of five men. It is entitled "A Way To Fly." And this time instead of the figures flying aimlessly, they control their movement with flying wings. These men know how to control their destiny. The black abyss in which the bulls were hurled has also been replaced with a partial darkness. On the edges of the etching there are some infiltering flights. Perhaps the lights carry the implication that man can reach a higher spiritual state. For as one critic has stated, "A Way To Fly" carries the idea that man can either "soar above the eagle or compete in degradation with the beasts." Inside himslef, Goya believed that man had the ability to rise above that eagle.

Unfortunately, the artist continued to see man in a world of degradation. During his years with the Court of Ferdinand VII, Goya's desire for an outlet to express an inner world grew more intense. Although the "Disparates" were such an outlet, they represent only the transitional period. They were small works finished before the mind of Goya was craving a larger canvass. After he had spent five years in that narrow Court, the artist was seething in a world of irrepressible messages. It was now time to find some sanctuary in which to express them for his transition to the inner world had been completed.

Since his career had brought so much fame to Goya, he could not leave the mother country. It would have been too politically embarrassing to the Court of Ferdinand. Therefore, Goya knew that he had to find a personal sanctuary inside of Spain. In February, l8l9, he purchased a tree-covered manor near the medieval town of Segovia. And for the first tiie in almost thirty years, the artist was removed from the royalty in Madrid. The house was christened "La Quinto del Sordo," (The House of the Deaf Man) because of an illness in 1793 which had left Goya Deaf. It was here at "La Quinto del Sordo" that Goya not only found his personal sanctuary, but also created it. The house became not only the place of expression, but the expression itself. It was on its cooled moorish walls that the artist was to open his mind. With Goya, the house became a modern Alhambra—the facade is simple, but the inner walls mirror real complexity.

These inner walls at "La Quinto del Sordo" not only abound with the artist's messages, they also abound with fantastic art. Certain themes from the "Disparates" are repeated here, but their external form is even more incredible. The messages are no longer on the small, black and white etchings. Now they are splashed on the walls in oils; dark oils, black and brown and green. And even though they are dark, they are woderfully vivid.

One of the most vivid of these walls was found in the dining room. It was entitled "Aquelarre" (The Witches' Sabbath). On the wall, the entire composition is made up of a human heath. All background has been eliminated; theee is no natural environment. Only the figures remain and somehow they become reminiscent of the figures in "Strange Folly," for as they sit, they huddle closely together. But this crowd has a different speaker--a he-goat (possibly a personification of Satan). He, too, gestures towards them. But as he talks, the heath seems to tremble with fear. There is a constant tenseness. Eyes shift fanatically, and frightened. One woman on the right leans inward, screaming something. The other's eyes shift in confusion. No one dares look directly at the he-goat. Between the center figures and the he-goat there is an incredible contrast. The swirling strokes of oil in the center of the heath give the figures a contrasting, constant motion while the dark he-goat nearby stands almost solid. Next to him sits his partner--a sinister nymph robed in shades of white. And her robes add the contrast of color to this already varied scene.

On the extreme sides of the heath, there are two figures which also add to the contrast. But theirs is a contrast of mood rather than of motion or color. First there is the old woman on the extreme left. She sits on the edge of the heath unconcerned about the he-goat. Perhaps for the artist, old age brought a sort of apathy towards the menacing creatures of this world. And perhaps she is representative of that age. Second, there is a woman on the extreme right. She, too, seems unconcerned about the he-goat. But her character does not reveal any apathy; rather, it reveals a certain wisdom. Her face shows a certain awareness. In the composition, she is the only figure which sits above the heath. Perhaps she represents some spiritual wisdom. Perhaps in this world of fear and witchcraft, she is representative of a madonna. But whoever this woman is, one can never really be certain for Goya left no artistic explanation. One can be certain, however, of the theme in this "Witches' Sabbath." It is the theme of the uncertainty in the modern world. It is another "Strange Folly" with the added sense of sorcery spreading across the dining room well.

On the adjacent wall in this room, Goya finished one of the most macabre messages of his career. The message must have beensurfacing from the artist's remote inner world, for it is a most terrible world. In it, a demented "Saturno" is seen crunching on a tender body. "Saturno," the Roman god of harvest, has begun harvest of his own children. The body hangs limply in his clenched hands. Its arms and neck are stained a brilliant, blood red. Here on the dining room wall is the artist's message of struggle, the ultimate struggle--man the destroyer, battling man the creator. In the image of "Saturno" the two meet.

It was this message which had seethed inside of Goya as he watched the reactionary Ferdinand VII destroy the new ideas that other men had created. For the artist, this was the most intimate of his messages. And without "La Quinto del Sordo" it may have been unrealized. Fortunately, Francisco Goya had an insatiable desire to externalize his personal messages. It was this desire which drove him to search for the personal sanctuary—the place free from political vexation.