



Sacred Heart
UNIVERSITY

Sacred Heart University
DigitalCommons@SHU

English Faculty Publications

English Department

10-2006

The Satanic Whitman: Woman, Nature and the Magic of Four

D. J. Moores
Sacred Heart University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/eng_fac



Part of the [American Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moores, D.J. "The Satanic Whitman: woman, nature and the magic of four." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 29.1-2 (2006): 19-31.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English Department at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu.

The Satanic Whitman: Woman, Nature and the Magic of Four

J. D. Moores

Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut

Had the Romantics lived in the twentieth-century and maintained their Romantic sensibility, they might have been Jungians, which is to say, there are a considerable number of parallels between Jungian theory and Romantic aesthetics. According to Jung the aim of all psychoanalytic work is to help the analysand become conscious of his or her entire Self, which includes conscious as well as disowned, unconscious elements. In Jungian theory when ego (conscious awareness) confronts and assimilates shadow (unconsciousness), the result is a revitalization and expansion of Self. Romantics longed for this expanded Self in their frequent transcendent yearnings, concerned as they were with the aspects of being denied by Enlightenment. I have discussed this urge to reject Enlightenment modes of ideation and being in favor of a more subversive, mystical orientation in several recent articles and a book, *Mystical Discourse as Ideological Resistance in Wordsworth and Whitman*. Romanticism entailed the reappropriation of marginalized, subjugated modes of being. All historical periods and artistic schools, according to Morris Philipson, "were tendencies of art which brought to the surface that unconscious element of which the contemporary atmosphere had most need" (in Snider, 2). Psychologically speaking, then, Romanticism was to Enlightenment what the Renaissance was to the Dark Ages--its repressed other, its shadow. Romanticism provided late eighteenth- and nineteenth century aesthetic consciousness with what it lacked--a chance to engage its other self and assimilate repressed energies into a new mode of aesthetic creation.

Not all Romantics were created alike, however. As I have argued in two recent articles on Poe and Hawthorne, some writers merely confronted the shadow but were unable to assimilate these "dark" energies. Morse Peckham called such writers "negative" Romantics (15), because they were unable to see, like the positive Romantics, "a divine or at least spiritual force at work in the universe" (Alsen 6). As I suggest in more psychological language, they were negative Romantics because they were aware of marginalized psychic energies but unable to make room for these in consciousness. Other writers such as Coleridge, as I argue in "'O happy living things': Healing Serpent Power in Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*," confronted the shadow and partially came to terms with its "darkness."

The supreme example of a Romantic author who does assimilate into consciousness previously subjugated, unconscious contents, is Walt Whitman. Richard Maurice Bucke, the poet's literary executor and good friend, believed Whitman was the best representative example (above even Jesus, Buddha, and others) of what he called "cosmic consciousness," someone in whom there is total awareness of "the life and order of the universe" (Bucke 3). Whitman seemed to inspire such "Whitmaniacs," as they have been called, perhaps because he (or at least his poetic persona) seemed to have infinite space in his consciousness for the totality of the human experience. Unlike so many other Transcendentalists, he even had room in his cosmic plan for evil, a point I will discuss at length in this essay. This enlargement of consciousness, as Whitman depicts it in *Leaves of Grass*, is of particular interest to the Jungian theorist because it smacks of individuation, the lifelong urge toward wholeness in which a person

becomes aware of him/herself as a unique individual intimately connected to the cosmos. Whitman thus declares in "One's-Self I Sing" that he will chant the song of "a simple separate person, / Yet utter the word Democratic, the word En-Masse" (1-2). Individuation is the process by which one confronts the shadow and deals with it not by elimination and/or doubling but by making room for its energies in consciousness.

I am not the first Jungian theorist to recognize parallels between Whitman's poetic persona and Jung's concept of individuation. In a chapter from *Approaches to Teaching Whitman's Leaves of Grass*, Lorelei Cederstrom gives an informative overview of the types of connections a reader can make between the poet and Jung. Cederstrom articulates many insights regarding the development of Whitman's persona, which is by no means constant in *Leaves* but develops along the dialectical lines of encounter and assimilation, much like a person moving in the direction of individuation (V.K. Chari offers a similar argument but couched in different language in *Whitman in the Light of Vedantic Mysticism*). "Although this pattern is straightforward," Cederstrom claims, "Whitman describes a painful struggle at each stage of development; growth is based on confrontation between the oppositions in human nature" (82). Her short discussion is focused on chronicling these pivotal, painful encounters with the "other," which, as she argues, the persona ultimately acknowledges and assimilates, making room for them in his ever-expanding consciousness. In "The Mind's Return" Ray Benoit comparatively discusses Whitman, Teilhard de Chardin, and Jung in terms of a futuristic state of spiritual, psychological, and social progression. Benoit sees in Whitman's verse what Jung called the *mysterium coniunctionis*--"the Self in which light and shadow, logos and eros, the masculine trinitarian symbol and the fourth feminine principle--respectively, the ideal of spirituality and the materialistic earth-bound passion--form a syzygial unity-in-duality" (27).

In this essay I would like to add to Benoit's "syzygial unity-in-duality" (a syzygy, according to Jung, consists of two opposite elements in polarity) and Cederstrom's dialectic of encounter and assimilation in a further discussion of the connections between Jung and Whitman. I will focus specifically on the poem "Chanting the Square Deific," reading it in terms of what Jung called the quaternity archetype and the symbolism of the number four. I will also make connections to other poems in *Leaves* to demonstrate the centrality of the "missing fourth"--the Satanic and feminine principles--in Whitman's verse.

Jung believed the number four had special significance not because of the mystical thinking or numerology with which he is sometimes mistakenly associated but because of his empirical observations: He discerned recurring number motifs in fairy tales, myths, legends, and in the dreams and hallucinations of his patients. Three, he noticed, signified a lack of wholeness, whereas four represented completion and often seemed to be associated with healing. On the basis of these numerical motifs he deduced the existence of the quaternity archetype, which he believed was a representation of the entire Self, the totality of psychic energies in a given person. The quaternity archetype has a numinous character in that it is beyond the conscious self, located in the collective unconscious among many such archetypes. Experience with this archetype "can take the form of conversions, illuminations, emotional shocks, blows of fate, religious and or mystical experiences" ("The Problem of the Fourth" 62). The archetype can seem to the person experiencing its numinous character to be a visitation from God, spirit, an angel, daemon, etc ... "One can explain the God-image aspect of the quaternity," he asserted "as a reflection of the self, or, conversely, explain the self as an *imago dei* in man" (66). In other words the archetype allows for the paradox of the self as God/God as self, an idea

that finds full expression in Indian thought, in which atman (self) is brahman (totality). The Sanskrit phrase "tat tvam asi" (thou art that) fully encapsulates Jung's paradox.

Yet, for all its numinous potential, in individuals lacking full awareness of self, the quaternity archetype can also go unnoticed. Jung believed the unconscious speaks to us in dreams, claiming that the rest of the energies constituting Self communicate in seemingly veiled language. He observed that when an individual suffered from a psychic schism or neurosis, some aspect of the person's total psychic makeup would be missing from consciousness and would often appear in dreams as a missing fourth. It would take a discerning eye like his, however, to make sense of such dream material:

... such dreams look very banal from the outside. There is nothing at all of the myth or fairy tale about them, much less anything religious. Mostly it is three men and a woman, either sitting at a table or driving in a car, or three men and a dog, a huntsman with three hounds, three chickens in a coup from which a fourth has escaped, and suchlike ... Only when the dreamer begins to reflect that the four are an allusion to his total personality does he realize that these banal dream motifs are like shadow pictures of more important things. (66)

The quaternity is important, he believed, "as a vehicle of the synthesis in which the individuation process culminates" (66). To be made whole, or individuated, is never a destination but a process. To be complete would signify stasis, and thus individuation is a lifelong, never-ending series of syntheses between conscious and unconscious elements in which one exists in a constant state of becoming. The quaternity archetype and its many manifestations (Tibetan mandalas, medieval mandorlas, squared circles, and other four-sided symbols) represent this union of energies in the Self. Such symbols "are the remedy with whose help neurotic dissociations can be repaired, by restoring to the conscious mind a spirit and an attitude which from time immemorial have been felt as solving and healing in their effects" ("The Problem of the Fourth" 67). The quaternity can heal psychic schisms and help an individual reclaim lost aspects of the psyche. Jung himself painted mandalas when he underwent significant crises of his own in an attempt to recover from the neurotic dissociations that plagued him, particularly after his break with Freud.

The number four is thus important because it signifies balance of opposing elements. In Jungian personality there are four orienting functions (intuition, sensation, thinking, and feeling). People are generally conscious of the three most dominant functions, while the fourth remains beneath consciousness and often is denied existence because it opposes the primary, or superior, orienting function. If a woman is predominantly a thinking type, she will repress her feeling function, which will become part of the unconscious shadow self. Her feeling function will communicate to her in dreams of intense emotions that seem to be beyond her conscious sense of self. It might appear as a little girl screaming to get her needs met or as a savage woman whose primitiveness seems to contradict the woman's civilized values. She will be off balance, perhaps even neurotic or psychotic, until she can reconcile thinking and feeling by incorporating more emotion into her consciousness. Once she does acknowledge her inferior fourth function, however, she will realize that her freedom from it all along was only illusory, and that her rediscovery of this aspect of the forgotten psychic self is "a treasure-

house of hidden wisdom" because it leads to marked transformation, renewal, and rebirth ("The Problem of the Fourth" Jung 49, 50).

In his analysis of Christian trinity, which he believed represented an imbalance, Jung noted the antagonism between nature and spirit: "The gulf that Christianity opened out between nature and spirit enabled the human mind to think not only beyond nature but in opposition to it, thus demonstrating its divine freedom, so to speak" (57). This Platonic freedom of spirit "wrenches the light half of the picture away from the dark half" (58). But if Christians do rise above nature and kick themselves loose of the earth, Jung believed, someone must carry the weight of matter; someone, such as a redeemer like Jesus, must atone for the psychic divorce. This denial of nature, he argued, "culminates in trinitarian thinking, which moves in a Platonic, 'supracelestial' realm" (57).

Whitman, like Jung, sensed intuitively that the Christian trinity reflected the psychic imbalance of the monotheistic tradition with its fetishistic privileging of light and spirit and its disavowal of darkness and matter. Inheriting a tradition in which matter and spirit are opposed, Whitman attempted poetically to reconcile the antagonism in such Platonic/Christian dualism: "Strange and hard that paradox I give," he wrote in "A Song for Occupations." "Objects gross and the unseen soul are one" (101-02). In Christianity the devil's abode is the underworld, specifically the earth's fiery, molten core. Whitman, however, saw the earth and natural energies in much more positive terms. One's consciousness, he believed, determined how he or she perceived the earth: "I swear the earth shall surely be complete to him or her who shall be complete, / The earth remains jagged and broken only to him or her who remains jagged and broken" ("Song of the Rolling Earth" 89-90). The value system informing Christianity, with its denial of matter, nature and the body, seemed to Whitman jagged and broken, and in his poetry he attempted to create a persona who could put the shards back together. His four-stanza poem "Chanting the Square Deific," which interestingly prefigures Jung's idea of the quaternity archetype by at least 45 years, was his prescient attempt to correct the trinity, for in rounding out Christianity's conception of God by adding a missing fourth, Whitman adds elements that at the least run against the monotheistic grain and possibly even border on heresy. Let us look more closely at Whitman's square in an attempt to see precisely how it "corrects" the trinity.

The first side of Whitman's square contains the God of monotheism, Jehovah, the old, angry, fatherly God, whom the poet calls "Unpersuadable, relentless, executing righteous judgments" (6). This God is a merciless, pitiless deity who will have vengeance at any cost in upholding his "mighty laws": "Relentless I forgive no man--whoever sins dies--I will have that man's life; / Therefore let none expect mercy--have the seasons, gravitation, the appointed days, mercy? No more have I" (9-10). This side of the square is also associated with three other gods--Kronos, the Greek Titan and god of time, Brahm, the Hindu creator god, and Saturnius, the Roman god of agriculture. It seems justifiable that Whitman would include Kronos and Saturnius on this first side of the square, since both gods are associated with relentless authority. Kronos, as a representative of time, the temporal "law" by which all humans are without exception bound, is a pitiless god in Greek mythology who cuts off the genitals of his own father, Uranus, and throws them into the sea. He even swallows his own children in an attempt to avoid his fate of being overthrown by one of them. Saturnius, the Roman god of agriculture and thus (in Whitman's conception) the deity responsible for the seasons, also subjects humans to his "inexorable" will, which he executes without "remorse" (12). Saturn might at first glance appear out of place here, given the Roman Saturnalia, a seven-day, annual festival that began on December 17 in which there was considerable drunkenness and feasting. Saturday, the seventh day of the week, was likewise a festive

day devoted to Saturn. To be born under the astrological influence of Saturn, however, meant one had a saturnine countenance, that is, either melancholy and sullen or bitter and sardonic. Saturn's saturnine disposition as the temperamental god of the harvest thus qualifies him for a position on Whitman's first side, as these traits align him with Kronos and Jehovah. Brahma, one of three principal deities in the Hindu Trimurti (trinity), also seems out of place. He is neither angry nor does he appear vengeful or temperamental. Brahma is male, however, a common thread among all of the gods of the first side of the square. Perhaps more important, in the Indian tradition he is revered for his creative activity, as he creates the world to form each new cycle of time (yuga), which Vishnu preserves and Shiva later destroys. He creates the yugas in which all humans continue their process of reincarnation and thus serves as a creator of temporality. All four gods represent the impersonal, authoritative power that mercilessly binds human beings within the physical universe. Whitman tempers the righteousness, fury, and impersonality of the first side, however, with a "Consolator most mild" on the second (13). This second god, an amalgam consisting of Jesus, Hermes, and Hercules, comes "[w]ith gentle hand extended" and offers the solace lacking in the first square and its law of karma and eye-for-an-eye justice code.

Whitman interestingly calls this deity a "mightier God" (14) perhaps because he displays tenderness and compassion, traits the poet himself valued and cultivated as a self-proclaimed minister and nurse in the Civil War camps. This god is the "cheer bringing God" who comes "with hope and all-enclosing charity" (21). He is "[y]oung and strong" and serves as a contrast to the hoary elders of the first side (23). Unlike the bitchy, irritable gods, he brings to the human inhabitants of the world "the kiss of affection" (20). Like Christ, he is "destin'd" to suffer an "early death," (23) and he has denied himself the earthly kingdom he can potentially possess: "All the world have I given up for my dear brothers' and sisters' sake, for the soul's sake" (19). Like Hercules, his life is "All sorrow, labor, suffering," (17) and he endures great privation for the benefit of the human race: "Many times have I been rejected, taunted, put in prison, and crucified, and may times shall be again" (18). His labors are in many ways a direct contradiction of the authority and law established in the first side, for the last two of Hercules' labors involve visits to the underworld and "represent a forcible seizure of immortality" (Sixby 184). Like Hermes, the helpful messenger god and deity of travelers, commerce, flocks, and dreams, he is at the service of humankind and ministers to all, "rich or poor" (19). As Zeus's messenger, he is the conduit through which eternal energies flow into the temporal realm.

The comforter god of the second side is contrasted on the third by a much darker deity who brings not light and cheer but pride and the spirit of subversion. This god is "[a]loof, dissatisfied, plotting revolt, / Comrade of criminals, brother of slaves, / Crafty, despised, a drudge, ignorant" (26-28). He is the enemy in the Hebrew myth, Satan, who refuses to be subjected by any deity, even by God himself. This dark principle remains utterly "[d]efiant" (33) and rebels "now and always against whoever scorning assumes to rule me" (30). He is Milton's Satan, who in *Paradise Lost* declares, it is "better to reign in hell, than serve in heav'n" (l. 262). He is the evil principle in the monotheistic tradition, with his "warlike" (34) spirit, his many "wiles," (32) and his proud declaration that he is "equal with any, real as any, / Nor time nor change shall ever change me or my words" (34-35). This figure is more of a deity than a demon, however. He is the evil principle, no doubt, but he is better likened to the medieval figure of Satanael, God's firstborn son, who is the direct equal to Christ ("The Problem of the Fourth" Jung 53). He occupies an equal but contrastive position to the consolator god of the second side. His energies are just as real and just as powerful as those of the redeemer and elder gods. Yet, unlike them, he is the destructive principle that opposes all creation. In this third side Whitman might have named Shiva, who, as I have

already mentioned, is the destroyer god who opposes but balances Brahma. Whitman's Satan is the opposite of creation and pledges himself to the destruction of all ordering, confining principles.

The last side of Whitman's square is not a god per se but an all-pervading spirit that entirely encompasses the spiritual world and the physical universe. This omnipresent essence, not to be confused with the Christian Holy Spirit, subsumes the gods of the other three sides, "including God, including Saviour and Satan" (40), as well as all contraries:

Santa Spirita, breather, life,
Beyond the light, lighter than light,
Beyond the flames of hell, joyous, leaping easily above hell,
Beyond paradise, perfumed solely with mine own perfume ... (36-39)

Santa Spirita is the summum bonum, the greatest good, but it also contains in it the evil son of God. It is the animating principle behind all gods and behind good and evil; it is the "[e]ssence of forms, life of the real identities, permanent, positive (namely the unseen) / Life of the great round world, the sun and stars, and of man" (42-43). Whitman's Santa Spirita differs from the Latin Spiritus Sanctus, which is a masculine form, as well as from the Italian Spirito Santo, which is likewise masculine (in *Leaves, Bradley and Blodgett* 444). Whitman's all-pervasive, subsuming spirit is thus feminine. As Sixby has pointed out, "here, in a sense, is the progenitor of the gods--Gaea, the Earth Mother, the almost universal primitive symbol of the emergence of life" (191).

To support Sixby's assertion, I would point to a passage in "I Sing the Body Electric": "As I see my soul reflected in Nature, / As I see through a mist, One with inexpressible completeness, sanity, beauty, / See the bent head and arms folded over the breast, the Female I see" (72-74). I would also point to a passage in "Starting from Paumanok," in which Whitman likewise perceives his soul as female: "... after due long-waiting now advancing, / Yes here comes my mistress the soul" (67-68). This association of soul/spirit with femininity is highly relevant to Jungian theory, for it represents the anima archetype--the repressed contrasexual other in the male psyche. Both men and women, according to Jung, have a contrasexual archetype of which they are generally unconscious. Just as men possess an anima, women have an animus. Cultures likewise have collective contrasexual others, as in the case of the patriarchal west, which suppresses its collective anima in its privileging of male values. In the individuation process one must come to terms with the contrasexual archetype by making room for it in consciousness. This is what Benoit means when he refers to a "syzygial unity-in-duality" (27). The syzygy the poet brings to consciousness is the polarity of male and female energies, for without both "there is no creativity, no imagination, no life" (Bingaman 178).

The source of natural and spiritual energies for Whitman was feminine, the repressed anima, without which no psychic vitality is possible. In his square he thus names the feminine principle as the stuff of which all life and all gods are made. Although she stands alone as the only female representative in the square, Santa Spirita carries significant weight and thus reconciles the masculine imbalance as the great, creative Mother, just as Satan offsets the overemphasis on the good and the ordered. Santa Spirita

completes the square deific, which serves as the animating principle in Whitman's verse: "Here the square finishing, the solid, I the most solid, / Breathe my breath also through these songs" (44-45). The closing lines are of great importance in that they point to the animating spirituality behind Whitman's poems. Since scholars have examined the poet's mysticism from several critical angles, there is no need to add to this discourse here. What scholars (myself included) have left out of such discussions is any mention of the satanic and feminine elements the shadow and the anima archetypes respectively--that feature so prominently in Whitman's spirituality. Together these constitute the missing fourth, which is indeed the breath of life in *Leaves of Grass*.

Clearly, the Satan figure is in Whitman's scheme the third side of the square, but in including the opposing spiritual principle Whitman is in effect squaring the Christian trinity of father, son, and holy ghost, while also "correcting" the Christian conception of spirit, which he no doubt makes more inclusive by subsuming all polarities associated with the duality of monotheism, and which he sexually balances by incorporating the feminine gender. It is a corrective to the dualistic notion of Satan being the enemy, "the aping shadow of God," as Jung calls him, "in whose shadow man was born, fatally tainted with original sin" ("Problem of the Fourth" 57). It is also a corrective to the patriarchal values informing monotheism, which consists of three closely interrelated religions--Judaism, Christianity, and Islam--that trace their origins to Abraham, the first patriarch. That this tradition is phallocentric is beyond dispute and need not be argued here.

What I would point out, however, is the association in monotheism of Satan and women with nature: the Devil is a horned, cloven-hoofed animal, while the earth in the pagan traditions that monotheism subjugates is female, often the great mother. Moreover, in Platonic and Neoplatonic symbolism, which significantly influenced Christianity, "both nature and matter were feminine," according to Carolyn Merchant in her excellent study, *The Death of Nature* (10). Because the earth was feminine in the ancient world and because matter was seen in demonic opposition to spirit, the Hebrew Bible (particularly Genesis) justifies the subjugation of both women and the earth (as well as natural creatures). Pagan beliefs die hard, however, as it was not until the scientific revolution that Europeans were ultimately able to "kill" mother nature. In the first phase of this transformation, as Merchant notes, Europeans began establishing their Biblically-justified dominion over nature by moving from a conception of earth as a nurturing "beneficent female" to a wild woman who could "render violence, storms, droughts and general chaos" (2). If mother earth were indeed wild, establishing dominion over her was completely justified. Ultimately, the scientific revolution fostered the notion that earth was not an organism at all but merely a mechanism, devoid of life, and thus utterly susceptible to man's exploitative dominion--a conception of the cosmos that nearly all Romantics would later attempt to refute in a return to organicism. Whitman's inclusion of both feminine and satanic principles in his square thus signifies his ambivalence to the monotheistic tradition and his intention to champion both woman and nature by singing their praises in *Leaves*.

Whitman in effect declares this intention of reasserting the missing fourth in the first two poems of *Leaves*. In "One's-Self I Sing" he proudly intones, "[t]he Female equally with the Male I sing" (5). He sees in both genders "[I]f immense in passion, pulse, and power" and justifies this equality by declaring that his endeavor to sing of it is the "freest action form'd under the laws divine" (6, 7). In "As I Ponder'd in Silence," the second poem in the final version of *Leaves*, he confronts a "Phantom ... with distrustful aspect, / Terrible in beauty, age, and power" (3-4). This terribly beautiful phantom, which he calls "the genius of poets of old lands," seems to look at him with a fiery gaze--"to me directing like flame its eyes"-

-and tells him in a "menacing voice" that the only enduring theme for the great, "ever-enduring bards" is "the theme of War" (emphasis added, 5, 6, 8, 10). The poet then mirrors the demon's pride: "I too haughty Shade also sing war, and a longer and greater one than any" (13). The satanic imagery and tone are as palpable here as is the liberation of the feminine in the first. To be sure, these two poems were not part of the original 1855 version of *Leaves*, as he published both of them in 1871. Given that he placed them first in his final arrangement is highly significant, however, and supports the notion that many of the key ideas in *Leaves* follow a trajectory that leads straight to "Chanting the Square Deific" and the idea of the missing fourth.

In "What Place Is Besieged?" the poet claims to send a "commander, swirl, brave, immortal, / And with him horse and foot, and parks of artillery, / And artillery-men, the deadliest that ever fired gun" (2-4). What exactly is under siege he leaves unstated. Given the defensive image, however, it seems safe to deduce that he is pledging support to the downtrodden, the besieged, and the subjugated--that is, to woman and demon, to anima and shadow, to nature. The war image should refute the impression many modernists formulated of Whitman as the naive poet of cheer. To the contrary, he is also the Satanic poet of evil: "I make the poem of evil also, I commemorate that part also, / I am myself just as much evil as good, and my nation is--and I say there is in fact no evil, / (Or if there is I say it is just as important to you, to the land or to me, as anything else)" ("Starting from Paumanok" 99-101). Whitman paradoxically asserts and then denies his (and the nation's) evil because he is pointing to the illusory quality of socially constructed evils such as sexuality, nature, and femininity while also expressing a thoroughly Jungian notion that "actual evils" such as one's undesirable character traits (anger, greed, jealousy, vanity, etc ...) also must be owned. The shadow self must not only be acknowledged but loved and welcomed into the grand scheme of consciousness.

Later in *Leaves* he thoroughly embraces the satanic role, rebelliously refusing to acknowledge the authority of God. Speaking directly to his readers as a glorious liberator, he seems to encourage their own proud rebellion: "I only am he who places over you no master, owner, better, God, beyond what awaits intrinsically in yourself" ("To You" 17). He echoes this heretical call in "Laws for Creation": "What do you suppose will satisfy the soul, except to walk free and own no superior? / What do you suppose I would intimate to you in a hundred ways, but that man or woman is as good as God?" (7-8). Like Satan trying to rally the defeated host, the poet is seductively appealing to the Christian sense of subservience to God, for in the monotheistic tradition the soul is always other than God, can never be God, and remains locked in a kind of servile, obligatory relationship to its creator. In *Leaves*, however, the poet is his "own master, total and absolute," and believes "nothing, not God, is greater to one than oneself is" ("Song of Myself" 1271). Such rhetoric culminates in his exclamation, "To be this incredible God I am! / To have gone forth among other Gods, these men and women I love" ("Song at Sunset" 29-30).

No doubt, the satanic image is ultimately a metaphor, and like all tropes, breaks down at a certain level of comparison. Whitman's persona uses similar heretical language and speaks in the same seductive voice as the conventional enemy of God, but he is ultimately not interchangeable with the biblical Satan. No doubt, the influences on Whitman's Satan were Byron, Milton, Carlyle, Buckley, Bailey, and the Book of Job, as Kahn points out (933), but in Whitman's square Satan stands for the supreme, rebellious individual who is distinct from the rest of the human beings on the planet. He is the separate self who will own no master and acknowledge no superior. In his embrace of the satanic persona he declares his poems will not only do good; "they will do just as much evil, perhaps more" ("whoever You Are" 36). As a way to further seduce sympathetic readers, he establishes kinship with them: "Nor is it you alone who

know what it is to be evil, / I am he who knew what it was to be evil" ("Crossing Brooklyn Ferry" 69-70). Leaves is his "call of battle" in which he claims to "nourish active rebellion" ("Song of the Open Road" 211). This rebellion is against American morality, informed as it was by the repressive constraints of Victorian England. "I know my words are weapons full of danger, full of death, / For I confront peace, security, and all the settled laws, to unsettle them" ("As I Lay with My Head in Your Lap Camerado" 4-5).

Denise Askin has insightfully pointed out that evil in Leaves constantly metamorphoses, as there is no consistency in what Whitman means when he uses "heavily freighted words such as 'sin,' 'evil,' 'wickedness'" in his poems (Askin 123). Arguing against the charge that such inconsistencies point to a failure in Whitman's thinking, Askin positively asserts and compellingly argues that the shifting meanings of evil in Leaves are designed "to shock the reader's moral complacency by exploding his expectations of language and logic" (123). Whitman proudly and satanically claims to sing of war both literally, as he does in the "Drum Taps" sequence, but also morally, as in his embrace of an "evil" persona. His intent is to shock and to enlighten morally complacent readers, whom he calls "unawakened somnambules," by disabusing them of unexamined assumptions fostered by the Judeo-Christian value system, such as the inequality of the genders and the inherent filthiness and evil of nature ("Thought" 8). He heartily embraced sexuality, not as a end in itself, as Harold Aspiz argues, but as a symbol of the union of previously disunited elements such as good and evil and human beings and the natural world (Aspiz 1). Although there is indeed a celebration of sexuality in its own right in Leaves, particularly in the "Children of Adam" and "Calamus" sequences, I concur with Aspiz's general point that the sexual act is "an analogue of spiritual transcendence" (1). Whitman uses sex to shock readers into consciousness of the Judeo-Christian denigration of the body and the privileging of spirit over matter.

Because of this liberation of the repressed other, he proudly declares his intention to "show of male and female that either is but the equal of the other" ("Paumanok" 165). He thus chants the song of the phallus, the "procreant urge of the world" ("Song of Myself," 44), and sings of "[p]lunging his seminal muscle" into all of North America ("By Blue Ontario's Shore" 73). As the self-declared "poet of wickedness," he rhetorically asks, "What blurt is this about virtue and vice? / Evil propels me and reform of evil propels me" (Song of Myself, 463, 464-65). He sings a "loud and savage song" ("By Blue Ontario's Shore" 326), savagely declaring, "I too am not a bit tamed, I too am untranslatable, / I sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world" ("Song of Myself" 1332-33). In "I Sing the Body Electric," his famous celebration of physicality, he claims to "discorrupt" the armies of those he loves and to "charge them full with the charge of the soul" (4). Of course, the discorruption is a moral notion turned on its head, as he celebrates the male orgasm and its "limitless limpid jets of love hot and enormous, quivering jelly of love, white-blow and delirious juice" ("Body Electric" 60). Interestingly, in the same stanza he also celebrates the feminine principle: "This is the female form, / A divine nimbus exhales from it from head to foot, / It attracts with fierce undeniable attraction" (51-53). In his famous letter to Emerson, who wanted the poet to excise the openly sexual and morally transgressive passages of Leaves, Whitman characteristically turned morality, which he called the "filthy law," upside down and claimed moral repression was an evil that harmed Americans. "This filthy law has to be repealed," he told Emerson. "[I]t stands in the way of great reforms" (in Leaves, 730). The repressive strictures of morality simply did not square (pardon the pun) with his conception of human beings and their position in the cosmos.

As Lester Goodman put it, the square "symbolizes Whitman's passion for synthesizing and unifying the antithetical concepts of matter and spirit which comprise the universe ... He has, in fact, 'squared the circle' in transcending the duality of heaven and earth" (48). In Whitman's new, squared schema,

therefore, "[w]hat is called good is perfect, and what is called bad is just as perfect" ("To Think of Time" 114). In the square all "separations and gaps shall be taken up and hook'd and link'd together," and the illusory schism between spirit and matter shall be bridged: "Nature and Man shall be disjoin'd and diffused no more" ("Passage to India" 110,114). In the square, "no matter what the horrors," everything is "provided for, to the minutest points" ("Assurances" 10). In the square "nothing is sinful outside of ourselves" ("By Blue Ontario's Shore" 20), and he revels in his inherent "evil": "Lusts and wickedness are acceptable to me / I walk with delinquents with passionate love, / I feel I am of them--I belong to those convicts and prostitutes myself, / And henceforth I will not deny them--for how can I deny myself" ("You Felons" 12-15). In refusing to deny the evil other, Whitman is engaged in the most vital activity in the individuation process--owning the shadow by recognizing its projection onto other people. Whitman refuses to scapegoat because he recognizes the evil such individuals embody also exists in his own heart.

Interestingly, though I do not believe he read Whitman, Jung arrived at nearly the same solution to the problem of the trinity that Whitman offered--a quaternity containing father, son, devil, and spirit, a "reconciliation of opposites and hence the answer to the suffering in the Godhead which Christ personifies" ("The Problem of the Fourth" 57). Because Jung believed that important, revered symbols such as the trinity reflected the collective psyche, he argued that the monotheistic west was psychologically unbalanced and lacked a holistic sense of self. "If the symbol is lacking," he claimed, "man's wholeness is not represented in consciousness" (65). Whitman's square is a representation of this wholeness, as it provides balance and representation where both were previously lacking.

In his analysis of "Chanting the Square Deific" George Sixby argues that because it was published as part of the "Sequel to Drum Taps," the poem was Whitman's attempt to console a war-torn, bereft nation (171). While I embrace such a premise with some qualifications, I must disagree with Sixby's ultimate conclusion, for he associates each side of the square with the following: the morality of the Puritans (side 1), the brotherly affection of the midwestern camp meeting (side 2), the rebellion of the South (side 3), all harmonized by the spirit of love (side 4) (195). Such sentiments may indeed partially inform the square, but they cannot account for its totality. Given Whitman's profound engagement with religion and spirituality, I believe the poem was his attempt to heal the schism not only in American but in western, patriarchal consciousness. The missing fourth element appears not only in "Chanting the Square Deific" but also in general throughout *Leaves*, as I have argued. The feminine and satanic were Whitman's attempt to bring to awareness repressed contents of the collective shadow. Like Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Whitman's persona is a sort of western everyman, who speaks for all of Europe and America and expresses the western world's need to heal from the injurious psychic wound it received at the hands of a psychologically fractured religious mythology.

Works Consulted

Alsen, Eberhard, Ed. *The New Romanticism*. New York: Garland, 2000.

Askin, Denise T. "Whitman's Theory of Evil: A Clue to His Use of Paradox." *ESQ* 28.2 (1982): 121-32.

Aspiz, Harold. "Sexuality and the Language of Transcendence." *Walt Whitman Review* 5.2 (1987): 1-7.

Benoit, Ray. "The Mind's Return: Whitman, Teilhard, and Jung." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 13 (1967): 21-28.

Bingaman, Kirk. "Christianity and the Shadow Side of Human Experience." *Pastoral Psychology* 49.3 (2001): 167-79.

Bucke, Richard Maurice. *Cosmic Consciousness*. 1901. New York: Penguin, 1991.

Cederstrom, Lorelei. "A Jungian Approach to Self in Major Whitman Poems." *Approaches To Teaching Whitman's Leaves of Grass*. Ed. Donald Kummings. New York: MLA, 81-89.

Chari, V.K. *Whitman in the Light of Vedantic Mysticism*. Lincoln, NE: UP Nebraska, 1964.

Goodson, Lester. "Whitman and the Problem of Evil." *Walt Whitman Review* 16 (1970): 45-50.

Jung, C.G. "The Problem of the Fourth." *Jung on Evil*. Ed. Murray Stein. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.49-71.

--. *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Dell, 1964.

--. *The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.

--. *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga*. 1932. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1996.

--. *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1966.

Kalita, Dwight. "Walt Whitman: Ecstatic Sea-Voyager." *Walt Whitman Review* 21 (1975): 14-22.

Kahn, Sholom. "Whitman's 'Black Lucifer': Some Possible Sources." *PMLA* 71.5 (1956): 932-44.

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature*. San Francisco: Harper, 1990.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Scott Elledge. New York: Norton, 1993.

Moores, D.J. *Mystical Discourse in Wordsworth and Whitman: A Transatlantic Bridge* Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2006 (forthcoming).

--. "'O happy living things': Healing Serpent Power and Coleridge's Rime." *Studies in Spirituality* (under review).

--. "'Oh, gigantic paradox, too utterly monstrous for solution': Poe's 'William Wilson' and the Jungian Self" *The Edgar Allan Poe Review* 7.2 (2006): 31-48.

--. "Young Goodman Brown's 'Evil Purpose': Hawthorne and the Jungian Shadow" *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 27.3-4 (2005): 4-16.

--. "The Darkness of Enlightenment, the Effulgence of Agnosia: Epistemology in Wordsworth and Whitman" *Journal of Indian Philosophy and Religion* 9 (2004): 1-32.

--. "'Gangs of Kosmos and Prophets En Masse': The Cosmic Poetics of Wordsworth and Whitman." *Romanticism: The Journal of Romantic Culture and Criticism* 10.1 (2004): 95-112.

--. "Wedded in Natural Matrimony: Cosmic Love in Wordsworth and Whitman" *Renascence: Essays on Values in Literature* 56 (2004): 161-180.

--. "'That Serene and Blessed Mood: Mystical Discourse in Wordsworth and Whitman" *Studies in Spirituality* 14 (2004): 285-302.

--. "Egoless 'Egotism' in Wordsworth and Whitman: The Paradox of Self" *Studia Mystica* 24 (2003): 72-103.

Peckham, Morse. "Toward a Theory of Romanticism." *PMLA* 66 (1951): 5-23.

Sixby, George. "'Chanting the Square Deific': A Study in Whitman's Religion." *American Literature* 9.2 (1937): 171-95.

Snider, Clifton. *The Stuff that Dreams Are Made on: A Jungian Interpretation of Literature*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron, 1991.

Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass*. Ed. Sculley Bradley and Harold W. Blodgett. New York: Norton, 1973.

