

An Original Relation to the Universe

Eric S. Rauch, LaGrange College

Abstract: This text is interdisciplinary in nature, though the main focus is on literary criticism, psychology, and philosophy. Essentially, it views people in live experience and characters in fiction as works of art that elicit the empathy and humanity of the viewer and the other characters, respectively. The main focal point is on Herman Melville's short story, "Bartleby, the Scrivener," in which the eponymous character is considered to be a work of art that elicits the compassion of the lawyer-narrator. Just as individuals in live experience become representative of world and societal movements, so do characters in fiction become metaphors and works of art that elicit the interpretation and the empathy of the other characters. Also discussed is the notion of synchronicity by which we can view our lives as texts and the universe as a grand text. Also considered is the plight of those with mental illness and how we can help heal the mentally ill through story. The ultimate nature of this text is the search for a better world through the power of art.

"The foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face, we through their eyes. Why should not we also enjoy an original relation to the universe? Why should not we have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs?"

Ralph Waldo Emerson in "Nature"

With these words, the American philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay "Nature," calls for a new way of looking at the universe. He calls for a contemplation not governed by tradition. He seeks new thought. In our age, this is vitally important. In our age, the world is at a crossroads. The choices we make and the paths we take will be lasting. In fact, these decisions and choices might have a bearing upon the perpetuation of our species. Rollo May writes that "We are living at a time when one age is dying and the new age is not yet born" (11). This is true for all ages, but most severely in our age when we have the power to destroy the world. This text does several things. First, it questions traditional notions of science and attempts to delineate a novel way of contemplating science. In this respect, science and art are wedded in the contemplation of a new age. This has been termed "synchronicity." Second, this text attempts to address how the world is a grand text, how peoples' lives can be read as texts or works of art, and how these conceptions can establish a new way of looking at ourselves and the world in which we live. Third, this text addresses the plight of those with mental illness and demonstrates the similarities and commonalities such people have with the

supposed saner world. This text demonstrates that people with mental illness, as well as all people in existence, can benefit by having a sense of story in their lives, both personal and collective stories and myths, and textual stories and myths found in the form of literature. Finally, this text discusses how people in live experience and characters in literature can act as a medium or metaphor through which the reader and the observer learn.

Synchronicity

One of the most central elements in this text is that of synchronicity. Bolen writes that "Synchronicity" is a descriptive term for the link between two events that are connected through their meaning, a link that cannot be explained through cause and effect" (14) Synchronicity is composed of meaningful coincidences, those occurrences we view as having some direction and not randomness and chaos. We can become empowered by these meaningful coincidences, the viewpoint that our lives are storied and that we can arrive at a more meaningful existence through them. Synchronicity shows that there is a certain artfulness to life, that our lives are not simply accidental and subject to chance; neither are they fated. Live is driven by a higher power. Some lives are works of art. Some lives can be read like stories as well. If we regard our lives as stories and storied, we can realize that there is a divine presence that guides our lives. We recognize that things exist the way they do for a reason. If we believe in the artistry of life, we can regard difficulties as opportunities for personal and collective growth. We can regard problems as being meaningful and as having some didactic purpose. In synchronicity, the world is God's text or the text of a Creator. Individuals can become like God or invite a higher power into their lives by believing in synchronicity and by regarding lives as works of art. F. David Peat writes that Carl Jung defined synchronicity as

... the coincidence in time of two or more causally unrelated events which have the same meaning. His implication is clear – certain events in the universe cluster together into meaningful patterns without recourse to the normal pushes and pulls of causality. These synchronicities therefore must transcend the normal laws of science, for they are the expressions of much deeper movements that originate in the ground of the universe and involve, in an inseparable way, both matter and meaning. (35)

Synchronicity works in this way. Let's say that I have been looking for a rare book and all the bookstores I go to do not have the book. One day, not looking for that particular book, I come across the book I am looking for hanging on a shelf in an unexpected place. This is a meaningful coincidence because there seems to be a purpose or artistry to experience. We are linked to a higher power when we regard life as a text and regard the world as a grand text as well.

Characters as Metaphors

Though mental illness is very real, very literal, and very disturbing, we can also look at mental illness as being a metaphor. We look at the mentally ill and, it is hoped, our empathy is augmented. We can view people with mental illness as being works of art from which we can learn. We can look at literature for some answers and support here because authors use symbols and characters as works of art by which the compassion of the characters as well as the reader are promoted.

Symbols and metaphors acting as works of art can be found in the great works of the 19th century American literary tradition. Viewing mentally ill characters as works of art can help us understand literature and ourselves better. In Herman Melville's short story, "Bartleby, the Scrivener," Bartleby works in a lawyer's office as a scribe, but he refuses to do any work. To the lawyer's admonitions to do work, Bartleby says "I prefer not to." He says few, if any, other words. One of the other scribes says "I think, sir, he's a little lunny" (16). Bartleby is not just mad, however. He changes the lawyer in fundamental ways. The lawyer becomes intrigued by Bartleby and becomes empathic to Bartleby's condition. In effect, the lawyer is the reader of a text, and that text is Bartleby. Bartleby is like a work of art. By contemplating Bartleby, the lawyer's humanity is enhanced and developed. Just like the best of artistic creations. Some individuals in literature become metaphors and media through which the story is told. They are the prism through which we view meaning. Just like famous persons throughout history who become icons, so do characters in literature become muses, metaphors, and media through which the story is told and the action progresses. In the beginning of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the muses are at work. Milton invokes the muse, "Sing heavenly muse ..." (l. 6) and he becomes a medium through which the muse expresses itself. Muses can be seen as metaphors, the conduit through which the stories are told. Literary characters can be used as

metaphors and abstractions, the means through which the story is told. So too can human beings be the medium for a new age.

Nineteenth-century American writers use symbols and characters as works of art by which the compassion of the other characters as well as the reader are promoted. In Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, the letter "A" is a symbol of sin and taboo. It also stands for something that defines and labels. It is also a work of art that carries a meaning that harms. Symbols can harm; they can also heal and hold meaning. Art can harm; it can also refine our sensibilities. In essence, art can elevate. The letter "A" is a symbol by which the protagonist, Hester Prynne, is ostracized by her society. She becomes a symbol, a work of art, one which is interpreted by the people around her. She becomes a symbol, an abstraction. Another character, Reverend Arthur Dimmesdale, suffers because he cannot reveal his adulterous affair with Hester Prynne. Dimmesdale is a character who questions his leadership of his community and society. He is a character relinquishing his role as leader and becomes a metaphor and a work of art to be looked at and understood. He is divided between his guilt and his station as a reverend. He doubts and questions his own guilt and finds himself wanting and sinful. He is death in life because he acts as a symbol and a work of art and not a real human being who is accepting of his imperfections.

We learn through the artists of our age. We learn through the icons of our age. We learn through the geniuses of our age. There is a fine line that separates genius from madness. It has been said, in effect, that both the genius and the mad individual are completely absorbed in their own egos. In a sense, what distinguishes the genius is that the genius can be a source of contemplation. In his essay, "Everything and Nothing," Jorge Luis Borges writes that William Shakespeare was everything and nothing (115-117). Shakespeare was like God because his characters were an extension of his own being. This is true for any being that has multiple souls and multiple selves. When Shakespeare has a conversation with God, Shakespeare says that he wants to be one and not many. He wants to be a body and not a soul. This is true for all geniuses throughout history. This is the dynamic of the soul – that we can envision others as being an extension of ourselves. In this way, Harold Bloom writes that "... the poet is condemned to learn his profoundest yearnings through an awareness of other selves" (29). He writes that William Shakespeare created all of our perspectives on life. He writes that "We have, almost all of us, thoroughly internalized the power of Shakespeare's plays, frequently not having attended to them or read them" (xviii). Bloom writes that "Shakespeare did not think

one thought and only one thought only; rather scandalously, he thought all thoughts for us" (xxvi-xxviii). In another sense, the great painter, Picasso, once said that painting was stronger than him in that it made him do what it wanted. In this respect, Picasso became an abstraction, a metaphor, a medium, through which he created his art. Herman Hesse wrote that "As a body everyone is single, as a soul never" (62).

The Power of Myth

In *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, the great psychiatrist, Carl Gustav Jung, believed in the importance of myths and stories that can be found across all cultures (2-3). All cultures have common stories and myths that could be studied and could aid in the development of the individual's mind. The collective unconscious connects the individual to the rest of humanity. Jung did not deal with individual patients through personal meaning; rather, he appealed through his idea of the collective unconscious to ascertain how the individual's difficulties had their roots in the common myths and history of humanity in general. Jung's theory of the collective unconscious states that individuals can use ancient myths and stories to help guide their own mental lives. The collective unconscious is important because, whether one has mental illness or is healthy, all peoples have myths in their socio-cultural-historical traditions.

Jung believed modern human failure to be a failure to have myths to guide our lives. This has occurred, he argues, because we no longer have stories and myths that we value and use to express our ideals, both individual and collective. In our age, there is a problem in too much belief as when people of different political persuasions or religious beliefs are fundamentalists and believe that belief and truth are monolithic and one-dimensional. There is also a problem with too little belief when all is sanctioned. Dan P. McAdams, in his book, *The Stories We Live By*, echoes the efficacy of the use of myths to guide personal development, by stating that human identity is a life story in which individuals can create identities through narrative, whether textual or personal. McAdams discusses how individuals can become better human beings through the use of personal myths. McAdams poses the rhetorical question: "What is a personal myth? First and foremost, it is a special kind of story that each of us naturally constructs to bring together the different parts of ourselves and our lives into a purposeful convincing whole" (12). In essence, we need stories. McAdams continues: "Some psychological problems and a great deal of emotional suffering stem from our failures to make

sense of our lives through stories. Therapists help us to revise our stories, and produce a healing narrative of the self" (33). To McAdams, modern life is problematic because, to a certain extent, we have lost meaning in our lives because we lack myths that would instruct us how to live.

The renowned psychiatrist, Robert Coles, writes in *The Call of Stories: Teaching and the Moral Imagination*, that his patients are not only people with problems, but people with stories: "The people who come to see us bring us their stories. They hope they tell them well enough so that we understand the truth of their lives. They hope we know how to interpret their stories correctly. We have to remember that what we hear is their story" (8). In this regard, his duty was to understand these stories and aid the individual patient in making these stories happier, more meaningful ones.

In society, we must establish a relation between self and something greater than oneself. We need to have a dialogue between self and how self is situated in a greater being or greater meaning. The renowned literary critic, Northrop Frye, writes that literature and myth can help us to regain a lost identity. He writes that "In other words, literature not only leads toward a regaining of identity, but it also separates this state from its opposite, the world we don't like and want to get away from" (49). The same didactic function can be found in art as well. Literature and art can help us re-fashion our lives and make us more empathic beings.

Art often involves a consideration with a god or gods or something more noble. Frye defines mythology by making a connection between self and god:

... in the history of civilization literature follows after a mythology. A myth is a simple and primitive effort of the imagination to identify the human with the nonhuman world, and its most typical result is a story about a god. Later on, mythology begins to merge with literature, and myth then becomes a structured principle of storytelling. I've tried to explain how myths stick together to form a mythology, and how the containing framework of the mythology takes the shape of a feeling of lost identity which we had once and may have again. (110)

We all need our God or gods or belief systems to help guide our lives. We all need something to believe in to help us lead a purposeful life. If we do not, we lose something so vital to life. When we are shut out from literature, art, or something higher and nobler, we lose something that is very important, among other things, individual and societal growth as well as empathy toward other people around us.

Frye later writes that "... literature is not religion, and it doesn't address itself to belief. But if we shut the vision of it completely out of our minds, or insist in its being limited in various ways, something goes dead inside us, perhaps the one thing that is really important to keep" (50). Art should be important to us because a world without art would be a world that had lost its capacity for meaning. Art should have meaning for us because it can help us to recapture a better identity, not only for the individual, but for the larger, collective society as well. To Frye, art can spark the imagination: "The fundamental job of the imagination in ordinary life, then, is to produce, out of the society we have to live in a vision of the society we want to live in" (50). It is through art that we form and enhance our imaginative capacities.

In a conversation with the journalist, Bill Moyers, the great mythologist, Joseph Campbell, states that "One of our problems today is that we are not well-acquainted with the literature of the spirit" (1). He also says that "Myths are clues to the spiritual potentialities of the human life" (5). In a sense, "Myth helps you to put your mind in touch with the experience of being alive" (5). Joseph Campbell also describes the journey of the hero. The hero has "... the courage to face the trials and to bring a whole new body of possibilities into the field of interpreted experience for other people to experience" (49). The hero is often an artist. Campbell states that "Myths must be kept alive. The people who can keep them alive are artists of one kind or another. The function of the artist is the mythologization of the environment and of the world" (107). The artist is one who makes the world and the universe akin to a story and a narrative and guiding myth. The artist is one who "... come[s] out of an elite experience, the experience of people particularly gifted, whose ears are open to the song of the universe" (107). Campbell states that "The shaman is the person, male or female, who in his late childhood or early youth has an overwhelming experience that turns him totally inward. It's a kind of schizophrenic crack-up. The whole unconscious opens up, and the shaman falls into it" (107).

The dynamic of the artist is that he or she has usually been wounded, and it is from this wound that the artist realizes something nobler. Campbell states that "A hero is someone who has given his or her life to something bigger than oneself" (151). Campbell states that "A legendary hero is usually a founder of something – the founder of a new age, the founder of a new religion, the founder of a new city, the founder of a new way of life" (166-167). The way for the hero to succeed is to heal himself while at the same time healing society. If this does not happen, the people live in a wasteland: "And what is the nature of the wasteland? It is a land

where everybody is living an inauthentic life, doing as other people do, doing as you're told, with no courage for your own life. That is the wasteland ..." (244).

Myths and Mental Illness

The journey of the mythological hero is similar to what happens to the person with schizophrenia. Campbell states that the journey of the person with schizophrenia is like that of the hero in that the journey of the hero is a search for something he or she has previously lost. The meaning of the life of the hero is then to regain that which he or she has lost.

Campbell writes that "... a schizophrenic breakdown is an inward and backward journey to recover something missed or lost, and to restore, thereby, a vital balance" (203). Campbell continues by stating that the difference between the mystic and the schizophrenic is that the mystic is healed through learning about the ways of the world, whereas the schizophrenic loses himself in the world. The hero seeks a coherent form of expression which connects him or her to the wider society. The difference, here, is that the genius seeks to learn from his or her society and world, while the person with schizophrenia has a total, or near total, severing of his or her relation to the world around him or her. The genius makes meaning discrete whereas the schizophrenic reads into the world without being able to make meaningful connections between self and world. In effect, there are too many connections but that they are incoherent. They have no form, no connection to the wider society. The genius can find a form or means of expression while the schizophrenic cannot. Campbell writes that

The difference – to put it sharply- is equivalent simply to that between a diver who can swim and one who cannot. The mystic, endowed with native talents for this sort of thing and following, stage by stage, the instruction of a master, enters the waters and finds he can swim; whereas the schizophrenic, unprepared, unguided, and ungifted, has fallen or has intentionally plunged, and is drowning. Can he be saved? If a line is thrown to him, will he grab it? (209)

The crucial point, here, is that the person with schizophrenia can achieve a more healthy status by making this journey analogous to what happens to the hero in his journey. The hero succeeds in his journey because he does not reject his culture but seeks to change and be changed by it. He takes upon himself this journey for redemption; rather than dismissing his

love for the culture, he learns to understand it. The schizophrenic rejects his culture and sees in it problems that he strives to escape from rather than embrace. By becoming more empathic, therapists and readers alike can understand the journey of the schizophrenic and the journey of the hero, as having some, but not all, common elements. By becoming more empathic, we can heal the person with schizophrenia and people with other forms of mental illness and help them on their journey to find and regain that which they have lost. The best medium for doing so is through art.

Elio Frattaroli distinguishes between the swimming-pool philosophy and the quest philosophy. "According to the swimming-pool philosophy, the purpose of life is to stay afloat, to function smoothly, maintaining the equilibrium, of the status quo" (109). Frattaroli contrasts the swimming-pool philosophy with the quest philosophy by saying that this quest philosophy involves the adventurer seeking a better state: "... the purpose of life is to pursue this higher state – enlightenment, wisdom, self-actualization – by progressing through a series of difficult, dangerous trials" (110). In addition, to Frattaroli, "You can't find your way to a higher level without learning from your missteps. Falling down is therefore good" (109-110).

The Power of Art

The modern failure is not that we do not have a metaphor by which to live but that we have not implemented these metaphors. The question is whether we have the will to make these ideals into a reality. This can be accomplished through art. In this way, art can heal the individual person as well as the collective society. At our core, human beings are composed of stories: "... stories can be found in every culture and subculture and can be viewed as a basic human strategy for coming to terms with time, process, and change" (Herman 2). All people have stories to tell. They just have to be told and implemented into our present-day discourse. Through narrative, we can help people with mental illness and those without pathology to order their worlds into a new theory of the world. **In this way, "Narrative has often been viewed as the product of a universal human need to communicate with others and to make sense of the world (Miller 1995)."** Herman 65. In fact, stories are necessary to make sense of experience, whether healthy experience or experience with some pathology to it. Consequently, we must strive to make order out of chaos, strive to make genius out of madness, through art.

Art and Science

This next section of the text considers connections between art and science and how they must be wedded in our present-day society. In this regard, it includes a discussion of the relation between physics and metaphysics. Consider particle to be a solid entity, as opposed to wave, which we consider to be in flux, a bundle of energy. When we label someone as mentally ill, we label them and admit no possibility. We regard them as something solid. When we regard them as a bundle of energy, things can change, both individually and collectively. This occurs when we contrast and compare the individual with his or her larger world.

We are left with a conundrum: can we include both synchronicity and causality in our theory of the world? Is all reality dependent on cause and effect, or can we link things together through art and the way we observe reality? Peat writes that "Any attempt to reduce all facts of nature to a causal chain will simply fail" (46). In this sense, must we rid ourselves of science and matter from our theory of the world, or can we adapt our traditional notions of science into a new theory of the world? We can never know the exact cause and effect of anything in reality. But, through synchronicity, we can come to understand that everything in the universe is connected but not exclusively through rational thought. Peat asks the question: "How will it be possible to retain the framework of science, while at the same time, acknowledging the limits of causality and determinism?" (47). Can we combine science and art, positivism with metaphor, or will we keep with tradition and outmoded theories of the world in which there is a Cartesian split between mind and matter, mind and brain, science and art? It may well be that society and culture suffer if we do not alter our theory of the world. It may very well be also that we have suffered already with an outdated, outmoded theory of the world.

Consider once again, Herman Melville's short story, "Bartleby, the Scrivener." To reiterate: the story is about a scribe who works in a lawyer's office on Wall Street in New York City. Whenever the lawyer-narrator requests and later demands that Bartleby does some copying or writing, Bartleby answers with the words, "I prefer not to." Bartleby is used by Melville as a work of art which humanizes the lawyer-narrator. The lawyer's humanity and empathy grow by his seeking to understand Bartleby. In effect, the lawyer tries to understand the soul of Bartleby and, by metaphorical extension, to understand his own soul as well.

Bartleby the Scrivener is an enigma. He occupies the locus of art and of philosophical thought. In effect, he is, or can be considered to be, a work of art through which the lawyer-narrator learns. Leo Marx, in an oft-quoted essay, "Melville's Parable of the Walls," writes that "Bartleby is not only about a writer who refuses to conform to the demands of society, but it is,

more relevantly, about a writer who forsakes conventional modes because of an irresistible preoccupation with the most baffling philosophical questions" (256). In this respect, Bartleby is a hero yet a troubled one at that. Bartleby is alone and in this aloneness, he can be considered to be insane: "Taking the last resort of the "normal" man, the lawyer concludes that Bartleby is out of his mind" (253).

Leo Marx is ambivalent regarding who is at fault, whether this be Bartleby, the lawyer, Wall Street, or all of humanity. Marx first states that Bartleby is at fault:

Bartleby's obsession was perhaps a palliative, a defense against social experience which had become more than he could stand. To this extent the nature of the Wall Street society has contributed to Bartleby's fate. What is important, here, however, is that Melville does not exonerate the writer by placing all the onus upon society. Bartleby has made a fatal mistake. (251)

However, conversely, Marx also says that "True, the society has been indifferent to Bartleby's needs and aspirations; it has demanded of him a kind of writing he prefers not to do; and, most serious of all, it has impaired his vision by forcing to work in the shadows of its walls. Certainly society shares the responsibility for Bartleby's fate" (253).

Walls are important to the story. Walls are important to human beings as well. Walls keep us safe. Walls protect us. Walls set boundaries. Robert Frost writes that "Good fences make good neighbors" (l. 44). He also writes, however, that "Something there is that doesn't love a wall" (l. 1). Nevertheless, walls are important to the narrator. In fact, all the physical surroundings of the law office and its general surroundings are important as well. In the office, we see matter being transformed into something not solid, but full of energy. In the first few paragraphs of the story, Melville, through the unnamed lawyer-narrator, writes the following: "Ere introducing the scrivener, as he first appeared to me, it is fit I make some mention of myself, my employ, my business, my chamber, and general surroundings; because some such description is indispensable to an adequate understanding of the chief character about to be presented" (3).

As readers trying to understand the story, we are compelled to ascertain the meaning of the physical description of the law office. The lawyer tells us that the structure of the office will have an impact on the nature of the characters that are in the story. Here is where physics comes into play. As in physics, where light is shown through a prism and colors are created

through the prism, the structure of the law office is represented into the white and black walls of perception. Later in the story, the narrator states the following:

I should have stated before that ground-glass folding doors divided my premises into two parts, one of which was occupied by my scriveners, the other by myself. According to my humor, I threw open these doors, or closed them. I resolved to assign Bartleby a corner by the folding doors, but on my side of them, so as to have this quiet man within easy call, in case any trifling thing was to be done. I placed his desk close up to a small side-window in that part of the room, a window which originally afforded a lateral view of grimy backyards and bricks, but which owing to subsequent erections, commanded at present no view at all, though it gave some light. Within three feet of the panes was a wall, and the light came down from far above, between two lofty buildings, as from a very small opening in a dome. Still further to a satisfactory arrangement, I procured a high green folding screen, which might entirely isolate Bartleby from my sight, though not remove him from my voice. And thus, in a manner, privacy and society were conjoined. (11-12)

In this way, matter is transformed into energy, the solid is transformed into the flux, and the body of the office is transformed into the soul of Bartleby and the soul of the lawyer-narrator as well. In effect, the narrator is an amalgam of the personalities of his scriveners. The narrator is searching for his soul.

Bartleby has failed to see that walls can simply be walls. They are not anything more than solid entities. They are manipulable and malleable. They do not have subtext or unconscious meaning. Bartleby is different, however: "Most men who inhabit Wall Street merely accept the walls for what they are -- man-made structures which compartmentalize experience. To Bartleby, however, they are abstract emblems of all the impediments to man's realization of his place in the universe" (Marx 254). In the end, however, Bartleby is isolated. "The lawyer can be saved. But the scrivener, like Ahab, or one of Hawthorne's geniuses, has made the fatal error of turning his back on mankind. He has failed to see that there were in fact no impenetrable walls between the lawyer and himself. The only walls which had separated them were folding (manipulable) glass doors, and the green screen" (256). To Marx, the walls do not

have metaphysical or psychological significance. They are simply physical entities. Yet this would deny the unconscious and the power of art.

At one point in the narrative, one of the characters says about Bartleby that "I think, sir, he's a little lunny" (Melville 16). In effect, one interpretation is that Bartleby might suffer from a mental illness since he is so divorced from the dictates of the social world. At another point, the lawyer-narrator states the following: "'Prefer not to,' echoed I, rising in high excitement, and crossing the room with a stride. 'What do you mean? Are you moon-struck? I want you to help me compare this sheet here—take it,' and I thrust it towards him. 'I would prefer not to,' he said" (13). The lawyer battles with his own soul in contemplating Bartleby. He wants to be fair to Bartleby but fair to his own being as well. Through Bartleby's plight, the narrator is changed just as when viewing a work of art. The narrator tries to understand Bartleby; in so doing, he is humanized by Bartleby much as what happens when viewing a work of art:

Not a wrinkle of agitation rippled him. Had there been at the least uneasiness, anger, impatience or impertinence in his manner; in other words, had there been anything ordinarily human about him, doubtless I should have violently dismissed him from my premises. But as it was, I should have as soon thought of turning my pale plaster-of-paris bust of Cicero out of doors. I stood gazing at him awhile. (13)

Bartleby, here, is equated to a work of art. At another point in the story, Bartleby is again considered to be a work of art that can be equated with Nero as Rome burns: "And here Bartleby makes his home; sole spectator of a solitude which he has seen all populous – a sort of innocent and transformed Marius brooding among the ruins of Carthage!" (23). Bartleby becomes an abstraction, a work of art. He ceases to have any human free will. Bartleby is a solid entity; the lawyer is a solid entity. The lawyer is humanized when contemplating Bartleby. The lawyer's soul is activated. What is the meaning of the walls?

Walls are solid; they are not spiritual. By considering a wall to be a metaphor, something not solid, we can, in the words of Nathaniel Hawthorne, in the short story, "The Artist of the Beautiful," "spiritualize matter" (167). In another sense, Bartleby is the lawyer's soul, a part of the narrator that will not leave him: "'Will you, or will you not, quit me?' I now demanded in a sudden passion, advancing close to him. 'I would prefer not to quit you,' he replied, gently emphasizing the not" (33). The lawyer says, "Now one of two things must take place. Either

you must do something, or something must be done to you" (40). And something does happen to Bartleby. He is put in jail in the "Tombs" and later dies, and, in the words of Dan McCall, "'humanity' is forever changed" (154).

Bartleby is Everyman. Leo Marx concludes by writing that "Among countless imaginative statements of the artist's problems in modern literature, "Bartleby" is exceptional in its sympathy and hope for the average man, and in the severity of its treatment of the artist" (256). Like an artist, or perhaps a failed artist, Bartleby is death in life. Bartleby cannot come to terms with his state in Wall Street and his state in the universe. Like many characters in American literature of the 19th century, life is balanced with death. They are inextricably intertwined. Marx writes that "... even in the walled street he had allowed his life to become suffused with death" (253). He continues by saying that "Whatever killed this writer was not the walls themselves, but the fact that he confused the walls built by men with the wall of human mortality" (253).

The Current State of Science

This text shows how in the United States and in the wider world today we are following a worldview that is outdated and not in synch with the current state of science. In effect, our moral beliefs, our relation to other people, is not in synch with what we know of science. We are faced with the chicken or the egg problem: which comes first – advances in science or advances in metaphor when interacting with one another as social, cultural beings? There is something outdated about causality; there is something outdated about positivism; there is something outdated about the traditional way we view science.

There is a link between art and science, a link between psychology and physics. In many fields and disciplines, including psychology, literature, religion (Buddhism, especially), and physics, specialists are trying to discover the laws of the universe. This might be sacrilege, but this is the nature of research today. In this way, we must try to make different disciplines coalesce. In contemporary physics, light has two forms -- as particle and as wave –and they cannot be considered within the traditional scientific paradigm. In effect, we have two ways of looking at matter – as something solid and as something in flux. Matter can be considered to be a work of art; the flux can be considered how art can change us into many selves.

The universe is composed of both particles and waves. We cannot, simultaneously, think that particles and waves can coexist. Deepak Chopra writes that "The first level of existence is

physical or material, the visible universe. This is the world we know best, what we call the real world" (35). In this existence, time is linear and there is a distinct past, present, and future. Today, we know that time is not linear but a combination of past, present, and future occurring simultaneously. We also know that life is not just science, not just cause and effect. "At the second level of existence everything consists of information and energy. This is called the quantum domain. Everything at this level is insubstantial, meaning that it cannot be touched or perceived by any of the five senses" (36). Here, there is no solidity. "The third level of existence consists of intelligence or consciousness. This can be called the virtual domain, the spiritual domain, the field of potential, the universal being, or nonlocal intelligence. This is where information and energy merge from a sea of possibilities. The most fundamental, basic level of nature is not material; it is not even energy and information soup; it is pure potential" (43). This constitutes our new theory of science and how it operates. Everything is in flux and everything is possible if we view our lives as works of art and as part of a meaningful universe. Chopra writes that "Beyond your physical self, beyond your thoughts and emotions, there lies a realm within you that is pure potential; from this place anything and everything is possible" (18). He is writing about synchronicity here. "Each time we have an experience like this, we can choose to dismiss it as a random occurrence in a chaotic world, or we can recognize it for the potentially life-altering even it may prove to be" (19). In effect, by opening ourselves up to meaning we can live a life of greater possibility: "When you live your life with an appreciation of coincidences and their meanings, you connect with the underlying field of infinite possibilities" (21). In this way, we are wedded to a higher power. We can begin to revalue the lives of those with mental illness and even those without pathology by not regarding these lives as immutable and solid, admitting of no alteration. We must view all matter as being energy that is in flux and not mass that is solid. In this way, we admit possibility. By our very act of observing, we can change the world. Stephen Wolinsky writes that "The process of seeing everything made of energy is actually a process of de-labeling or de-framing, taking off all labels and seeing emotions as energy – their most basic substance" (52-53). Energy is solidified when we label someone, when we try to define them. It is through story that we entertain possibility.

The most recent science believes that everything in the universe is connected. This follows from the work of scientists, theologians, and writers of literature. Stephen Wolinsky discusses how a hologram – a three-dimensional photograph manufactured with the aid of a

laser – can be cut in half into sections. In a hologram, each part contains the whole. In a hologram, past, present, and future exist simultaneously and there is no such thing as time:

Now, if there is no time, this has extraordinary implications. The first implication is that if there is no time, then there cannot be cause and effect, because cause and effect are linear and require a past, present, and future as a time line, linear construct. If everything is happening simultaneously, there could be no this in the past causing this in the present or future. Why? Because they would all just be occurring. (129)

In our world today, we must be mystics. We must regard all of history as happening in every instant. This perspective can be found in art and in literature. The question remains: is history and the universe mutable or has it been all determined? In our world, our universe, we must come to realize that, though the universe has been predetermined, we still have free will. We might not be inventing the universe, but we might be discovering it. The great poet, T.S. Eliot writes in his poem, "Burnt Norton" that past, present, and future, all exist in each and every moment:

Time present and time past
Are both perhaps present in time future
And time future contained in time past.
If all time is eternally present
All time is unredeemable. (l. 1-5)

Here, is where I disagree with Eliot, however. I believe that the universe contains all histories and is mutable through the exercise of our human free will. This is what makes us human, this exercise of free will. Nothing is engraved in stone. Through our thought, we create possibilities. This is how we should perceive the universe today. We need to realize that all time is eternal and capable of discovery by us. Our lives are not completely preordained. We have free will.

In his essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," T.S. Eliot, writes that the artist is the recipient of all past interpretations: "... the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of literature of his country has a simultaneous existence and

composes a simultaneous order" (38). In essence, T.S. Eliot believed there to be no sharp demarcation between past, present, and future, but that all would be together. Science and art, physics and metaphysics, must coalesce into one grand theory. In this way, science and art are conjoined.

In *The Anxiety of Influence*, Harold Bloom, has somewhat of a different interpretation than does Eliot. Bloom believes that all good readings and interpretations by critics or poets are misreadings of these previous poets and artists. Bloom calls these misreadings, "misprision." He writes: "In ways that need not be doctrinal, strong poems are always omens of resurrection. The dead may or may not return, but their voice comes alive, paradoxically never by mere imitation, but in the agonistic misprision performed upon powerful forerunners by only the most gifted of their successors" (xxiv). Bloom believes, somewhat similar to Eliot, that all great poets and artists take their predecessors into account when they write. Yet, to Bloom, these later poets misread their predecessors.

Bloom writes that all readings and writings by poets are an amalgam of past, present, and future writings. In this way, the poet, the artist, has some free will to change the past as well as the future. Unlike Eliot's view, the future is redeemable. Bloom writes that "Shelley speculated that poets of all ages contributed to one Great Poem perpetually in progress" (19). This idea frees the theorist. It demonstrates that we have free will when interpreting a text or interpreting a life. In this way, "Every poem is a misinterpretation of another poem" (94-95). This connects us to tradition yet it also allows us to be revolutionary with our interpretations of texts to create something anew. This is what Emerson meant when he called for an original relation to the universe.

In our age, our understanding of life is fragmented. We need a more integrated philosophy so that science and art are conjoined. Our age must prize the poetic mind and the poetic understanding of the universe. At the same time, our age must prize a scientific understanding of the universe as well. Our problem, today, is that various disciplines are fragmented and that they do not cohere into an all-embracing philosophy. In *Atom and Archetype*, a compilation of letters between the physicist, Wolfgang Pauli, and the psychiatrist, Carl Gustav Jung, C.A. Meier quotes Arthur Koestler, who believes that 'all decisive advances in the history of scientific thought can be described in terms of mental cross-fertilization between different disciplines'" (xi). In addition, in this vein, Werner Heisenberg writes that

It is probably true quite generally that in the history of human thinking the most fruitful developments frequently take place at those points where two different lines of thought meet. These lines may have their roots in quite different parts of human culture, in different times or different cultural environments or different religious traditions; hence if they actually meet, that is, if they are at least so much related to each other than a real interaction can take place, then one may hope that new and interesting developments may follow. (187).

When we believe in or apply the principles of synchronicity, we come to recognize that everything in the universe is interrelated. *In Quantum Consciousness: The Guide to Experiencing Quantum Psychology*, Stephen Wolinsky writes that "Quantum consciousness is essentially unity consciousness – certainly not a new concept in the history of humankind. Eastern religions (and even some Western philosophies and religions) have been telling us for a very long time that there is an underlying unity that connects us all" (9). Thus, reality cannot just be understood solely by cause and effect. In this respect, "Heisenberg demonstrated that the observer creates that which he/she observes. In Quantum Physics terminology: we create our subjective experience" (17).

Prior to Albert Einstein's findings, Isaac Newton's laws of motion governed the day. The world was viewed without the observer. In this respect, legal positivism ruled the day and there was an objective standard that theorists could appeal to when contemplating the physical as well as the mental world. This is not entirely true or operative today. We now know that science and the scientific method have progressed with new theories.

In our age, we must transcend Newtonian as well as Cartesian thinking that views the observer and the observed, mind and body, as separate entities. In past conceptions, we have been separate from the universe and look at it from a distance, not realizing that we are a part of it. By changing the world, we change ourselves. By changing ourselves, we change the world. Heraclitus stated that one cannot go into the same river twice. The only constant is change. Everything is in flux. The world changes by the way we observe it. We live in a sea of appearances.

In his essay, "Eureka," Edgar Allan Poe discusses Newtonian mechanics. He discusses how many becomes one and how one becomes many (232-233). In this respect, Poe is talking about light and matter and energy and what impact science and physics have on

metaphysics. To Poe, all oneness becomes multiple and all multiplicity becomes one and unity. Though not explicitly stated, Poe can, by extension, be talking about the viewpoint that is inherent in the ideals of the United States, which is founded on the maxim, "E pluribus unum," or out of many, we are one. In this way, multiplicity is made out of unity and diversity is made out of sameness. Heterogeneity is made out of homogeneity and complexity is made out of simplicity. Poe talks about how the physical qualities of attraction and repulsion can be equated, respectively, to the body and the soul:

Discarding not the two equivocal terms, "gravitation" and "electricity," let us adopt the more definite expressions, "Attraction" and "Repulsion." The former is the body; the latter, the soul: the one is material; the other the spiritual, principle of the Universe. No other principles exist. All phaenomena [sic] are referable to one, or to the other, or to both combined. So rigorously is this the case --- so thoroughly is it that Attraction and Repulsion are the sole properties through which we perceive the Universe --in other words, by which Matter is manifested to Mind (232-233).

The paradigm developed, here, is that there is Unity and there is diffusion. Poe, here, is demonstrating that the body and the soul work together to create a whole human being: "Thus the two Principles Proper, Attraction and Repulsion -- the Material and the Spiritual -- accompany each other, in the strictest fellowship forever. Thus the Body and Soul walk hand in hand" (236). This represents the power and dynamics of how we view a work of art, this vacillation between body and soul, the material and the spiritual.

Art and science can be conjoined into a new worldview. So can all other disciplines be wedded. Everything in experience is connected into a unified whole. This is the way we must come to view the world. In this new worldview, we are undergoing a profound cultural transformation. In effect, "The major problems of our time, cannot be understood in isolation. They are systemic problems --interconnected and interdependent" (Capra 324-325). What we have in contemporary life is a crisis of perception. It is a failure to look at life in the right way. The way we perceive something forms what we perceive. John Gardner in his book, *Grendel*, writes that "Connectedness is the essence of everything " (27). This is the way we must come to look at and perceive life.

Mystics can be found in thought involving the universe. If we are to grow both individually and collectively, we need a new theory of the world. We have had our forces of destruction. We must now realize that our notions of causality and Cartesian thought are outdated and that the universe once again be integrated. Adaptation to a new theory of the world may mean changing the customs upon which our culture has been based for over 200 years. The dialogue between the great mythologist, Joseph Campbell, and the renowned journalist, Bill Moyers (1988), in *The Power of Myth*, may be instructive here once again. Campbell, arguably, has an answer, here, in valuing the myths of different cultures. By looking at life the way Campbell does, we can create a respect for other peoples, who, though they may have different and differing belief systems, still are respectful and can learn from each other.

It is not yet certain what the next paradigm will bring. In his book, *The Elegant Universe*, physicist, Brian Greene, writes that what might be needed is a bridge between art and science:

By fearlessly taking on science, and leveraging its intrinsic fascination to produce entertaining works of substance and drama, the arts may well be the perfect medium to fully integrate science into the world's conversation. We may even find that the art world's scientifically inspired works will provide a new stimulus to the scientific imagination and, in some possibly intangible way, prepare us for the next step in understanding the universe. (ix).

In *Einstein and Religion* (1999), Max Jammer states that Einstein believed that science can tell us nothing about morality and the way we live our lives. "According to Einstein, even science at an advanced stage cannot define, let alone command, ethical values. For science is confined to what is and ethics to what should be, and no path leads from the knowledge of what is to the knowledge of what should be" (52). I disagree with Einstein here. Our view of science and art should cohere into a new theory of the world. "You are right in speaking of the moral foundations of science; but you cannot turn it around and speak of the scientific foundations of morality." For science, Einstein continued, cannot teach men to be moral and every attempt to reduce ethics to scientific formulae must fail" (69). In this text, I argue for a metaphorical consideration that can be derived from science. "Scientific thinking alone, Einstein continued, cannot lead us to the ultimate and fundamental purpose of our existence" (90). But perhaps

synchronicity, its wedding of binary oppositions, can help us to come closer to an ultimate purpose for our existence that conjoins science and art into a new synthesis.

Theorists disagree as to what extent science and metaphysics can cohere into a unified theory. In *The Invisible Century*, Roger Panek writes that "Einstein thought that to generalize from a physical theory to a statement of the human condition – to draw a mathematical proposition to an existential conclusion – 'is not only a mistake but has something reprehensible about it'" (186). Panek later writes that "What lies beyond our sensory perceptions, beyond the strictest applications of the scientific method, beyond physics, belongs – can only belong – to metaphysics" (163). Yet, in the final analysis, I think we shall find that in order to form a coherent theory of the world, we must think across the disciplines.

All readers and writers generate hypotheses about the world. Scientists also generate hypotheses. In the book, *A Brief History of Time*, Stephen Hawking, contrasts his theory of the universe with other current understandings. He writes that "The eventual goal of science is to provide a single theory that describes the whole universe" (10). Arguably, the goal of art is to provide this same theory as well. The Romantic poet, William Blake, says the same thing through his poetry. In his poem, "Auguries of Innocence," Blake writes the following:

To see a World in a Grain of Sand
And a Heaven in a Wild Flower
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour. (l. 1-4)

Hawking also writes that "A theory is the more impressive the greater the simplicity of its premise, the more different kinds of things it relates, and the more extended is its area of applicability" (136-137).

We live in an age in which the collective society is ill and perhaps we can apply the principles of art, the soul, and psychotherapy to the broader, collective society. In this age of information, we have as at no time previously been able to heal the society. Watts writes that "But no one has yet discovered how to apply psychotherapy on a mass basis" (16). Through the advent of more advanced means of technological interaction, all advances of our moral natures can be forged to make this form of therapy to be possible. The question remains, however, whether we may have the individual and collective will to do so.

All human thought is a coming-to-terms with the present state of the soul at particular points in time. James Joyce, in *Ulysses*, considered history to be a nightmare from which he was trying to awaken. The overriding focus of this text, however, is that science and art should matter in our world today. Perhaps the thoughts of those discussed in this paper, cannot be applied in reality but are simply, or perhaps not so simply, musings that take concrete form only on the page with no definite bearing on people's lives. Perhaps they are just abstract principles not having an enduring impact on reality. Nevertheless, consider this text to be an attempt to revalue art and science, even though many writers find such meaning illusory. Through the soul, we seek to understand our selves and the world around us. Yet throughout history, the soul has been the province of madmen. Consider Don Quixote fighting windmills. Oftentimes, the artist or genius is mad because he or she envisions what he or she believes to be a reality that is better than the present one. In their imaginations, such people try to create a better world than the one they encounter in reality. Their quest is to perfect reality, yet this, too, is elusive. Are these thoughts just thoughts?

Geniuses often lead horrid lives yet we need such individuals to progress and to grow, both individually and collectively. In fact, many of the theorists alluded to in this text are geniuses. In this regard, consider Freud and Jung, Campbell and Frye, Milton and Shakespeare, and many others. Idealism, too, is the province of madmen. Who but the mad would or could deny reality? It is a shame that reality determines these individuals to be insane. Yet this is our present reality. The artist, the genius, seeks higher ground in search of a better world. This might be futile, yet the destiny of the artist is to transform the world and, through this work, to make this universe, a better place and one that can sustain itself.

Works Cited

- Blake, William. "Auguries of Innocence." *The Complete Poetry and Prose*. David V. Erdman and Harold Bloom, Eds. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1982.
- Bloom, Howard. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Bolen, Jean Shinoda. *The Tao of Psychology: Synchronicity and the Self*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Everything and Nothing." *A Personal Anthology*. New York : Grove Press, 1967.
- Campbell, Joseph, and Bill Moyers. *The Power of Myth*. New York : Doubleday, 1988.
- Chopra, Deepak. *The Spontaneous Fulfillment of Desire: Harnessing the Infinite Power of Coincidence*. New York : Harmony Books, 2003.
- Coles, Robert. *The Call of Stories: Teaching and the Moral Imagination*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1989.
- Eliot, T. S. "Burnt Norton." *Collected Poems and Plays*. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1952. 117.
- . "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *The Complete Poems and Plays*.
- Fratraro, Elio. *Healing the Soul in the Age of the Brain: Becoming Conscious in an Unconscious World*. New York: Viking, 2001.
- Frost, Robert. "Mending Wall." *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. Alexander W. Allison, Ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1983. 539.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Educated Imagination*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Gardner, John. *Grendel*. New York, Knopf, 1971.
- Greene, Brian. *The Elegant Universe: Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory*. New York : W.W. Norton, 1999.
- Hawking, Stephen. *A Brief History of Time*. Toronto; New York : Bantam Books, 1988.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "The Artist of the Beautiful."
- Heisenberg, Werner. *Physics and Philosophy*. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Herman, David. *Narrative Theory and Cognitive Sciences*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications, 2003.
- Hesse, Hermann. *Steppenwolf*.
- Jammer, Max. *Einstein and Religion*. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Jung, Carl. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959.
- Marx, Leo. "Melville's Parable of the Walls." *Sewanee Review* 61 (October 1953): 602-627.
- May, Rollo. *The Courage to Create*. New York : Norton, 1975.
- McAdams, Dan. *The Stories We Live By: Personal Myths and the Making of the Self*. New York, N.Y. : W. Morrow, 1993.
- McCall, Dan. *The Silence of Bartleby*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Pauli**, Wolfgang, et al. *Atom and Archetype: The Pauli/Jung Letters*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 2001.

Melville, Herman. "Bartleby the Scrivener."

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*.

Panek, Richard. *The Invisible Century: Einstein, Freud, and the Search for Hidden Universes*.
New York : Viking, 2004.

Peat, F. David . *Synchronicity: The Bridge between Matter and Mind*. Toronto ; New York :
Bantam Books, 1987.

Poe, Edgar Allan. "Eureka."

Watts, Alan. *Psychotherapy East and West*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1961.

Wolinsky, Stephen, and Kristi L. Kennen. *Quantum Consciousness: The Guide to Experiencing
Quantum Psychology*. Norfolk, Conn. : Bramble Books, 1993.

ERIC S. RAUCH is currently an Assistant Professor of Education at LaGrange College in LaGrange, Georgia, where he teaches students who want to become teachers at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. More specifically, his expertise is in Literacy Education. In addition, he has taught previously at St. Bonaventure University, at Hofstra University, and at Technical Career Institutes College of Technology. Rauch's Bachelor of Arts degree is in English from Cornell University and he holds a Ph.D. in Literacy Studies from Hofstra University. His dissertation was titled "A Theory of the World: The Writing Practices of One Woman with Schizoaffective Disorder, a Combination of Schizophrenia and Bipolar Disorder." Rauch has also worked at a psychosocial rehabilitation clubhouse in Long Island, New York, helping to heal those with mental illness and psychiatric disabilities.