1-1-1956

Bridie's concept of tragedy in "Susannah and the Elders".

William G. Warden
University of Windsor

BRIDIE'S CONCEPT OF TRAGEDY IN SUSANNAH AND THE ELDERS

Submitted to the Department of English
of Assumption University of Windsor
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts

by

William G. Warden, B. A.

Faculty of Graduate Studies

1956

ABN 5351

Approved by:

C P Crowley CSB

E C Pajeau CSB

Albert A. Thibault

A B S T R A C T

Bridie's concept of tragedy allows for two traits which influence for better and for worse, in terms of tragic drama, his Susannah and the Elders. These traits are irony and liberalism. Irony works to the betterment of his drama as tragedy in that it provides, though secondarily, situations somewhat to be pitied and feared. Primarily, be it noted, irony strengthens an argument for the villainous Elders, the central figures, and to argue a case for them in his drama clearly seems to be Bridie's intention. Liberalism, while it does not interfere with his dramatic argument, does however work to the ruination of it as tragedy, and this despite the use of irony. By its provision of a liberal outlook on life to the extent of omitting spiritual values, liberalism deprives the heroes of stature and their struggles of scope. For the most part they become non-tragic, and the drama loses a tragic sense. These ideas I consider in my paper and come to the conclusion that through irony the play succeeds as dramatic argument, but through liberalism it fails as tragedy.

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

Grateful am I to Reverend C. P. Crowley, C. S. B., Ph. D., Chairman of the Department of English, for his manifest patience and scholarly guidance generously accorded to me throughout the course of my graduate studies and in the preparation of this paper. My gratitude is extended also to Reverend E. C. Pappert, C. S. B., Ph. D., and to Doctor Albert Thibault, both of whom read the proof and offered helpful suggestions for its improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

INTRODUCTION

This past year my graduate studies have centered on the Scottish doctor-playwright, James Bridie (1888-1951). In the course of my reading, two things gradually became apparent: first, that Bridie was a most prolific writer and talker (forty-two plays, two autobiographies, two collections of essays, several speeches, excessive participation in student politics and publications to the detriment of his medical studies); and secondly, that much of his writing and talking was imbued with, how shall I say, a quest for freedom, perhaps, and possibly a preference for the human beings who seek it. He hated labels, for instance, and once wrote in anger to James Agate, London critic of the drama, "I wish you and the rest of you would leave your infernal labels at home."[1] Furthermore, Bridie spent much effort lecturing critics that "technique", which he was often labeled as careless of, "has nothing to

---

[1]James Bridie, Moral Plays (London: Constable, 1936), p. vii (i. e. "Author's Note" before the text of The Black Eye).

do with the blind adherence to a few arbitrary rules."[2] And anyone who did adhere blindly to arbitrary rules might have found himself ridiculed through Bridie's talent in the graphic arts. For, you must know, Bridie was from 1912-20 a caricaturist "of outstanding merit",[3] and, incidentally, copies of three of his caricatures, happily in my possession thanks to the Glasgow Art Gallery, further testify to such a talent. (For reproductions of these caricatures, see Appendix.)

Now this detestation of labels and blinding rules points up what I found in Bridie's writings, especially in his so-called biblical plays. It was a partiality for the riddance of restraint, and this partiality characterized his handling of the machine-like people in certain biblical or apocryphal stories, such people as Jonah, Tobias, Esther, Susannah and the Elders, all of whom he has dramatized. And if at that point in my research I wanted to name his handling "liberalism", I later became convinced of the propri-

---

[2]James Bridie, Colonel Wotherspoon: And Other Plays (London: Constable, 1934), p. ix.

[3]T. J. Honeyman, "OH! Did This", Scottish Art Review, III (March 1951), 6. The "OH!" in the title of the article represents the signature O. H. Mavor (pseud. James Bridie) affixed to his drawings.

ety of the name when, through the kindness of the present editor of The College Courant at the University of Glasgow (Bridie's alma mater), I received an article by a professor who knew Bridie and his works well. He found it not "fanciful to suggest that there is an unconscious symbolism" in the fact that so many of Bridie's heroes, like their author, "are at odds with the organisation in which they live." And the professor went on to explain this symbolism with "the quasi-political term 'liberal' -- in its old sense -- because no other term is so apposite."[4]

Finally, when I discovered Bridie's concept of tragedy, penned by him during 1939 in a preface and in an essay, I was certain of my conviction that he had the approach of a liberal. For he conceived that tragedy, as the etymology of the word indicates, is a

> 'goat-song' . . . a song, delivered with a peculiar bleating intonation, about a certain quality shared by mankind with the goat -- that of butting furiously and hopelessly against the facts of life.[5]

---

[4]W. L. Renwick, "James Bridie the Playwright", The College Courant: being the Journal of the Glasgow University Graduates Association, III (Whitsun 1951), 100.

[5]James Bridie, Tedious and Brief (London: Constable, 1944), p. 14.

In my opinion, the concept was implicitly liberalistic insofar as it prescribed "butting furiously . . . against the facts of life." Also, I believed it was implicitly ironical insofar as the butting, contrary to what would be thought, was prescribed as hopeless. Certainly, I felt, here was an interesting point -- tragedy with the common element of irony and an uncommon one of liberalism. And it is now my intention to examine Bridie's concept as it is realized in Susannah and the Elders, the only one of Bridie's dramas which, to my knowledge, he considered a tragedy.

My plan is to make a textual analysis of the drama from the viewpoint of its profound irony. A definition of irony will be made plain early in the course of the analysis and then throughout. With regard to "liberalism", a definition of it will also be made plain when I later come to that point. Until then, I use the word "liberal" in its nineteenth century European sense which, whether in political and economic spheres or religious and social ones, was basically a demand for freedom from restraint.[6]

---

[6]Cf. Hermann Gruber, "Liberalism", The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (1910), 212.

II

SUSANNAH AND THE ELDERS

In the Apocrypha there is the very old story of two elders and judges of the Israelites captive in Babylon. These men plan to seduce a lovely young wife, Susannah, but they are confounded by her piety and eventually brought to ruin by an inspired young man, Daniel. James Bridie used this story for the basis of his play, Susannah and the Elders. He tells us in the preface, written two years after the play, that since there is only a very limited number of stories in the world, a dramatist must use "all sorts of tricks"[7] when he bases his plays on these stories. Bridie goes on to inform us of the various tricks he used in this instance. The first was an emphasis on the Elders. This was in part accomplished, so he writes, by changing their nationality to that of the ruling class in Babylon and thereby enhancing their professional position as Judges and their social position as aristocratic gentlemen. The

---

[7]James Bridie, Susannah and the Elders: And Other Plays (London: Constable, 1940), p. ix.

next trick was to introduce Daniel earlier and establish a more acceptable connection between him and Susannah's plight. Then, Bridie created a new character, Dionysos the Greek, and let him flirt with Susannah so that the Elders might have some evidence to substantiate the charge of adultery they contrive against her. As for Susannah, Bridie changed her role slightly; she is noticeably friendly with the old Judges and yet simultaneously very cold and shrewd in her dealings with the invented character, young Dionysos.

Perhaps all these tricks are used, as Bridie implies, because "the danger in retelling too plainly an old story in contemporary language is the danger of squalor."[8] To me, however, that is not the real reason. Bridie admits he wanted to write a tragedy with the Elders as tragic figures, and each trick is therefore geared in some way towards diminishing the impact of villainy one gets from these figures in the original story. In this light, the outstanding reason for Bridie's tricks becomes a desire to state a case for the Elders in tragedy without altering radically the essentials of the original. And this reason is quite easily discerned in Bridie's preface. Moreover, it is plainly indicated

---

[8]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. xii.

immediately before the drama begins. A Reader steps before the opening curtain to give the "Argument". First he outlines the story, and then argues:

> The old story says that these Judges who did this wickedness were false and evil to the bone; but who knows the heart of a man and what moves in that darkness? And is there any man living who has in him no tincture of goodness however unhappily he may do in his life?[9]

These questions may seem sententious; nevertheless, to Bridie's credit they are justified by two factors in the Apocrypha which work in favour of the Elders. The obvious one is that they are too ashamed in the beginning to reveal even to one another their inordinate desire for Susannah, and not for some time do they so reveal it. Their shame bespeaks at most a "tincture of goodness" and at least a remnant of conscience moving in the "darkness" of their hearts.

But quite apart from this is a hidden factor which may well be important. It is the terrible sense of irony permeating verse five:

> That year two of the elders of the people were appointed judges -- men of the kind of

---

[9]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. 1.

whom the Lord said,
"Lawlessness came forth from Babylon,
from elders who were judges, who were supposed to guide the people."[10]

Aside from the melodramatic casting done therein, the verse sets down what Alan Thompson calls an "essential feature"[11] of irony: a "striking discrepancy" between expectation and event, in this case the discrepancy between the guidance expected of the Judges and the "lawlessness" eventuated by them. The twist inherent in the verse moves the mind forward to anticipate a final disaster, and this anticipation is, according to G. G. Sedgewick, a common function "of a great dramatic irony, at least in tragedy".[12] If we pause at this point in the apocryphal story to reflect, or I should say to "anticipate", we may well find ourselves wondering if these Judges become victims of some force, personal or otherwise, which occasions their calamity. And immediately when we start thinking in terms of victims, we prepare grounds for sympathy and thereby for some kind

---

[10]Edgar J. Goodspeed, trans., "The Apocrypha", The Complete Bible: An American Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 144.

[11]Alan Reynolds Thompson, The Dry Mock: A Study of Irony in Drama (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1948), p. 10.

[12]G. G. Sedgewick, Of Irony: Especially in Drama (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1935), p. 44.

of an analysis, perchance an argument, in their favour. It seems not unreasonable to suggest, therefore, that as a result of the irony in verse five Bridie found grounds for an argument on the Elders' behalf. He writes in the preface that "something inherent" in the original made him emphasize them and that the old story has its "tragic aspect".[13]

It happens that when we move into the drama itself the factor of irony becomes important. One of the Elders, Lord Kashdak, is sitting in judgment on a very hot day and presiding over a murder case. The second Elder, Lord Bel-Kabbittu, soon enters with the exciting news that Susannah is coming, and Lord Kashdak quickly remits the case to a higher court because its sordid side might offend her. He then says, "I'm not going to tolerate loose living in my section",[14] and right away there is a kind of grim joke. In view of the notoriety of the story, most of us happen to know the facts, and

---

[13]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, pp. x, xi.

[14]James Bridie, Susannah and the Elders: And Other Plays (London: Constable, 1940), p. 5. The play Susannah and the Elders covers pages 1-64. Henceforth, the location of all quotations from it will be given by inserting the page number in parentheses immediately following each quotation. Quotations from the preface will be footnoted as usual.

because of this knowledge any inclination to laughter on our part abruptly withers. Irony has used its anticipatory power and therefore we sit back and wait for the loose living, which Kashdak is not going to tolerate in his section, to settle right there.

Irony is again felt shortly after Susannah arrives to watch her darling Elders "Uncle Dick" and "Uncle Bill" at work. A case of blasphemy is now on the docket. Dionysos, a Greek, is guilty of blaspheming the Babylonian gods but he is released when Susannah, who as an Israelite has no faith in such gods, passionately urges his deliverance. The Elders lovingly comply and dismiss the case. Before anyone leaves, a farewell dinner-party is arranged for that night because Susannah's husband, Joachim, is leaving the next day on a long business trip. It is decided that the party, to which Dionysos is invited, will be held in the cool atmosphere of the Elders' beautiful garden, though Susannah strangely and incoherently at first objects to this setting, then finally agrees. Much to the Elders' discomfort, Dionysos now offers to escort her home, but she coldly declines. They leave separately, and the old men remain alone on stage. Kabbittu speaks of their relationship with Susannah and her husband:

> . . . There is no happier thing in the world than a friendship with a nice young married couple. It's such a free, innocent sort of association.
>
> (p. 15.)

His speech is bitterly ironic because what the association promises for these momentarily innocent men is at odds with what it ultimately realizes. Clearly, irony is working in this drama to suggest an argument for the Elders.

Let us continue in this vein. Kashdak and Kabbittu next discuss the possibility of merciless gossips spoiling the good name of Susannah while her husband is away. This possibility becomes a worry for them and leads to a complaint of the "modern fashion of speaking about the most -- the most intimate subjects" (p. 15). Then, in a gesture of self-defense, Kabbittu immediately remarks, "You know I hate hypocrisy", a remark which effects in us a mental halt. We recall the situation when Susannah pleaded for the release of Dionysos, and Kabbittu hesitated to grant it because, as he said, in administering the law "personal wishes and ideas don't come into it at all" (p. 10). Yet, for very personal wishes, namely, to please Susannah, he finally did release Dionysos. Thus his remark now, which is what Sedgewick would call "an irony of reminiscence",[15]

---

[15]Sedgewick, Of Irony, p. 53.

functions to reveal character, because in forcing a reminiscence the remark discloses that Kabbittu is most decidedly a hypocrite. Shortly after it, in reference to "hot-blooded young people", he says, "thank the gods, our fires are out" (p. 16). And this remark forces us ahead, that is, to anticipate a re-enkindling of their fires. Without a doubt, then, irony is suggesting more arguments, this time against the Elders. By sending our thoughts alternately forward and backward, it is giving us a firm grasp on the whole affair. Sedgewick would here say it is bestowing "that sense of control which . . . is the peculiar pleasure of the stage".[16]

There is at this point in the drama another noteworthy remark. Kabbittu goes on to cite some advantages of old age and concludes with the satisfying thought, "When the needs of the body have sunk low . . . the mind is free." (p. 16.) Kashdak agrees "in a sense". The thought has a slight ironical value in that it anticipates what may be a motive for later conduct. But aside from this, it strikes deep into character. On the pretext that the needs of his body have sunk low, Kabbittu is in effect excusing himself for becoming a free-thinker. Such an attitude is in turn permitting his "free, inno-

---

[16]Sedgewick, Of Irony, p. 55.

cent sort of association" with Susannah especially, of which he spoke recently. There has been no sign yet of a similar attitude in Kashdak; nevertheless, he freely partakes of the same association, and if his actions speak louder than his few words thus far, then "in a sense", as he says, he is thinking along the same lines as Kabbittu. The point that their minds are provoking rather liberal behaviour may bear watching.

Action mounts when some "unbearable Jew boys" (p. 16) come into the courtyard. They are Daniel and his three companions, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, all of whom are "very promising young members" of the law profession. They display a marked disrespect for their Babylonian captors and professional seniors, the Elders, and Daniel brazenly admits a constant desire "to get into trouble". In point of fact, Shadrach states, "Daniel thinks that trouble is the only thing that keeps life interesting." (p. 17.) "And quite right too," adds Abednego. Thus in this scene an external conflict is set up between the Elders and Daniel. And when his companions become grossly impertinent and he himself becomes insulting, the Elders angrily withdraw. Before the scene closes, Daniel boasts that he and his companions have no need to worry about any repercussions because "The Lord is on our side" (p. 19),

a boast that ironically contrasts with his behaviour and admitted trouble-seeking. One begins to speculate now with a view towards his final role in the Elders' downfall.

In Scene 2, Daniel and his companions are on their way to Joachim's house, supposedly to give him a message before he departs. They are arguing amongst themselves about the virtues of the Chaldeans in Babylon. Apparently the summer heat is still intense. Daniel becomes enraged during the argument, and it seems odd that the Lord should be on the side of this young man.

> DANIEL. . . . I shall care for and nourish the rage of the Jew till the last Chaldean brat has his head dashed to bits on these cobblestones.
> ABEDNEGO. Oh, stop him! Stop him! It's much too hot for this.

And later,

> DANIEL. Meshach, the Chaldeans are dogs and dogs, treacherous dogs and the sons of dogs. How can you forget it?
> SHADRACH. He hasn't forgotten Daniel.
> ABEDNEGO. You don't let him.
>
> (p. 20.)

This hateful abuse, be it noted, is coming from the promising member of the legal profession who has a reputation for prophetic powers and who is forgetting that these same "dogs" have elevated him in their midst.

Scene 3 opens on the loggia of Joachim's house. Susannah is busy packing his things when "the intelligentsia" (p. 21), Daniel and company, arrive. She and Daniel differ widely in their opinions of the Elders. Susannah argues, "They are the friends of our people. They are honourable and just, and they treat us kindly and generously." (p. 23.) Here, Daniel invokes the authority of his name, "the Judgment of God", but Susannah will not be persuaded by his violent arguments against them. In the end, he ignores her reasoned pleas to make the best of captivity, and she ignores his prophetic claims that "even in old judges the lusts of the flesh take a long time to die." (p. 25.) Finally, he refuses her invitation to the dinner-party at the Elders' home, and having delivered his dramatic warning and bid farewell to Joachim, he goes off with his companions. According to Joachim, Susannah "is only a child" (p. 25); according to his mother Haggith, who enters after the rumpus, "She talks too much." (p. 26.) The scene closes with a sense of dread foreboding when Haggith deplores her daughter-in-law's encounter with "the Prophets": "It isn't wise", she exclaims, "It isn't lucky. It isn't safe. No good comes of it. No good <u>can</u> come of it!"(p. 26.)

At the beginning of Act II, we witness the gracious charm of the Elders as hosts. Dinner has been served in their lovely garden, and their slaves are obediently pouring drinks, performing various entertainments, and fanning the guests. The evening is perfect and the conversation is gentle. Kabbittu requests a song from Dionysos and he sings two little poems by Sappho, a girl he once knew in Greece. The Sapphics, we note in passing, are poems of pure irony and translated by Bridie. One is about a "Goldenapple on the tree-top blushing" (p. 29), which in its exalted state was missed and left forgotten when the gatherers came; the other presents a beautiful "Hyacinth on mountainous pathways hidden", which in its secreted state was "trodden underfoot by the shepherd clown" and left "unseen and unknown". Kabbittu exclaims, "Nobody can beat the Greeks at these charming little meaningless songs." (p. 30.) Susannah, however, is rather cold in her reaction to Dionysos' talent. She begins a new subject for conversation, and this too is ironic. She wants to know about the problems involved in building "a tiny reservoir" because she desires to have a pool, like that of the Elders, for bathing. The worst problem turns out to be a financial one, and therefore the idea is dismissed by her. She says, ridiculously, "I think the Lord meant

me for a fish." (p. 30.) If she were, Kabbittu implies he would get her a silver tank with coral rocks. This chatter ceases, and then Susannah turns more warmly to Dionysos and engages him in a conversation about his native city, Corinth, and its religion. She thinks it "a good idea!" (p. 32) that Corinth has beautiful young ladies as priests; but Kashdak thinks it "an unusually repulsive and shocking idea!", and Kabbittu agrees. "I may not be a very religious man," he admits quite freely, "but I think that religion should be taken seriously." His hypocrisy is again disclosed by an irony of reminiscence, which brings to mind Dionysos' free behaviour in blaspheming the gods and the serious Judge Kabbittu he faced in court. Yet, here, Kabbittu seems to be excusing himself from taking religion seriously. Thus by his remark now, some kind of liberal behaviour on his part is again indicated, as it was earlier when he mentioned his "free, innocent sort of association" with Susannah and her husband.

Be that as it may, Kabbittu avoids an argument with Susannah on religion and orders more wine and music. The weather becomes the new topic of conversation. Again irony pervades every word and leaves us terrifyingly aware of ultimate disaster.

SUSANNAH. . . . I like this sultry weather, just before the rains. The whole earth has an eager feel about it.
KASHDAK. I think we shall have thunder.
SUSANNAH. Do you think so? There is a feeling of danger, too. But it's exciting. Especially as all danger and everything wild and strange are so far away from this garden. Do you feel that, Dionysos?
DIONYSOS. Yes.
SUSANNAH. There was a little doubt in your voice. Why was that?
DIONYSOS (leaning back). I have no doubt. But a faint shudder passed over me. It has gone. Somebody must have walked on my grave.
(p. 33.)

So much of the story rushes back into our minds. Dionysos' first flirtation, the Elders' desire to protect Susannah while Joachim is away, Daniel's warning, the desire for a bathing pool -- all these were put forth eagerly. And if we compare the plot thus far with the weather which begins to threaten thunder, we are surprised into a Pathetic Fallacy. Behind everything and yet in tune with all, unseen save by us, something like a power of Nature now moves. And through the eyes of irony the black future is seen foreordained. Its inevitability is certain at the close of the dinner scene. Here, farewells are made, and Dionysos wins permission to escort home Joachim, Susannah, and Haggith who slept through most of the evening. Then, in a gesture of kindness, Kabbittu tells Susannah, "You must look on

this garden as your own" (p. 34), and she promises to come. When left alone, the Elders discuss the success of the evening and eventually confess identical thoughts: the "couple of sentimental old ruins" are thinking about "goldfish . . . In a silver tank. With coral rocks." (p. 36.) There now seems to be another power, perhaps a power of destiny, moving behind all purposes to bring them to defeat.

Two short scenes follow. In the first, the very tired dinner guests are trudging homeward. Dionysos manages a few words alone with Susannah and eagerly professes his love for her. She politely but firmly and forever rejects it. In the second scene, Joachim and his mother reach home and are slightly alarmed over Susannah's whereabouts. When she does arrive, a simple explanation relieves their worries, and Joachim mentions how happy he is the Judges will be looking out for her safety and entertaining her in his absence. He says, and Susannah agrees,

> They're very decent fellows for Assyrians. High-principled, cultured, decent old fellows. The best type of old-fashioned gentlemen. Hard to beat.
>
> (p. 38.)

With that the curtain closes on their painfully ironic

ignorance.

In Scene 4, Haggith and Susannah are sitting on the veranda. It is one week later and Joachim is still away. Haggith expresses fear lest he should get into bad company, and Susannah, obviously bored with life at this time, states, "I'd like to get into bad company myself, just once for a change." (p. 40.) Now she too, like Daniel, is looking for trouble. And it is not long before she finds some. Haggith delivers her a lecture on her familiarity with the Elders, then on her habits of dress "more like one of these fast Chaldean ladies than like a quiet, modest Jewish girl" (p. 41). Susannah is decidedly relieved when Lord Kashdak stops by and Haggith, recalling a pressing engagement, hurries off. Kashdak has come partly to obtain Susannah's advice on a very trying case. He eventually wins her sympathy for his predicament in judging it, and she soothingly cries:

> I know it's terribly difficult for you. Day after day you must do your duty by a book of rules and forget that you are a man at all. And then suddenly your heart says to you, "I am here!" and you are astonished and don't know what to do.
> (p. 43.)

Aside from feeling an irony of anticipation in the cry,

we sense again something liberalistic. It takes the form of a lament over the restraints of "duty by a book of rules", which duty in turn causes a man to forget that he is "a man". When in turn he suddenly remembers this, he is, Susannah implies, left frustrated. Kashdak replies, "That is true." And so in her sympathy, Susannah is coming dangerously close to offering him arguments for a freer life, and such a life for him may primarily affect her. Indeed it may, for Kashdak before he leaves offers her the use of the garden and pool that very afternoon. "There is thunder in the air. It is stifling." (p. 44.) Susannah joyously accepts the offer; little does she know that another desire is being fulfilled, the desire for "bad company".

In Scene 5, we learn that Kabbittu had precisely the same offer on his mind. When he meets Kashdak on the street, he is walking to Susannah's house to see if she might care to take advantage of both his and Kashdak's absence and enjoy the garden. As they talk, along comes Dionysos. He pretends he has lost his way to the Museum, but the Elders suspect, not without reason, a renewal of his interest in Susannah. They send him off in the right direction, and after settling to some extent their suspicions, they accept the "prospects of a

miserable day" (p. 46) and leave for appointments, Kabbittu with the King and Kashdak with the Most High Judge, Latazakar.

Scene 6 opens upon the Judges' garden. Stage directions indicate that "distant summer thunder is heard rumbling from time to time." (p. 46.) They also indicate Dionysos on stage talking to the Majordomo, a slave. Apparently the Greek has lost a scroll -- a plausible excuse for his presence inasmuch as he had been giving lessons in Greek to Kabbittu. However, when he spots the inviting pool, Dionysos insists on remaining and taking a dip. The Majordomo, bearing in mind strict orders to keep the garden private, prepares to eject him from the premises, but it is too late. Susannah arrives with her maids and picnic things, and Dionysos is now determined to stay. In her fury, she requests his immediate removal and two armed slaves carry him out. The Majordomo apologizes profusely for the disturbance and then retires discreetly after bestowing some broad winks on the maids. While Susannah bathes, one of them sings a Song of Solomon, "The voice of my beloved! Behold he cometh" (pp. 50-51), which song in this setting is strikingly ironic. For, when it is finished, the maids sneak off to investigate the meaning of the Major-

domo's winks, and Susannah is left alone.

Behold, it is not her beloved who comes, but Kashdak, and a moment later, Kabbittu. Bitter words and violent threats are exchanged as both men give various excuses for their presence. More bitter is the mutual realization that they share in the same ignominious plan. Kashdak rightly shouts, "Honour is a sham." (p. 53.) Gradually their tempers subside, and the Elders become frustrated and afraid. Then once more the old liberal arguments are brought to life:

> KASHDAK. You said we could laugh, now, at our agonisings. You said when the needs of the body had sunk low the mind was free.
> KABBITTU. We look like it, don't we?
> KASHDAK. The mind is free. We are soldiers of Nabuchodonosor and judges of Babylon. We can take what we like and no man dare call us to account.
> KABBITTU. I'm not so sure of that.
> KASHDAK. Are you afraid?
> KABBITTU. I do not think I am a coward.
> KASHDAK. Then we open the gates.
> KABBITTU. No. Wait.
> KASHDAK. You and I rode wheel to wheel through Jerusalem over the bodies of Jewish women. If we're damned for this, we're damned for that! Go and hide if you dare not.
>
> (p. 53.)

When the gates are thereupon flung open, Kabbittu does not hide. This is not to be wondered at since we are already aware of his own free thinking on religion and free

association with a married couple, and since we are shockingly reminded here of his satisfying thought voiced earlier, "When the needs of the body have sunk low . . . the mind is free." (p. 16.) Furthermore, we are told he and Kashdak escaped being damned for their destructively free conduct long ago in Jerusalem, and so there seems to be considerably less reason for being damned for their planned conduct now. And as for Kashdak himself, we remember his past agreement with Susannah's cry about the dangers of living "by a book of rules", the lamentable result being that one forgets he is "a man" and is frustrated when he realizes, as she said, "I am here!" (p. 43.) At this terrible moment, which she so ironically forecast, we are not surpised that Kashdak overcomes his initial frustration and experiences little difficulty in making Kabbittu overcome his initial fears. The liberal arguments, innate, it now seems, to both men, quite fittingly keep both "here" to stay.

And the same arguments keep both men standing firm before the shocked Susannah. Her threat that if they "dare to do this thing" she will shout their names "to the whole city" (p. 54) has no effect on them. Kashdak retorts, "If you can tell tales we can tell tales

also." Eventually she is forced to choose either submission to their ignominy now or later, for their announced plan is publicly to charge her with adultery, "an assignation" (p. 54), if she does not consent to their desires. Susannah refuses to sin in any way with the Elders and her final answer is a ringing scream which brings several slaves running to the garden. Meanwhile, it seems Dionysos has been lingering nearby all this time, and now, when Susannah's cry for help is heard, he attempts to come to her rescue. While climbing the garden wall, he is speared and killed by the unsuspecting slaves. The circumstances of his death are tragically ironic for the girl whom he adored: the evidence provided by his corpse dragged from the inner garden condemns her, in the minds of the Elders, as an adulteress and delivers her up to their hands. She is led away to prison to await trial.

Five days later the trial begins. The Most High Judge, Latazakar, presides with other "Members of the College of Justice" (p. 56), including Daniel and his friends. Several Jews are present, among them Susannah's relatives and her husband Joachim, who has returned home. It is he who, in accordance with custom, has made the charge of adultery against his wife. The Elders, of

course, are chief witnesses. Their ignominy now seems boundless as they step before all and condemn Susannah for committing adultery with Dionysos. Their condemnation is false, as they know, because the only evidence they have is that Dionysos was in the vicinity of the garden and was enamoured of Susannah. But the Elders testify they actually saw the deed. The penalty of death is laid down by Latazakar despite Susannah's prayers to God and protestations of innocence, and despite Joachim's pleas for mercy. Susannah collapses, and at this moment Daniel shouts, "I am clear of the blood of this woman!" (p. 59.) To the amazement of everyone, he demands that the case be reopened and that he be allowed to examine the witnesses. Because of his position as a member of the bar, Latazakar is forced to grant both demands. Daniel then proceeds to examine Kabbittu after first separating him from Kashdak. A series of rapid-fire questions climaxes with the testimony that Kabbittu saw the deed committed under "a mastik tree . . . to the south of the pond" (p. 61). Kashdak is brought back and he testifies it was committed under "the holly-oak, north of the pool". Thus the Elders are trapped by their own mouths and manifested as treacherous perjurers. The frightening reversal pro-

duces a tumult in the court and Susannah is released.

Before she leaves for home, she tenderly rushes over to thank Daniel for saving her life. From this little scene valuable insight into character can be derived:

> DANIEL. . . . You owe your life to Jehovah, who, in his inscrutable purpose, spares fools the consequences of their foolishness. . . . Has it not been revealed to you yet that you are compact of folly and danger?
> SUSANNAH. What do you mean?
> DANIEL. Go home and pray. You will not kill me as you killed the Greek. I am no old man to run to my death because of you. Be content, woman. Go home and pray.
> SUSANNAH. I don't understand you. I think you must be mad. I shall pray for you. Come, Joachim.
>
> (p. 62.)

Once again these two are at odds. There is truth in Daniel's description of Susannah as a "compact of folly and danger". She was warned often by her mother-in-law and by a Prophet, yet she foolishly failed to realize that men are men, whether they be young Greeks or old Judges. As a result, she planted her own fate in a garden of friendship with the Elders. Her foolishness, in combination with her beauty, rendered her extremely dangerous to deal with, and the dead Greek and the ruined Elders testify to that danger. Wisely, then, Daniel re-

fuses to have any further association with her. However, there may be truth also in Susannah's belief that he is "mad", especially so when he goes to the extreme of suggesting that she killed the Greek and prompted the old men to run to their death. Susannah was, after all, unwittingly and unintentionally instrumental in their disasters, but not in any sense deliberately responsible for them. She was, as we are told in the preface, "a force of nature"[17] and therefore it is proper that she should be told to "go home and pray" since Jehovah, "in his inscrutable purpose", did spare her life. It remains to be seen if He intends to spare Daniel, who has now found the trouble he so often sought.

Near the end, Daniel brings down upon the Elders the just charge of conspiring "against the honour and the life of a daughter of Judah", and of committing perjury "before the Supreme Court of Babylon, dragging the name of Justice in the mire." (pp. 62-3.) He demands that Latazakar "make an end of them, and that quickly." (p. 63.) They have no answer to make, but rather they have an explanation to give, and before the Prophet and the Most High Judge, the Elders search their hearts:

---

[17]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. xiii.

KABBITTU. . . . All the world has known me as a kindly, just, respectable man. And so I thought myself. For I forgot how the exalted Anu had made us all. What you saw was the head of a man, uttering discreet things, above the robes of a grave and seemly magistrate. Beneath these robes was the body of a goat. The head ensues and cherishes honour, justice, pity, shame, a good conscience; the beast can be tamed but he knows nothing of any of these things.

And now, I have been of some small service to my King. I ask of him, through you his minister, this one gift: I ask of you to put me to the torture, that before I die the torment of my body may abate the agony of my spirit.

LATAZAKAR. And Kashdak?

KASHDAK. I am like Kabbittu in this, that I was a hypocrite to myself as well as to others. It was not I but my hypocrisy that did this cruelty. I am a hypocrite no more. I have lived long enough. Do with me as you please.

(p. 63.)

The findings of their search are not totally surprising. The Elders discover that they were hypocrites to themselves as well as to others. Hypocrisy is manifested as the intense flaw in their character, so intense that it blinded them to the order of life as their supreme deity, "the exalted Anu", ordered it. As a scene of recognition, this is a bitter one. Whether it is a scene of tragedy cannot now be discussed, for there is a dramatic finale yet to consider. When this is done, we will return to this scene.

Latazakar remits the case to the King "for judgment and punishment" (p. 63), and then adjourns the court. All withdraw except Daniel who remains on stage with his friends. They are enthusiastic over his victory, but he does not share in their enthusiasm. Meshach claims that the Lord "spoke already today, Daniel, through your mouth." To this Daniel replies, "I hope He did Meshach. I do not know." (p. 64.) That Daniel does "not know" if the Lord spoke through his mouth is stingingly ironic for a Prophet who once vociferously claimed that He was on his side and at another time angrily shouted the meaning of his name, "the Judgment of God" (p. 23). Perhaps "Jehovah . . . in his inscrutable purpose" has not, as the curtain closes, completely spared Daniel.

It is here that Bridie's use of irony is all important to his argument. His last line and the ironic change it demonstrates force attention upon all aspects of the story. In terms of strict justice, then, the Elders were damned, Susannah was freed, and Daniel was victorious. In terms of moral considerations, however, there are other conclusions to make. Here, one might recall to advantage the pathetic figures and what they said before the garden gates:

KASHDAK. There is no good left anywhere at all. Since we parted I have been walking in the sun, on and on with gongs beating in my head. Since I told her she might bathe in the garden, I have been possessed and compelled with the desire to see her. Only to see her like a white nymphaea in the pool. Why should it be so terrible?

KABBITTU. It would be dishonourable.

KASHDAK. Dishonourable! Honour is a sham. What are you doing here, you hypocrite?

KABBITTU. I am here because I cannot help it.

(p. 53.)

At that time and at the trial the Elders demonstrate that in them honour has been a sham. And they know from past experience that it has been a sham also in the Prophet Daniel who openly sought trouble and hatefully abused them and all Chaldeans. Little do they know, however, honour has suffered a betrayal also in Susannah who wanted "to get into bad company just once" (p. 40). Thus Kashdak was closer to the truth than he realized when he said, "There is no good left anywhere at all." Nevertheless, the Elders became the actual trouble-makers, and, therefore, moral considerations put them at gravest fault and eventually condemn them. As for Susannah, the same considerations put her at some fault, and it is no wonder, then, that Jehovah saw to it she was sent home to pray. As for Daniel, again the

same considerations put him at grave fault, and again it is no wonder that Jehovah saw to it he was left in a terrible state of uncertainty. Clearly, the trouble he so often sought resides finally in his troubled conscience. This is the supreme irony of Bridie's argument.

The technique of irony, then, becomes the greatest "trick" of all that Bridie used. Through it he stages his vision of the whole affair for the spectator to judge. It is not definitive enough to say, as Thompson says, that "irony as a weapon is usually a method of destruction . . . which gives opportunity for future good."[18] That is true, of course, for Daniel, who through his stinging realization may become a better instrument of Jehovah in the future. But that is outside the drama. Within the drama itself, irony clarifies the situation as it stands at present. It purifies the air, so to speak. And to speak so is remarkably accurate here because Bridie has the rain begin to fall at the end of his drama. For Daniel, the rainfall means that "The Lord has spoken to all life that it may arise again" (p. 64). For us, it symbolizes the new life born in Daniel and, perhaps, in Susannah too. What is more, the rainfall reminds us of the weather that prevailed through-

---

[18]Thompson, The Dry Mock, p. 257.

out the drama and renders it also ironic: an ally for the Elders, an enemy for Susannah. Right to the end, Bridie's use of irony leaves a clear picture. The spectator is not fooled as the characters were. He sees the irony as they did not; because of it, he has complete control as they had not. And from his detached position, he judges that there is a case for the Elders and that Bridie's vision of them has a warrant.

Yet irony is not only intellectual. It is one thing to perceive it and quite another to feel it. Both are necessary, however, if the irony is to be fully effective. How can it be emotional? "To feel it one must be pained for a person or ideal gone amiss."[19] Through Bridie's vision one can feel pain for the calamity of the Elders' life and for the overthrow of Daniel's narrow-minded righteousness. Bridie says that "the object of the tragedian is, among other things, to produce a painful impression."[20] His embroilment of the ironic sense sharpened the pain because it raised the moral issues of the story, clarified the position of the characters involved, and thereby provided grounds upon which

---

[19]Thompson, The Dry Mock, p. 15.

[20]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. xi.

pity and terror can be felt. Irony served fundamentally to enlighten his argument and to gain some kind of tragic effect.

Certainly the argument is now plain. Before the drama began, Bridie asked us through his Reader to consider if there is "any man living who has in him no tincture of goodness however unhappily he may do in his life" (p. 1). Then he told us, "To-night you are to be the judges of these old Judges. Search yourselves well that you may do justly." His effective use of irony leaves us no other choice but to search. And having searched Daniel and Susannah as well as the Elders, we are inevitably led to the converse of the proposition: is there any man living who has in him no tincture of <u>badness</u> however <u>happily</u> he may do in his life? The entire argument upon which the drama is built shines in the light of irony.

We might suspect as much if now we take a closer look at his concept of tragedy. In defining tragedy as a "goat-song", he went on to explain this in terms of a man "butting hopelessly and furiously against the facts of life."[21] That any man, as Bridie sees him,

---

[21]Bridie, <u>Tedious and Brief</u>, p. 14.

finds it hopeless to butt against the facts of life is in itself ironic for his eventual result will be at variance with his earlier expectation. Thus it is that irony, implicit in Bridie's concept, works in his drama to show the Elders in the garden and at the trial experiencing results vastly and inevitably different from their expectations. The facts of their life determine such an end.

Is such an end tragedy? To answer this, an inquiry into the character of Bridie's men, the Elders, and into the facts of their life is needed. One might begin by noting what Thompson says is a feature of Sophoclean tragedy, a feature we ourselves expect of all tragedy: the character who "falls because of some error or frailty in an otherwise noble nature".[22] Such a view was not alien to Bridie, for he wrote in his preface that tragedy presents "ignominy that soils without destroying the nobility of man".[23] Therefore he used his tricks -- the ones he explained as the enhancement of the Elders, the invented piece of evidence, Dionysos, the early prominence of Daniel, the foolishness of Susannah, and the one we discovered as most important

---

[22]Thompson, The Dry Mock, p. 136.

[23]Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. xi.

of all, irony -- he used these in an effort to bestow some nobility on his Elders, and he gave the Elders, as we noted previously, the intense frailty of hypocrisy. The nobility of their position as aristocratic gentlemen of the ruling class in Babylon is unquestionable. But the nobility of their natures as tragic heroes, our chief concern, is highly questionable. For one thing, their benevolence to the captive Jews, specifically to Susannah, Joachim and Daniel, is a kind of selfish gesture, almost a hypocritical one, because it brings them certain advantages. It brings them an association with Susannah, provides them with Joachim to "manage their affairs" (p. 23), and in a way keeps them from all-out war with Daniel.

Over and above this, and in accordance with their author's concept, is their furious butting against the facts of their life -- the facts regarding religion, chastity, and truth, all of which the Elders butt against. It is in this regard their natures are decidedly ignoble. The recognition scene (p. 63), in which Kabbittu sees both the "head" of man with its capacity for good and man's "body of a goat" with its capacity for evil, does not so much redeem a soiled nobility in either Elder as Bridie undoubtedly intended it should. Rather, each

Elder in his own terms self-exposes his hypocrisy, and thus this scene bestows on each a nobility for the first time. Both have come a long way from their destructive days in Jerusalem, but they are not improved men. They cursed religion then, and they ignored it now; they rode over women then, and they tried to violate one now; and they violated now, whether or not they did before, the majesty of truth at Susannah's trial. Until their reversal at that trial, they were forever butting and, by their own admission, blindly hypocritical.

Such an all-embracing ignorance of spiritual values is not what we are accustomed to in tragedy. "Tragic realism", to paraphrase John Gassner, "encompasses both sides of man",[24] and because of this, we are accustomed to find at work in tragedy what he[25] and Louis L. Martz[26] refer to as the "double vision". The Elders see both sides of man only after they are ruined, and they cannot, therefore, register a profound tragic effect because their vision of life, narrow as it is,

---

[24]John Gassner, The Theatre in Our Times (New York: Crown Publishers, 1954), p. 472.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Louis L. Martz, "The Saint as Tragic Hero", Tragic Themes in Western Literature, ed. Cleanth Brooks (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 153.

does not provide for one. It does not encompass life's "manifest evil and immanent good",[27] the two factors Una Ellis-Fermor demands equating in tragedy. Great tragic heroes see all the facts of life and fail in their strivings to reconcile them. Bridie's Elders, however, see only one-half of them, and these are essentially earthbound, -- the restraints society places on conduct. They fail in their strivings to butt these because they do not see the facts of religion, chastity and truth behind these restraints. In Bridie's concept such a failure is the heart of tragedy.

For D. S. Savage, it is the heart of the liberal dilemma. In regard to this dilemma, I quote him at some length from his comments on the novelist E.M. Forster:

> Liberalism is a half-hearted creed, born out of stable and comfortable material circumstances, in which it puts its main trust, making a gesture of greater or less sincerity towards spiritual values -- but nothing more than a gesture, however sincere. . . . The absolute is carefully excluded from the liberal way of life. The gesture towards the spirit is arrested, and modified into a gesture towards culture; that, in turn, resolves itself into a salute to civilization, and in times of stress the process of deterioration will not always stop there.[28]

---

[27]Una Ellis-Fermor, The Frontiers of Drama (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 132.

[28]D. S. Savage, The Withered Branch: Six Studies in the Modern Novel (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, n. d.), p. 146.

In many ways, his comments apply here. The Elders' material circumstances are stable and comfortable, and they rely upon these and safeguard them through benevolent treatment of people who might as captives, in this instance, destroy them. Furthermore, they make only a gesture towards spiritual values, and this because court formalities demand opening respects paid at all times to the gods "Anu, Enlil and Enki" (p. 3). From their own lives they carefully exclude "the absolute" -- such absolute values mentioned before as religion, chastity and truth. Babylonian civilization is their chief concern, and in their attempts to win others over to it, they meet a time of dreadful stress and deteriorate in character to such a degree that our reaction to them as tragic figures deteriorates proportionately. My conclusion is based on Savage's: "Liberalism rests upon a fundamental spiritual failure",[29] a precise definition of the Elders' liberalism which "forgot how the exalted Anu made us all." (p. 63.) And so liberalism complements hypocrisy in them to produce, as Savage would say, "half-hearted" men.

The essential weakness, therefore, of Bridie's concept of tragedy, as it is found in Susannah and the

---

[29]Savage, The Withered Branch, p. 47.

Elders, is that it allows for liberalism. This is a weakness here because it leads to a butting against the facts of life, which activity can only be based on blindness and spiritual failure, as it was so based with regard to the Elders. As liberals, they naturally did not see the indestructible spiritual realities underlying their environment. As hypocrites to themselves, they would reject them if ever they were seen. And so their rebellion against environment (the essence of Bridie tragedy)[30] is bound to be hopeless (the very word in the statement of his concept)[31] because it does not struggle with the hard core of spiritualities that contribute to the totality of environment. The scope of their rebellious struggle includes only the facts of life minus their core.

Thus the liberalism in his concept works to the ruination of his drama as tragedy. It robs the drama of a tragic sense of life. This sense (philosophically discussed elsewhere in reference to living)[32] on a grand scale is Hamlet's "crawling between heaven and earth"

---

[30] Cf. Bridie, Susannah and the Elders, p. x.

[31] Bridie, Tedious and Brief, p. 14.

[32] Miguel de Unamuno, Tragic Sense of Life, trans. J. E. Crawford Flitch (New York: Dover Publications, 1954), pp. ix-xix.

(Hamlet, III, i, 130-31), or on a lesser scale Blanche DuBois' "dark march towards whatever it is we're approaching".[33] In either case, there is a positing of something spiritual underlying the dramas of these tragic figures. And, consequently, their tragic struggles with life or environment are broad in scope -- one might say all-inclusive -- and are, therefore, never described as hopeless. They are always described as involving a potential for evil, which has its despair, plus a capacity for grandeur, which has its hope. This capacity is not described in the struggle of Bridie's Elders with life. Their life misses a tragic sense in proportion to its acquisition of a liberal sense. And that proportion embodies mainly a potential for evil actualized into spiritual failure. Only at the end are they "crawling between heaven and earth". But, within the tragic plan, this is too late for grandeur. There is only time, as Kabbittu said, for "torture" (p. 63).

Bridie's concept is forced, then, to rely upon its implied irony for a tragic effect. Its greatest strength, as his drama reveals, is irony. But in using irony as he did to emphasize an argument, Bridie did not

---

[33]Tennessee Williams, A Streetcar Named Desire (New York: Signet Book by the New American Library, 1952), p. 72.

so much gain a tragic effect as gain a victory in the argument. Perhaps he wrote a thesis drama instead of a tragedy. Eric Linklater says of Bridie, "Argument is among his prime accomplishments",[34] and the verbal fencing throughout Susannah and the Elders testifies to that accomplishment. But it does not necessarily testify to an accomplishment of having created tragedy. One never seems to know whether he was mainly interested in the downfall of the Elders or in arguing a case for them by arguing against Daniel and effecting something like a downfall in him. One only knows for certain that Bridie was interested in arguing.

Here, we might note with some advantage a comment by Winifred Bannister, who knew Bridie personally throughout his playwright career and who has written the first book entirely on his works. She writes, "Bridie's political views were rather like his religion: so liberal minded, so humanitarian that they were unfixed."[35] Because he himself was unfixed, then, I suggest, he tended to unfix others. This tendency is found in his

---

[34]Eric Linklater, The Art of Adventure (London: Macmillan, 1947), p. 38.

[35]Winifred Bannister, James Bridie: And His Theatre (London: Rockliff, 1955), p. 36.

attitude towards critics, as was mentioned in my introduction. Again, it is found in his attitude towards Roman Catholic priests whom he enjoyed greatly for their argumentative powers.[36] And it is found in what he did with Prophets in his dramas. Jonah and the Whale dramatizes the unfixing of the Prophet Jonah, once convinced that he was highly favoured, finally convinced that he is "a nobody . . . an ordinary man"[37] when his prophecy of the destruction of Nineveh was not fulfilled. In a sense, Susannah and the Elders dramatizes the unfixing of the Prophet Daniel. Certainly the fact that Daniel was lowered from his pedestal is fundamental to the argument for the Elders, for the irony of his descent raised moral issues to their credit. The unfixing of Daniel, therefore, and the downfall of the Elders seem to strive with each other for Bridie's attention. Add to this strife the element of liberalism, and, while the dramatic argument remains robust, the tragedy becomes seriously crippled.

---

[36] Cf. James Bridie, One Way of Living (Toronto: Macmillan, 1939), pp. 38-39. This book is an autobiography covering the author's life from 1888-1938.

[37] James Bridie, A Sleeping Clergyman: And Other Plays (London: Constable, 1946), p. 255.

A P P E N D I X

Three Bridie drawings are reproduced by photostat on the following pages. According to the notes scribbled on the back of my copies by someone at the Glasgow Art Gallery, the first drawing is a caricature of a "Rich Man". The second, more like a cartoon, is a "Gall Stone Descending the Human Bile Duct". The third is noted simply as a "Caricature". T. J. Honeyman, whom I have already quoted, has further explanations of these and other drawings. With regard to the artist himself and to his works, Honeyman says this of Bridie (i. e. O. H. Mavor):

> With O. H. much of his scribbling is merely an intimate chit-chat between himself and his thoughts. He is talking to himself and instead of muttering he whispers in graphic incisive lines. . . .
> O. H. collected facts about people and the institutions and practices created by them. In his plays he made these into new people and situations. Sometimes he may have been helped towards finding the words he gave them by making their faces and peculiarities visual in the abstractions of a casual sketch. . . . O. H. was the most original and most versatile man I have ever known. He was also the most kindly. He was suspicious of reformers but he would rather give them his blessing than extend it to complacent conformers.[38]

---

[38] Honeyman, "OH! Did This", p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Bridie, James. A Sleeping Clergyman: And Other Plays. London: Constable, 1946.

--------. Colonel Wotherspoon: And Other Plays. London: Constable, 1934.

--------. Moral Plays. London: Constable, 1936.

--------. One Way of Living. Toronto: Macmillan, 1939.

--------. Susannah and the Elders: And Other Plays. London: Constable, 1940.

--------. Tedious and Brief. London: Constable, 1944.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Bannister, Winifred. James Bridie: And His Theatre. London: Rockliff, 1955.

Brooks, Cleanth, ed. Tragic Themes in Western Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Frontiers of Drama. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Gassner, John. The Theatre in Our Times. New York: Crown Publishers, 1954.

Goodspeed, Edgar J., trans. "The Apocrypha" in The Complete Bible: An American Translation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.

Gruber, Hermann. "Liberalism", The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (1910), 212-214.

Linklater, Eric. The Art of Adventure. London: Macmillan, 1947.

Savage, D. S. The Withered Branch: Six Studies in the Modern Novel. New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, n.d.

Sedgewick, G. G. Of Irony: Especially in Drama. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1935.

Thompson, Alan Reynolds. The Dry Mock: A Study of Irony in Drama. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1948.

Unamuno, Miguel de. Tragic Sense of Life. Trans. J. E. Crawford Flitch. New York: Dover Publications, 1954.

Williams, Tennessee. A Streetcar Named Desire. New York: Signet Book by the New American Library, 1952.

Articles

Honeyman, T. J. "OH! Did This", Scottish Art Review, III (March 1951), 2-7.

Renwick, W. L. "James Bridie the Playwright", College Courant: being the Journal of the Glasgow University Graduates Association, III (Whitsun 1951), 98-104.

VITA AUCTORIS

1929 Born in Ingersoll, Ontario, the fourth of five sons of Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Warden. Elementary and high school education in Sacred Heart Separate School and Ingersoll Collegiate Institute.

1947 Senior Matriculation from Ingersoll Collegiate Institute and registration at Assumption College, Windsor, Ontario, for pre-medical studies.

1950 Bachelor of Arts degree from Assumption College in affiliation with the University of Western Ontario, London. Entrance into the Congregation of St. Basil (Basilian Fathers) -- two years of high school teaching and completion of first year theological studies, St. Basil's Seminary, Toronto.

1953 As a layman, member of the teaching staff of Assumption High School, Windsor, Ontario, and registration at Assumption College for graduate studies in English.

1955 Student-delegate of Assumption College to the Sixth International Seminar of World University Service of Canada held in Japan. Two months of study tours, lectures and conferences devoted to the Seminar's theme, "The Responsibility of Higher Education".

1956 Master of Arts degree in English Literature from Assumption University of Windsor.