

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE FAUST MYTH IN GEORGE GORDON

BYRON'S *MANFRED* AND *CAIN*

Patricia Denisa DITA

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Petru GOLBAN

2018

**T.C.
NAMIK KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE FAUST MYTH IN GEORGE
GORDON BYRON'S *MANFRED* AND *CAIN***

Patricia Denisa DITA

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

DANIŞMAN: DOÇ. DR. PETRU GOLBAN

TEKİRDAĞ-2018

Her hakkı saklıdır

Özet

Prometheus, Orpheus, Psyche, Apollo ve benzeri romantiklerin yeniden canlandırdığı ve yeniden yazdığı mitlerin arasında, Faust'un efsanesi, genel olarak bireyciliğin romantik yükselişinin, özellikle de onun var oluşun dualizmi, isyankârlık ve hayalperestlik gibi bireysel tematik perspektiflerinin metinselleştirilmesinin en uygun yollarından birini sağlamaktadır. Gordon, Lord Byron'un etkileyici edebi başyapıtlarından Manfred ve Cain lirik oyunları, Byronic kahraman olarak bilinen detaylı ve en ilgi çekici versiyonlarını geliştirerek İngiliz edebiyatında romantik kahramanın yükselişine katkıda bulunmuş eserler arasındadır. Yalnız, adapte olamayan, uyumsuz, kibirli, hayalperest, isyankâr ya da “Byronic kahraman” olarak adlandırılan birçok karakterin ortak özellikleri olsa da yine de belli bazı özellikleri ortaya koyar ve Childe Harold, Manfred, Don Juan, Cain ve diğerlerinin arasında Byronic kahramanın belirli hipostasları olarak kabul edilmelerine müsaade eden çeşitli eylemleri sergilerler. Bunlar arasında Manfred ve Cain, aynı zamanda Byronic kahramanı ve Faustian figürlerinin hipostazlarıdır ve ayrıca Faust efsanesinin yeni Romantik Hareketin yeni duruşu ve tematik karmaşıklığı içindeki yeniden inşasını mümkün kılar. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma iki dramatik eserin mitleri yeniden canlandırıp, yeniden şekillendirme yollarını açıklamak ve karşılaştırmak için kritik bir çaba sarf etmekte ve onu hem romantik hem de göreceğimiz gibi anti-romantik edebi anlatım için bir araç haline getirmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: mit, edebiyat, karşılaştırma, Faust, Goethe, romantizm, Byron, varoluş ikiliği, hayalperestlik, isyankârlık.

Abstract

Among the myths revived and rewritten by the romantics – Prometheus, Orpheus, Psyche, Apollo, and so on – the myth of Faust would provide one of the most congenial ways of textualization of the romantic rise of individualism, in general, and of some of its individual thematic perspectives, such as dualism of existence, escapism, and rebelliousness, in particular. George Gordon, Lord Byron's impressive literary masterpieces, the lyrical plays *Manfred* and *Cain* are among those works that contributed to the rise of the romantic hero in English literature by building up one of its particular as well as most interesting versions, which is known as the Byronic hero. Solitary, inadaptable, arrogant, misfit, escapist or rebellious, whatever would be the common features of the many characters that are labelled as "Byronic hero", they still reveal certain distinct features and perform various deeds that allow them to be regarded as particular hypostases of the Byronic hero, among which Childe Harold, Manfred, Don Juan, Cain, and others. Among these, Manfred and Cain are at once hypostases of the Byronic hero and Faustian figures making possible the reconstruction of the Faust myth within the new attitudes and the thematic complexity of the Romantic Movement. In this respect, the present study embarks on a critical endeavour to disclose and compare the ways in which the two dramatic works revive and reshape the myth, and make it a vehicle for both romantic and, as we will see, anti-romantic literary expression.

Key words: myth, literature, comparison, Faust, Goethe, romanticism, Byron, dualism of existence, escapism, rebelliousness.

Acknowledgements

The story of Faust is among the most important myths in world culture encompassing the idea of the individual subject striving to exceed the normal boundaries of existence, to develop, improve, rise above human condition, to be different and to be more than what circumstances allow. At the same time, the myth of Faust is a warning about the dangers and the destructive outcomes of such endeavours. Due to its wide-ranging and diverse thematic implications, the myth of Faust is a permanent presence in literature, being revived, rewritten, reshaped, and reconstructed by various writers belonging to different literary periods and movements. Studying Romantic Movement as a master student at Namik Kemal University, I have come to learn about the ways in which Byron and other romantics attempt to apply the myth in order to support and thematize their artistic credo. The master classes contributed thus to both my development and the present thesis, and for this I am grateful to all the professors of the Department. Particularly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Petru Golban for guiding and correcting through the whole process of this research. I would also like to thank my family for supporting and encouraging me in my endeavours.

Patricia Denisa DITA

May, 2018

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE RISE AND LITERARIZATION OF THE MYTH OF FAUST	3
1.1 The Historical Premises of the Faust Story	3
1.2 <i>Historia von D. Johann Fausten</i> and Its Philosophical, Moral and Literary Implications	7
1.3 Christopher Marlowe and His Contribution to the Literary Myth of Faust	11
1.4 Lessing and His Version of the Faust Myth	12
1.5 Goethe and the Literary Myth of Faust Reified	13
1.5.1 The Moral Implications	14
1.5.2 The Philosophical Implications	17
1.5.3 The Mythological Implications	22
2. ROMANTICISM AND THE ROMANTIC RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MYTH OF FAUST	29
2.1 The Philosophical Substratum of Romanticism	30
2.2 The Romantic Spirit in English Literature	35
2.3 Byron, the Byronic Hero and Its Hypostases	40
2.3.1 The Romantic Persona and the Dualism of Existence, Escapism and Rebelliousness	42
2.3.2 <i>Manfred</i> and Escaping Escapism	44
2.3.3 <i>Manfred</i> as Faust	56
2.3.4 <i>Cain</i> and the Limits of Rebelliousness	62
2.3.5 <i>Cain</i> and Faust	75

CONCLUSION

82

BIBLIOGRAPHY

85

INTRODUCTION

This research examines the archetype of Faust with its deep historical and cultural roots in primitive Christian dogma and its development from a simple legend of Germany into a literary myth with wide-spreading intertextual perspectives occurring through centuries in different national literatures to the present. The textualization of this archetype by various writers would often express the discontent and the limitations of the contemporary to the writer era. Thus, Faust becomes an imagined “new man” of the future, with eternal and universal resonance, and exponential for whatever time he may exist. This is especially evident in Faust’s attempts to progress through gathering knowledge by any means possible, usually by venturing into the disreputable sides of the culture at a certain moment.

In the medieval version of the Faust story, we have a well-defined body of culture being institutionalized by and in the church. Faust works outside this paradigm, and practises apostasy and evil dealing with Mephistopheles. He sees the limits of human condition, and, out of desire for superiority, turns to these heterodox means to enact his will, which would lead him to his eventual damnation. Therefore, in the medieval era, Faust is used as a cautionary tale of intense moral didacticism in order to reinforce the moral values.

The imaginative flight and skilled hands took this story and expressed it anew, reconstructing and re-thematizing it according to their era and to their social and cultural background, contributing to the foundation, perpetuation, and various new shapes of the myth. If in Renaissance, the intellectual curiosity and ambitions still bring people to damnation, this aspect changes in Classicism. Knowledge is no longer seen as a negative value. In Lessing, Faust was for the first time in the history of his literarization destined to escape damnation. However, the image of Faust was better established by the young poets of the next generation, among whom Müller and Klingner, who were also precursors of the Romantic Movement.

The one who made possible the real replacement of the meaning and the real reconstruction of the old legend of Faust, signifying its genuine literarization, its establishment as a literary myth, is Goethe, whose work became a masterpiece of the universal literature that inspired many other creative minds.

In British literature, Marlowe was the first great writer who represented the story of Faust in his work according to Renaissance tenet, where Faust is damned due to his curiosity for knowledge, worldly pleasure, as well as his ambitions. Another great representation of Faust was made by Lord Byron, who was inspired by Goethe's work and its reinterpretation of the legend, and who managed to represent the Faustian type of character through his Romantic heroes Manfred and Cain.

Our research focuses on the Romantic literary expression of Goethe's *Faust* in Byron's works *Manfred* and *Cain*, and for this purpose we have applied the comparative approach. The same approach has been applied to distinguish the Classical and Romantic tenets. In order to provide a better understanding of these two periods and of their philosophical insight, we have relied on cultural studies. With respect to the Romantic doctrine and literary practice, we have adopted the thematological approach in order to examine the major themes and concerns of the Romantic period as illustrated in Byron's works, such as the rise of individualism, dualism of existence, escapism, and rebelliousness. The mytho-archetypal approach has been used to display the transformation of the story into a myth and to demonstrate how the character of Faust has become an archetype adopted by many writers into their works to express discontent, ambitions, limitations, strives, and other aspects of human condition.

1. THE RISE AND LITERARIZATION OF THE MYTH OF FAUST

The story of Faust offers a complete illustration of the nature of the literary myth and of its development, providing clear stages of the process, where the history is transformed into a legend and then into literary works. The interaction between literature, collective attitudes and political events of the past has made possible this transformation of an individual from a historical figure into a mythological one.

1.1 The Historical Premises of the Faust Story

Judging from the few surviving documents (between 1480 and 1540), Faust was an individual of a bad nature. Although often esteemed as an astrologer, he was also considered a charlatan. Even though he was sufficiently educated to act as a schoolmaster, he was despised by many of the scholars that mentioned him.

Faust the individual is said to have lived between 1480 and 1540, a period when the primitive Christianity inherited from Oriental and Jewish mythologies, the conception of a world of demons as opposed to the divine one. Moreover, the popular thinking about the existence of some bad spirits with their leader Satan, that attracts people to perdition, together with the belief that these bad spirits might be invoked through magic, were widely spread. St Augustine is the one who makes the distinction between black magic and white magic. Thus, invoking the demonic spirits through black magic is considered to be an evil act, whereas invoking the good ones through white magic is admissible. The conjuring of the infernal spirits would provide the individual with superior knowledge and faculties in all the domains. However, in order to be able to gain the power and the knowledge superior to humans, there was a pact through which the individual was obliged to give his soul and his body to the devil after a period of time during which he could enjoy his newly attained condition. To make the deal, the individual had to sign the pact with his own blood. The tradition provided a lot of such stories, such as the story of Simon Magus, which reminds us of the figure of Faust.

According to Fitzsimmons (2008: 22), the *Faust* story is said to rely on the life of a real magician and alchemist known as Dr. Johann or Georg Faust who was active in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and who seems to have been born in northern Germany. However, the first reference about Faust appears in 1507, when Trithem calls him “a vagabond, a babbler and a rogue, who deserves to be thrashed so that may not henceforth rashly venture to profess in public things so execrable and so hostile to the holy church”. In 1513, a canon of the church of St. Mary’s in Gotha called Faust “a mere braggart and fool”. Some considered that “Faust” was an assumed name. It was thought that the man could have been one of the charlatan magicians who travelled throughout Europe during the Renaissance, entertaining at fairs and at royal courts. About him, there were many stories which claimed that he had sold his soul to the Devil for magical powers. Some other stories credited him with various abnormal and unorthodox activities such as conjuring up the evil spirits. Mephistopheles was his infernal servant for twenty-four years who did his bidding. Faust is said to have been received a hostile reception at the University of Erfurt. He is also claimed to have casted a horoscope for the prince-bishop of Bamberg in 1520. In 1528, he was expelled from Ingolstadt. In 1536, the chronicle of Waldeck reports his successful prediction regarding the fall of Munster, and, in 1540, a leader of the Welser troops in Venezuela mentions his accurate forecast of their expedition’s failure. In 1539, the city physician of Worms complained that many people had been deceived and defrauded by Faust, which is the final reference to him that dates from 1540. He is said to have died the previous year, and according to the popular imagination, he was destroyed by the Devil at a rural inn in Wurttemberg. Actually, among the aspects of his life contributing to the subsequent legends that have arisen surrounding his character was his mysterious death. However, he evidently died under horrific circumstances with his throat cut.

According to Hawkes (2007: 28), the historical Johann Faust, although a marginal figure, was also an intriguing one due to his boasting, clowning, and sexual misbehaviour. He was said to have represented the “overweening sorcerer” who was convinced by his own pride that he could control the devil. Despite the few sources that refer to him and his life, there is one thing that they all agree: Faust was an incorrigible braggart, who did not lose any chance to proclaim the extent of his

learning and power. Furthermore, he was also thought to have posed as the spiritual heir of the archetypal magician, Simon Magus. Some sources claim that Faust named himself “the second magus”.

As Heine wrote in the explanatory notes to his own version of Faust:

maybe the legend of Johannes Faust has such a mysterious attraction for our contemporaries because here they see the battle they themselves are now engaged in, represented in such a natively comprehensible way, the modern battle between religion and science, between authority and reason, between belief and thought, between humble renunciation and impudent pleasure-seeking – a battle to the death, where in the end maybe the devil comes for us like for the poor doctor. (cited in Van der Laan, J. M. *Seeking meaning for Goethe's Faust*. 2007: 5)

According to Van der Laan (2007: 8), although there was a person named Faust (whether Georg or Johann remains as uncertain as the details of his life) who seemed to have provided the name for the mythical character, two other individuals were in particular associated with Faust, likely shaping the prototypes for the legendary character. They were named Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486 – 1535) and Theophrastus Bombastus Paracelsus von Hohenheim (1493 – 1541). Both were physicians and experimental scientists, practitioners of forbidden arts, having been considered magicians as well. Both performed for that time unbelievable feats, held unorthodox views and explored the mysteries of the occult. While Agrippa gave up on all human knowledge, yet, sought to perceive the knowledge of God and divine mysteries, Paracelsus believed that human creativity repeated the divine creation. In the sixteenth century, the Humanist Conrad Gessner had already compared Paracelsus to Faust. Moreover, Paracelsus claimed to have had a precise mixture for the physical creation of homunculus by mixing semen and blood without resorting to the female uterus. According to sixteenth century legend, the production of homunculus was also one of Faust’s successful works. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Paracelsus came more and more to be associated, if not identified, with Faust.

After the historical figure's disappearance, his deeds were perpetuated by people through oral tradition, in this way, Faust having entered the legend as a very admired magician and a schoolmaster whose aim was to attain knowledge through science. He was considered by critics as Marcus, Conradt, Felix Huby, the best entertainer of his time, an epoch of geographical discoveries, humanism, popular reforms and omnipresence of the Devil, where the magicians who tried to conjure up the demonic spirits were burnt at the stake.

Between 1568 and 1583, there appeared no less than five works that related Faust as the one who invoked the spirits and made the pact with the Devil, this fact implying that the oral tradition built up through him the desired image. Since Faust became so famous, the Lutheran Church wanted to erase his popular image through transforming it into a negative example for people. There were two known works that had appeared before the chapbook from 1587, which had related the Faust's story in a more negative way, as the Church wished. The first one is written by Christoph Rosshirt around 1575, entitled *Zauberer Faust*, and the other belongs to Zacharias Hogel, entitled *Chronica von Thuringen und der Stadt Erfurt*, in which stories are inserted about Faust's life that might have taken place between 1580 and 1585.

In the first work, Faust is presented as an individual who commits tricks and sacrileges through evil acts. He lives his last moments at an inn where the Devil comes at night and takes him, the ending being interpreted as a well-deserved punishment for his misbehaviour. The work ends with a Christian warning in order to show the people what might happen if they do not follow the moral ethics. In Hogel's, work there were related acts like Faust's conjuring of *Iliad's* characters in front of his students from Erfurt, other witchcrafts as the one with the wine located in Erfurt too, etc. The trajectory and the anecdote of these two works will be also assumed by the chapbook of Spies edition, together with the religious warning.

1.2 *Historia von D. Johann Fausten* and Its Philosophical, Moral and Literary Implications

In 1587, all the fragmentary anecdotes and legends were gathered for the first time into a continuous story, written by an anonymous German author, which was published by Johann Spies at Frankfurt am Main. *Historia von D. Johann Fausten*, being a chapbook of stories concerning the life of Johann or Georg Faust, served as a religious and theological cautionary tale.

As Frank Baron has observed, after the publication of the Faust-book, there was an extraordinary number of witch trials and executions taking place in southern and western Germany. Baron claims that “the narrator took his role as a representative of the religious and secular authorities seriously, and he had no difficulty imagining what the authorities expected Faustus to have experienced and felt” (1992: 4). Theodore Ziolkowski (2000: 14) considers that the Faust myth is partially a product of the trials for witchcraft.

As Hawkes claims, *Historia* is “a passionate defense of the Lutheran view of signification” (2007: 31). Before the Reformation, ecclesiastical writers considered magicians rivals for the control of the metaphysical sphere. The churchmen realized that the participating witches in sacred rituals practised magic in their ceremonies.

Historia is an impressive popular tale, even though its structure is not always coherent. The first part presents the tragic story of Faust’s imprudence, in other words, how his pride leads him to the presumptuous pact, and how after twenty-four years of enjoying the magic and pleasure, he is destined to face a horrible death. The second part provides some scholarly chapters concerned with cosmography and geography, the latter not being up-to-date, but rather ancient. However, in the third part, the writer gives unsophisticated account of Faust’s magic tricks and pranks. Finally, the moral warning appears in the end, but this time, its dramatic overtones increase when Faust’s last days and death are described. The book is a combination between different sections, some intended to arouse fear, and others intended to arouse mirth.

The author stitched together the oral transmitted anecdotes, but he used other scholarly sources too, which include theology, geography, literature and even science. However, the writer was not so interested in Faust's life, which was the most authentic source, as he was rather impressed by the destiny of an individual who dared to make such a pact with the Devil. Therefore, the book gathered a lot of legends about Faust, chronologically written in order to look like a biography of the bizarre character. If we considered the ending of the work, the book would have autobiographical features, as a result of the hero's deeds from his stormy life, to which some comments and fragments after his death were added. However, this is, of course, a speculation, or an attempt to create veracity and authenticity.

Historia appeared as a moralizing book to arouse fear for those who would dare to follow Faust's path and to deny religion. Faust's personality, of a legendary magician, as well as of a charlatan, his misbehaviour and his death were the perfect match for such propaganda. In the book, the enthusiasm for science and knowledge is also denied, which becomes later the subject matter of literature. Faust appears in the book even as possessed by the demon of knowledge, and thus he cannot accept anymore the theological explanations. Because the sixteenth century could not find another solution, Faust had to fall prey to the Devil as the result of his recklessness. Christian ideology, very rigid at that time, realized that its prestige was threatened by the urge for knowledge and science; thus, its power of dominance was under threat too, and so there was the need to arouse fear in people.

We should not forget the fact that the magic was considered a faculty, even though nowadays it seems so naïve. The art of witchcraft, which is very well performed by Faust, is actually the ancestor of scientific knowledge. Faust's biggest sin is in fact the thirst for knowledge, and Marlowe, among other later authors, will notice this shade of his personality and, according to his epoch, will turn it into a noble thirst.

The moralizing character of the book and its warning function appear from the beginning. There is no chapter where the moralizing character or some warning sentences are not inserted. Every chapter reminds people of the right Christian path. The ending provides an increased number of warnings, which are intended to arouse

fear. Moreover, at the end, even Faust himself addresses to his Christian friends in order to make them aware of the price they have to pay for such an immoral life and to advise them to follow the right way (the religious one) by living a temperate life and being thankful to what was given to them. Interesting is the figure of Mephistopheles. He does not only perorate on morality and Christian ethics, but also recommends himself as the God's instrument on this Earth through which the ones that are not aware of deceptive temptations and do not follow the moral path are punished. Therefore, the evil that Mephistopheles, as devilish character, brings into the world is actually the heaven's desire, where every violation of its laws is punished.

Written from Lutheran positions, *Historia* manifests an anti-Catholic tendency, being part of the sixteenth century general religious dispute. This tendency becomes visible in Mephistopheles' hypostasis as a Catholic monk, or when Papa is represented as an Antichrist. However, it becomes even more evident through the general ideology, where salvation through repentance and good deeds is impossible, since, according to Protestant doctrine, only God's mercy may save people, and, however, Faust lost his potential salvation due to his pact with the Devil.

The central episodes of the chapbook are Faust's pact with the Devil, signed with his own blood, the love affair with Helen, with whom Faust had a child who disappeared with his mother when Faust died, the lament and the hero's end. Faust seems to have a contradictory image. On one hand, his enthusiasm for science leads him to make the pact. On the other hand, the supernatural abilities that he gains are not only to exceed his human limits, but also for tricks and sensual satisfaction. This Faustian aspiration to knowledge and pleasure will represent later the polarity of the two souls of Goethe's Faust, where this duality will define the contradictory unity of his being.

Spies's *Historia* is based on a lost earlier book, the "Wolfenbüttele Manuscript", which was composed between 1572 and 1587. A Latin manuscript of Faust legends may have existed before 1570. This chapbook, however, is the first known printing of the traditional Faust legend which was translated into English in 1588 as *The History of the Damnable Life, and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus*.

At the end of the sixteenth century, Faust's chapbook grabbed the contemporaries' attention. It became famous because the work satisfied the people's curiosity about a man who, although disappeared half a century ago, was said to have done incredible things, in this way his legendary existence having been kept alive in the popular mind.

In spite of the chapbook's acquired success, some critics like Horst Hartmann and Hans Henning did not consider *Historia* a real chapbook because it was influenced by the Lutheran thinking; therefore, its content was thought to have been hostile to science.

Starting from the 1587 *Historia*, the Faustian myth will be progressively established through the development of three fundamental directions. The first one starts immediately after the chapbook's edition, which keeps the negative tendency of warning with regard to the protagonist's misbehaviour. The second direction, passing through England, highlights the Renaissance figure of the character, yet, without entirely giving up the medieval reminiscences which are visible in the pact scene and the character's death scene. From this dichotomous interpretation, Lessing finds the solution, but eliminating the pact, which is the fundamental constitutive part of the theme, and makes the subject matter's amplitude and significance be diminished. The decisive step in this direction is made by Goethe, representing the third one.

1.3 Christopher Marlowe and His Contribution to the Literary Myth of Faust

The English translation of the chapbook represented the source of inspiration for Marlowe's version of Faust, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, which was staged in London shortly after 1590. In Marlowe's play, there is an alternation between tragic scenes and grotesque buffoonery episodes. The structure of the original story is actually replicated by this combination. Here Faust has become a Renaissance man, having the typical Renaissance thirst for knowledge, power and experience.

According to Roslynn Haynes, Marlowe "preserves the medieval association between intellectual arrogance and Lucifer's revolt against God, for ultimately Faust seeks knowledge as means of attaining god-like powers" (cited in Van der Laan, J. M. *Seeking meaning for Goethe's Faust*. 2007: 77). It is true that such an issue is the centre of the Faust story. By becoming a magician, he could be a "mighty god".

Marlowe's drama, according to Kuno Francke (2009: 398), presents Faust as a typical man of Renaissance, as an explorer and as an adventurer, longing for supernatural or extraordinary power, sensations, worldly knowledge. Here Mephistopheles is a demon without any comprehension of human aspirations. He is harsh and fierce, being an important factor that has produced Faust's destruction. Faust is disappointed quickly by his pact with the Devil. But there is not only Mephistopheles who has brought Faust to destruction, since, in Marlowe's drama, Helen of Troy is presented as a she-devil becoming another means of Faust's destruction. He conjures up Helen of Troy, the symbol of antique beauty, but what appears to him is a just a spirit. His ambitions provide him with a heroic greatness, but they are also the final means of his destruction which lead him to condemnation to eternal punishment in hell.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the interest and the enthusiasm for Faust's story made it become a great success as a theme for plays at fairs or in the puppet plays. The scheme of these plays began from Marlowe's work, which was spread to the continent by English comedians and then corrupted. The most important

role belonged to the burlesque servant usually known as Hanswurst, Kasper or Pickelharing. The audience could laugh out loud, but moral values were untouched. What is interesting is the fact that the happy clown, who had a down-to-earth good sense, escapes the Devil, whereas, the intellectual, Faust, remains bonded to his terrifying and incredible story, being led to damnation.

Beside the puppet plays, which for much of the century were the main channel for the story, there were also other numerous published accounts with regard to the Faust legend. Further indications are provided by H. Henning's bibliography, which lists 400 mentions or descriptions of Faust in any type of works. Even folk songs about Faust were circulating on fly-sheets at that time. In the eighteenth century, when books and documents about witchcraft were in fashion, almost one hundred works were ascribed to Faust.

1.4 Lessing and His Version of the Faust Myth

G. E. Lessing, having written between 1760 and 1780, contributed to the shape of the myth, although his work was fragmentary. He provided a new scheme for the original story, where Faust became a hero of learning. According to the Enlightenment's doctrine, knowledge took on a positive value. Thus, the intellectual curiosity was not a sin anymore, his Faust having been a defence of Rationalism. For the first time in the history, Faust was destined to escape damnation.

As Fitzsimmons explains (2008: 162), in Lessing's fragment, published in his seventeenth *Literaturbrief*, Faust chooses from seven devils the fastest one. Faust does not have only "too much desire for knowledge", but he also wants to have it in the shortest time possible. Faust is impatient, he wants to reach the future quickly, but unfortunately he cannot be fast enough. He is exactly as the opposite of Lessing who knows that the education of mankind is a gradual process which cannot be finished in one generation, and certainly not by one man, even though his name is Faust. In the

end, Faust could not be the ideal character or myth for Lessing, whose understanding of time was not limited only to one life.

However, the image of a new Faust was established by the young poets of the following generation, like Maler Müller and Klinger, who were also the precursors of the Romantic Movement. In their works, the character of Faust is brave enough to defy society with its implications as morality and religion, and to make a pact with the Devil. He is a rebel, an individualist, in fact, the writers' own image.

Among the precursors who paved the way to the Romantic thinking and literary practice are Johann Gottfried Herder (1744 - 1803) and his student, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749 – 1832), both being the most important representatives of the *Sturm und Drang* (Storm and Stress) movement, as well as Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller (1759 – 1805) and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel (1772 – 1829).

1.5 Goethe and the Literary Myth of Faust Reified

The one who put a lot of himself into the portrayal of Faust, is the brilliant Johann Wolfgang Goethe. At first part of the Pre-Romantic movement, Goethe later turns into a Classicist, declaring that “Classicism is health, Romanticism is sickness”. He claims that Romanticism cannot express the whole of the human nature. In his opinion, through Classicism one might reach the perfect balance between mind, reason and feeling. In *Prometheus and Faust* (1995: 125), Timothy Richard Wutrich explains that even though the whole work displays knowledge of antiquity, Part Two showing Goethe's Classical learning at its supreme level, Goethe designed Faust according to the elements of a late medieval German tradition.

Goethe's Faust is a frustrated man due to his disappointment with human learning. Even though he is superior to humans, possessing more knowledge than any other ordinary man, he is still discontented with his own condition. He accepts Mephistopheles' proposals out of despair, being convinced that they could not bring

him any satisfaction. The pact now takes a different form. The pact seems to look more like a wager over Mephistopheles' ability to divert Faust's aspirations. Here Faust possesses some characteristics attributed to the romantic hero with his constant hesitation between the immediate desire's gratification and the satisfaction of the profound aspirations of his being. However, even though he seems to be the embodiment of Romanticism, he has also got some classical characteristics, since Goethe was writing Faust while he had already returned to the Classical doctrine. What is Classical in Faust are his ideas, which look altruistic; the problem, however, is how they are practised. Everyone knows Faust's nature, from the beginning to the end. He is a blackguard, rogue, and a reprobate, in other words he lacks morality, being also considered by some critics the "evil" fellow. For example, his idea of utopian community entirely reflects the Classical doctrine. But the way he tries to build the community is so selfish that he does not even care the least about his workers. According to Van der Laan (1999: 452), he cares neither how he gets his workers nor how he gets work out of them. What he actually does is more to destroy his community than to build it, since he gives damage to his people. Even if he utters his egalitarian vision of a new land of liberty, the way in which he does it is the embodiment of its founder's values, or, better said, the lack of these values, since he performs acts of violence, power and domination over his people.

1.5.1 The Moral Implications

In his book *Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia* (1999), Van der Laan explains that there is no morally progress or regress, ascends or descends in Faust's nature. He changes without changing, develops without developing. As in the above example with the human community that he wanted to create, his idea of utopian community, land of liberty and freedom is indeed altruistic; however, the way in which he builds this community reflects the fact that the founder lacks moral values, providing, in the end, only damage. Therefore, even though through his ideas, there might be an improvement or a development, the way in which he practises his ideas

shows that there is no change of his nature at all. Faust cannot choose one behaviour over another, and morality is all about making choices. In his book, *Facing the Extreme: Moral Life in the Concentration Camps*, Tzvetan Todorov notes that: “where there is no choice (that is where the individual cannot choose one behaviour over another), there is also no place for any kind of moral life whatsoever” (cited in Van der Laan, J. M. *Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia*. 1999: 453).

Vaan der Laan (1999: 453) claims that Faust’s inner self is divided into two souls, being unable to make moral life, in terms of decision and in terms of action, possible. His divided self is unable to choose between good and evil, right and wrong, unable to discriminate or discern, unable to decide. For him, the values are not clear-cut; for him, good and evil blend and merge, where good gives birth to evil. When he tries to build the utopian community, indeed, the idea is good, but the practice is evil due to the damage he creates through his immoral, selfish acts.

Moreover, because of his inner division, Faust cannot interact with the world outside himself. His alienation from himself coincides with alienation from others, too. Due to his alienation from other human beings, the moral life is excluded, since morality exists in terms of the self in relation to other selves outside itself. In other words, morality means inter-human relation, which may also presuppose a human community, or a communal life, but as Faust is an individual separated from any human community, he eliminates the possibility of living a moral life as well. Morality, as it presupposes a communal life, might temper the drives of an individual, thus the individuals are able to co-exist, but Faust, living divorced from community, never tempers his drives, thus he lacks moral values. What is morality if not responsibility for human community? But, since Faust does not prove any human relation or interaction, he does not know such a responsibility. In *Notes on Morality*, the epilogue to *Facing the Extreme*, Todorov claims “caring” as “the moral action par excellence”, and “the ‘I’ has as its goal the well-being of the ‘you’” (cited in Van der Laan, J. M. *Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia*. 1999: 453). If Faust is totally cut-off from any human community, he is unable to experience worry or anxiety, he is unable to aim to the welfare of the Other, thus he is unable to experience care. His refusal to acknowledge care might be the final denial of moral life. Therefore, he could not

establish any human relation with either Gretchen or Helena, nor with the community he tries to create.

Through his selfish nature he destroys Gretchen, he kills her family, and, in the end, her as well. He experiences love at a spiritual level, but, again, the way in which he proves it is totally immoral. He orders Mephistopheles to bring her to him. He does not strive at least to really gain her love, or to make her feel special through his care for her. He just gains her through the orders he gives to Mephistopheles, seduces her, has sexual intercourse with her, and leaves her. He abandons her in terrifying ruination. He does not take any responsibility for her. In the end, he destroys her and everything around her. When she is imprisoned, he does not try to save her from there because of his care or love for her, but because of an uncomfortable feeling of guilt. Gretchen is aware that all her life is destroyed and she prefers death to life, because there was nothing to live for anymore.

Regarding Helena, she is the embodiment of beauty for Faust, but this does not prove any kind of affection that he might feel for her. Through Helena, Faust experiences beauty at its maximum level.

Furthermore, due to his lack of values, he destroys his “utopian” community as well, again through acts of violence, power, domination and manipulation. Thus, Faust is not an immoral individual, but an amoral one. Every action of his proves his selfish nature. He has no care for anyone, but more, he despises some people, one example being Wagner, his student. He is annoyed with Wagner; he despises his approach to learning and his limited mind. Faust has already passed through Wagner’s learning process and has not gained any satisfaction due to the limitation.

1.5.2 The Philosophical Implications

According to Van der Laan (1999: 454), Faust does not only lack moral values, but he also lacks a real sense of identity. He appears from nowhere and has no home to speak of. He has no definite occupation, although once he was a scholar and a professor; he no longer bothers with any field of knowledge, as philosophy, medicine or theology, due to his frustration provided by the impossibility of exceeding his human condition through learning. This thing is very clear made in his opening monologue. He has no family, no friends, no lasting relationships, no community. Consequently, Faust has no sense of identity, nor a sense of self. The self can be defined through the Other self, thus through interactions and relations to and with others. Faust has a relation only with himself, unable to engage in a relation with another self outside himself. Since the self is fully realized through another self, Faust is unable to become a whole self.

Van der Laan (1999: 454) considers that Faust becomes morally inert or morally impotent due to his inner division which provides his loss of identity and integrity, and thus determines a disordered, chaotic and impossible moral life, which disturbs existence. A divided self, as Faust's, is a self which is its own Other. This fact makes Faust incapable of being engaged with an actual Other. In order to become moral, the self needs to engage and to consider the Other, to care for the Other, another human being, another self. Considering or engaging with another self presupposes limitation, but Faust throws off all the constraints that involve any limitation. He cannot give up something of himself for another self. He cannot limit himself. Thus, he has lost any foundation that stands for any values. He cannot engage with the Other, he cannot be responsible for the Other, he cannot care for the Other, he cannot exist for other selves, and, therefore, he cannot act morally. As he himself admits, he wants to experience other selves within his own self, which will ultimately provide the fragmentation of his self. Furthermore, his self becomes so absorbed with itself that he loses his inner harmony. As an effect, the self estranges from itself.

Faust lacks an integrated identity or any real identity. As Van der Laan claims (1999: 456), no one can determine who Faust is. He comes from nowhere, having no roots or heritage, no past, except a father with whom he practised a dangerous sort of medicine. He is amoral through his acts of power such as possession, consumption, domination, violence, control, which express his entire nature. He never limits his power, but only increases it and seeks the expression of ultimate power to create his own world: a God-like power. Therefore, if he aims to create his own world as a God through building his “uftopian” community, is his idea/desire altruistic anymore? His goal might be to become a creator, but what he really becomes is a false creator with no altruistic desires or ideas at all.

By living his amoral life, performing acts of domination over the others, Faust shows his inability to govern his own self. A self at odds with itself will always try to exercise domination over others, enjoying thus a false victory, but being, however, unable to control it. This kind of power, exercised by the self over the Other, deprives the Other of freedom, here being a relation of subjugation, which will result in no meaning in the end, either for the self, or for the Other.

In the end, through his amoral acts, exercising power over others to indulge his divided and disharmonious self, he finds no meaning, and thus, no self-fulfillment. But what is self-fulfillment for Faust? What does happiness mean for him? In his book *Happiness as a Faustian Bargain* (2004: 52-59), Bernard Reginster explains that what Faust considers happiness is a perpetual desire. He wants something to desire that will kindle him all the time. Desires as gold, women, possessions, etc. imply momentary pleasure since they can be satisfied. Faust does not want a simple life, self-complacency and pleasure because humans find value in the confrontation of difficulty. Thus, Faust wants to be moved by desires.

If we consider happiness to be satisfaction, then happiness might be achieved. But if happiness is satisfaction, satisfaction is reached through the attainment of a goal, and in order to attain something, firstly we have to desire that thing. After the attainment of a goal, we get pleasure. Therefore, being happy supposes getting pleasure. The problem is that this pleasure is temporary. There is no pleasure forever-

lasting. In this case, what will happen after this state of ours is over? Boredom is installed. According to Schopenhauer, when boredom sets, all our desires for determinate objects are satisfied and there is no other desire to kindle us. He describes boredom as an “empty-longing”. Schopenhauer explains why a goal might not fulfil the will: “The goal was only apparent; possession takes away its charm” (cited in Reginster, Bernard. *Happiness as a Faustian Bargain*. 2004: 54). Thus, Schopenhauer’s suggestion is that we have to desire to have desires (in addition to the desires for determinate objects and ends). Hence, what Faust wants from Mephistopheles by making that pact is actually a desire to have desires, or a perpetual desire, something that cannot be satisfied by simply attaining a goal, so he cannot experience any empty longing. Moreover, according to Nietzsche, people also need resistance to their desires. The resistance will make the goal harder to achieve and humans consider the difficulty of an achievement a contribution to its value. Thus, the more difficult a thing is to achieve, the more valuable it is. The idea that we find value in the confrontation of difficulty, explains Reginster, enables us to understand why Faust asked for a life without ease, self-complacency and pleasure.

Moreover, Nietzsche offers his view over happiness and its meaning: “What happiness is? – The feeling that power increases – that resistance is overcome. Not contentment, but more power, not peace at all, but war” (cited in Reginster, Bernard. *Happiness as a Faustian Bargain*. 2004: 54). Nietzsche’s view over happiness might also explain Faust’s immoral life and his immoral acts over people to achieve more power, to become a demigod. For Faust, happiness is not a state. For him happiness is a process where he gains power by confronting the resistance to his desires through his terrible acts, where this process will always need the desire to have desires which will provide him a perpetual lust, thus he might consider himself always “satisfied” through never being satisfied at all. But, according to Nietzsche, to be in a state of longing means to be alive, though what is desired is beyond the human existence, this being the modern insight into human soul, which is primarily tragic. Thus, this process will never give him self-fulfilment, but will provide him with a hunger for his soul that will keep him alive. However, real fulfilment will never be achieved in such a state.

Moreover, according to Schopenhauer, the final satisfaction of the will might happen when no other fresh desires would occur, here happiness being a permanent state of peace and contentment, which supposes the Christian eternal life in heaven. Through selling his soul to the devil, Faust, at first, deprives himself of this eternal happiness in heaven. However, in the end, Faust receives salvation through repentance; in this way, he may experience true happiness and self-fulfilment in heaven.

Even though Faust has some romantic traits, Goethe's character is not entirely romantic. For example, Hegelian philosophical themes as knowledge and truth find their correspondents in Goethe's work. Even the perpetual desire that Faust wants when he makes the pact with Mephistopheles represents his spirit, which, according to Hegel, should not rest, but be in a perpetual "movement", which later will turn into progress. This progress presupposes a long path which will enable the spirit to become knowledge. Hegel claims that knowledge is the instrument through which we can possess the essence of the absolute, and in order to reach that level there are many stages to be completed. This way to the absolute which is the only truth and vice-versa might be very tiring, but this journey is the journey of the spirit where the consciousness might be lost, and doubts and despair appear. Thus, the pact with the devil, as we have mentioned earlier in this research, is made by Faust out of despair, which appeared throughout his spiritual journey to the absolute. The terrifying acts that he performs might represent the loss of consciousness, which is another step in attaining the absolute truth. Faust is the wanderer who desperately proceeds on the path of knowledge to find the absolute truth, his spiritual image being skeptical and doubtful. His experiences determine his path to knowledge. He experiences a strange sort of love because in his affair with Gretchen he is very selfish and destroys the poor girl; he experiences beauty through his affair with Helena; he experiences power; and all these experiences are stages of total or plural knowledge.

Moreover, Faust has a divided self, where the spirit is the real representative of the absolute essence, and the individual represents only the unaccomplished spirit. This divided self might represent another stage in Faust's development. This separation bears the movement of the spirit, where the spirit receives different forms

throughout its journey to knowledge. The final moment of the spirit's journey is the unity, individual and species, for the self and in the self.

Goethe's *Faust* is also considered a representation of Hegel's philosophical ideas in art. In Hegel's scheme, where knowledge is represented as supreme truth because the truth is the whole, certain themes emerge, which are encountered in Goethe's *Faust* too, such as consciousness, self-consciousness, rationality, religion, skepticism with regard to science, absolute knowledge, self-realization between pleasure and necessity, desire and destiny manifested on the rational field, in other words, the foundation of identity through deeds and aspiration, and the idea of the two souls through the divided self. The thematic register is amplified through pairs such as pleasure and work, deed and individuality, deed and guilt, nature and spirit, individual and destiny.

The consciousness has a double object, according to Hegel, namely the object of sensibility and perception (negative), and the true essence, as opposite to the first one, the former consisting of feelings and sensations which are shaped by the individual's consciousness into particular experiences by various categories, such as cause and effect.

The self-consciousness presupposes the removal of this contradiction, determining its own object as desire. Desire is life, here, Faust being an affirmative answer to the concern with the values of life. Life is metaphysical restlessness and risk, where only through risk one may attain freedom, as Hegel considers. Only risk makes the individual an independent consciousness. Everyone should go for the death of the other, since everyone risks his/her own life, because the other is not more valuable for an individual than his own self. His essence is represented as being the Other. In this way, the Faustian coordinates are defined as well: freedom and risk, guilt and removal of guilt through the infinite of aspiration, identification with the Other (Mephistopheles). In a Hegelian sense, Faust illustrates the path to the being's interior, the isolation of the spirit from common and laic. But the consciousness of subjectivity is marked, according to Hegel, by the belief in evil as an immense power in a laic light, and which led to the apparition of Faust's story, the story of the individual subject who

made the pact with the devil due to his disgust for science and who threw himself into the arms of worldly pleasure, by which losing his eternal happiness through getting all the worldly splendours.

1.5.3 The Mythological Implications

According to Schelling, the aim of art is the revelation of truth as eternal and absolute value, which records some determined historical realities under mythical form. The truth enters the art as beauty. The metaphysical notion of beauty cannot be identified with the metaphysical notion of truth. Thus, art is a symbolical representation of the absolute, where freedom and necessity, as metaphysical essentials, interact and unify in an absolute synthesis. Goethe's drama, in Schelling's view, belongs to the few great realizations of the new epoch, where he realizes Goethe's attempt to create the great mythological poetry, to which the "Universal Spirit" meditates in present. Myth illustrates the truth about existence, the divine and the absolute, being responsible for the creation of art and other products of this type, having a superior reality of the reality of nature, because myth represents the eternal ideal world together with the finitude of reality. Myth removes the opposition between the species and the individual. According to Schelling, the humans' historical evolution has three stages: from antiquity, defined by Schelling as "the species' world", to the modern world – "the individuals' world" – and the future world, where the mythological poetry of the universal spirit is born and unifies the species with the individual.

Schelling claims that Goethe's *Faust* is the most intimate and the purest essence of his epoch, its content and form representing their entire epoch and its past. *Faust*, for Schelling, is the best illustration for the German character and physiognomy.

Both Schelling and Hegel consider Goethe's principal work as the representation of the world in its essence. They opened the way to glorification and nationalization of Goethe's *Faust* as a masterpiece of the universal literature.

Fitzsimmons (2008: 162) considers that it may be a blessing for the German literature that Goethe was the one who had worked with Faust myth for more than sixty years. Goethe took the legend out of the pure theological domain and placed it in the realm of reality. Faust discovers his escape to be not in the servitude of Mephistopheles but in Gretchen herself. This was the beginning of the insertion of practical life applications into the legend. However, as Fitzsimmons affirms, for a complete interpretation there must be taken into consideration two facts: firstly, the minor and the major changes of the old myth, and, secondly, they must be interpreted with regard to the changing circumstances of Goethe's life. His work on this myth is a constant searching for, or selecting of images to understand and to create his own world, to find answers to the changing times concerning the social and political developments.

Moreover, Fitzsimmons (2008: 163) claims that Goethe's working with the traditional myth integrated it so completely into his own world view, that his *Faust* replaced the old myth. Even passages which are taken or inspired by the chapbook were transformed in order to have new symbolic meanings. A good example could be Helena subplot which is used by Goethe in *Faust II*. In both texts Helena appears twice, once to satisfy Faust's students' curiosity and entertain the guests at the emperor's palace, and her second appearance is for Faust himself, becoming his mistress and being impregnated by him. If for Spies, this is an example of Faust's trickery and lust, for Goethe, Helena symbolizes in her first appearance a shadow or a memory of the past, of classical antiquity; in her second appearance, she symbolizes an appropriation of the past for the present, in other words, she is the embodiment of Goethe's poetic philosophy of history. For Faust, Helena's episode is one important step in his development: he experiences beauty at its highest form, at the same time being aware that he cannot possess her or hold her, that beauty is merely an illusion. In the end, he holds only Helena's veil in his hands.

If we consider the ideal theory, there is the matter and the ideal world or the absolute, where everything is pure mathematics, order, perfection. However, the matter is represented by chaos, being everywhere at any time and changing at full speed, where the change is not even obvious. At the interaction of the chaos with the

ideal, our own world is created; therefore, a human being might stay between these two “worlds”. But, does the material really exist, or is it a mere illusion created through our consciousness? Idealism affirms that the material world is only an illusion projected by consciousness. Reality is not material, but immaterial, thus, nothing exists except through a perceiving mind. From Plato’s ancient idealism to Hegel’s absolute idealism and other various forms of objective idealism, it was assumed that the world of ideas has some objective reality outside the subject that conceives them. However, subjective idealism is more drastic, as in George Berkeley’s view presented in the book *Principles of Human Knowledge and three dialogues* (2009), the existence is either to be perceived or to perceive. Therefore, things gain existence through being perceived. In Berkeley’s view, things cannot come or go out of existence each time an individual perceives them or stops to do so. They cannot exist in a chaotic mixture of perception by different people. Thus, Berkeley thought that there is the mind of God, which is the actual supreme consciousness that ultimately perceives the existent world. However, people discard the real values, focusing on the material world, as Faust does with the help of Mephistopheles. Helena, as Fitzsimmons considers (2008: 163), is a mere illusion. Being an illusion, according to the theory of idealism, she is part of the material world which exists only through consciousness. Even though, Faust conjures her up, trying to make her real, what is left in his hands is only her veil; she is not inside since what is considered to be real world is not real, but an illusion created by a perceiving mind.

Fichte’s subjective idealism also explains a similar thing: “consciousness of the object is only a consciousness of my production of a presentation of the object, which is not recognized as such”. Fichte explains that “all the reality is transformed into a fabulous dream, without there being any life the dream is about, without there being a mind that dreams” (Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *The vocation of man*. Vol. 60, 1906: 64). In his view, “you are placed before yourself and projected out of yourself by the inmost ground of your being, your finitude; and everything you see outside you is always you yourself... In all consciousness I intuit myself; for I am I... I am a living seeing. I see (consciousness), and see my seeing (that of which I am conscious).” (cited

in Rasmussen, Joel, Judith Wolfe, and Johannes Zachhuber. *The Oxford handbook of nineteenth-century Christian thought*. 2017: 133).

Fitzsimmons (2008: 163) also explains that there are numerous changes that Goethe made, some of the most important being the beginning, Gretchen's tragedy, and the ending. The entrance to Goethe's *Faust* is made through three prologues: "Dedication", a personal reflection on his work when Goethe returned to it in 1797; "Prelude in the Theatre", an improvisational scene between a theatre director, a poet and a harlequin figure, which puts the play into the social context of the literary life of the time; and "Prologue in Heaven", which provides a transcendental frame for Faust's tragedy. The ending is very important because it makes an immense difference between the culture and the popular thinking of the two periods. The chapbook ends with the damnation of Faust, where his soul is taken by the Devil, this being also a warning for those who do not respect the moral principles. But Goethe's *Faust* ends with the salvation of Faust through repentance. In primitive Christianity, the salvation of the soul is not possible through repentance, whereas later the repentance represents a possibility for the soul to escape the infernal. This is a major change in the human thinking and conception of religion, morality, culture and life in general. In Goethe's work, Faust acknowledges and accepts his limits. He is aware of the existence of finitude. He accepts to die, hence he becomes a master over time since he decides the moment of his death although there is also the possibility to continue to live. At this point, Faust throws off all the constraints of time, the reason being his awareness of finality. Moreover, through acceptance of limits, through his moment of epiphany, he saves himself and he also saves the others through his absence, in this way not being able to commit any other terrible deeds. Therefore, the salvation of the self represents the salvation of the others, too.

At first, Faust suffers under the authority of God. He tries to throw off the constraints of fate and time to escape his ordinary condition and become a demigod through his rebellious attitude against God. He wants no boundary of time and no limit. By making the pact with Mephistopheles he experiences the material world, which cannot make him a demigod since reality is an illusion. His love affair with Gretchen might be the moment that represents perfection, if Gretchen is considered the

embodiment of purity, but, due to his amorality, he discards real values and continues his life in a materialistic way, committing numerous terrible deeds. His self is divided because of his amoral life that he lives due to his attempt to abandon the path that represents his condition. When he accepts his limits and repents, he becomes a master of time. Thus, only in that moment he is able to escape the constraints he has fought against for so long. He receives salvation, saves the others through his absence, goes to Heaven, and unites with God, finally, being able to feel the real fulfilment. Through acceptance, he has the possibility to exceed his mere human condition.

Therefore, as Van der Laan (2007: 15) also claims, Goethe's play, in its mythic implications, makes its audience to confront with problems of good and evil, innocence and guilt, reward and punishment. His Faust reflects an individual who asserts, yet struggles with the futility of faith, the bankruptcy of knowledge and the loss of meaning. Faust raises serious questions about rebellion and suffering, faith and apostasy, about the conditions and limitations of knowledge and existence, about reality and simulation, about what is moral or immoral, about order and disorder, strength and weakness, power and domination, about the possibility of human progress and improvement.

Goethe's work on this myth was such an inspiration for so many creative minds in literature that it can be compared to what Hesiod or Homer did for Greek mythology.

Van der Laan (2007: 12) claims that Goethe's *Faust* stands at the center of this long and impressive tradition. It is considered to be the most intricately woven, the most ambitious and the most ambivalent of all Faust stories, being a culmination of the entire tradition.

Van der Laan (2007: 12) also affirms that, although there are many versions of the myth of Faust rendered in literary works, Goethe's *Faust* remains provocative and laden with meaning, the most important and extraordinary conduit for the Faust character, of the Faust archetype.

Goethe's work is considered to be the most complex, profound, extensive and encompassing treatment of the Faust myth. Not even Thomas Mann could achieve

such a scope, aim, breadth, or depth as Goethe did. As Marshall Berman (1983: 39) observes, “Goethe’s *Faust* surpasses all others in the richness and depth of its historical perspective, in its moral imagination, in political intelligence, its psychological sensitivity and insight”.

In Goethe’s work all the threads of long tradition come together. It is the pivotal version of all the Faust texts before and after. According to Van der Laan, (2007: 14) “all Faust texts either lead up to or out of Goethe’s great drama”.

Harry Redner sustains that “Faust became the fundamental myth of modernity” (cited in Van der Laan, J. M. *Seeking meaning for Goethe's Faust*. 2007: 13) primarily due to Goethe’s version.

Van der Laan (2007: 14) claims that Goethe’s *Faust* offers a survey both of the previous Faust literature and of Western culture itself. It goes back to the classical antiquity and forward into the postmodern. In his *Faust*, there are echoes of and parallels to Homer’s great epics, the Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus, the myth of Icarus, Euripides’ *Helen*, Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, Cervantes’ *Don Quixote*, and others. From here results the fact that somehow, Goethe’s *Faust* is not only a story characteristic to Germany, but an embodiment of European literature, or even an expression of the world literature.

In Levin’s opinion, Goethe’s *Faust* “is probably the most elaborate literary crystallization of any myth we have had or more exactly, any legend” (1968: 114).

Goethe’s *Faust* had such an immense impact that it is reflected not only in the literature, but also in painting, music, popular culture of Europe and some other parts of the world.

According to Fitzsimmons (2008: 461), Goethe’s *Faust* has many elements that make the work a success: a foredoomed love affair, a hero in conflict with himself, a villain of suave charm and real menace, some supernatural elements that contributed to making the play even more spectacular, and, at the end, the salvation of Faust.

Through his dedication and through the changes that appear in his Faust, through taking Faust out from the popular culture and placing the legend in the realm of high culture, through the ambiguity given to the protagonist, through the new meaning and the new conduit for the Faust character, Goethe, in his work, might be considered as the one who established Faust as a literary myth. His Faust had such an immense impact, that it became the source of inspiration for many artists, being reflected in various arts, including literature, in general, and in the literary works of Romantic tradition, in particular.

2. ROMANTICISM AND THE ROMANTIC RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MYTH OF FAUST

Goethe's work was a great inspiration for the Romantic literature, in general. At first, together with his teacher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744 – 1803), Goethe was part of the Pre-Romantic movement "Sturm und Drang" as one of its most important representatives, creating a new type of character, the young genius and his hopeless love.

This German movement provided a new literary sensibility, being an expression against French Classicism, and an emphasis of personal sensory experience and subjectivity, thus praising emotion, passion, rebelliousness, mysticism, nationalism, fragmentariness, and reviving the interest in native folk.

But later Goethe turned again into a classicist, valuing Classicism over Romanticism because Romanticism with its emphasis on feeling and personal experience could not express the entire human nature as Classicism would do with its perfect balance between mind and heart, reason and emotion.

Goethe, together with Friedrich von Schiller, who for a time, like Goethe, was an important representative of "Sturm und Drang" movement, put forward during 1788-1832 the main ideas of the cultural and literary movement called "Weimar Classicism", or, in other words, German Classicism which both coincided and was in opposition with the contemporary literary movement of German Romanticism.

This might be the reason why Goethe's *Faust* is a classical character with romantic features. Weimar Classicism advanced the concepts of harmony and wholeness, elaborated on aesthetic form, and praised the ancients for having achieved the balance between mind and emotion.

2.1 The Philosophical Substratum of Romanticism

In *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry* (1796), Friedrich von Schiller made the distinction between naïve poets (the ancients) and sentimental poets (his contemporary Romantic writers) and these two types of poetry. According to Richard Harland, “‘naïve’ poets are at one with Nature; ‘sentimental’ poets admire Nature precisely because they see it as something apart, something lost. ‘Naïve’ poets present the object impersonally in concrete description; ‘sentimental’ poets present the object always through themselves, subjectively and self-consciously” (cited in Richard Harland, *Literary Theory from Plato to Barthes: An Introductory History*. 1999: 63).

In this respect, the sentimental poet expresses the impression that the object (nature) made upon him, and, possessed by mind and feeling, the sentimental poet (the Romantic one) aims to idea and ideal in such a condition that exhibits a state of perpetual unfulfilled desire, hence revealing the modern artist’s condition of breaking the linearity of literary development, which was for a very long period of time dominated by the rules of the classics.

In 1819, Arthur Schopenhauer asserts in his work *The World as Will and Idea* that human existence is actually the movement between boredom and desire. In order not to get bored, humans have to want something. However, after attaining a particular goal, boredom will be again installed because, in most cases, the attainment of the goal does not suffice to fulfil the will. According to Schopenhauer, this happens because the “goal was only apparent; possession takes away its charm” (cited in Reginster, Bernard. *Happiness as a Faustian Bargain*. 2004, article: 54). But humans can be bored even though they are engaged in achieving a goal, if the respective pursuit consists of unchallenging activities. Therefore, people need to encounter resistance and to confront it. However, according to Nietzsche, this is not sufficient because “most commonly, we want not only to confront resistance, but also to overcome it” (cited in Reginster, Bernard. *Happiness as a Faustian Bargain*. 2004: 55). Hence, Nietzsche calls this desire for the overcoming the resistance in order to attain a goal: “the will to power”. Nietzsche also affirms in *The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of*

Music (1872) that to be alive is to be in a state of longing, where what is desired is primarily tragic, being beyond human existence, providing the modern insights into the human soul.

To revert to the origins of Romanticism, important founders of Romanticism are Friedrich Schlegel (1772 - 1829) and his brother August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767 – 1845), who were the critical leaders of German and European Romantic school of poetry. August Wilhelm Schlegel is known for his organic principle in literature, language and culture. The organic model applied to literary form becomes a main concern in the literary theory of the Romantic doctrine, as in the works of Goethe, Schelling and Coleridge. In *On Dramatic Art and Literature*, August Wilhelm Schlegel differentiates between mechanical and organic form, the organic form being “innate, it unfolds itself from within, and acquires its determination contemporaneously with the perfect development of the germ” (1846: 340), the organic form being produced, in other words, when the essence of an idea unfolds according to its own nature.

Friedrich Schlegel is the one who coined the term “Romantic”, which comes from the German word “roman”, meaning “a potpourri kind of novel which skips over and between all other genres” (cited in Richard Harland, *Literary Theory from Plato to Barthes: An Introductory History*. 1999: 70). Friedrich Schlegel’s ideas firstly examine the nature of the poetic genius, the author’s subjectivity as the most important principle in the poetic production and the individual inner experience in the quest of the universal truths.

Friedrich Schlegel’s conceptions represented a major influence on the Romantic writers and critics of all Europe, where his idea of “subjective mind” turned into the concept of “the unconscious” for Thomas Carlyle (*Characteristics*, 1831), where, according to Harry Blamires, “for Carlyle it is not the conscious mind, ‘the mind as acquainted with its strength’ that is the spring of health and vitality, for its concern is with the mechanical and the overt. The unconscious is the source of dynamism, for it is in touch with the region of meditation, those mysterious depths that lie below the level of conscious argument and discourse” (1991: 261).

Another major source that influenced the consolidation of the Romantic principles was the German idealist philosophy supported by philosophers like Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770 – 1831), Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762 – 1814), and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775 – 1854). Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804) and later Arthur Schopenhauer (1788 – 1860) with their ideas also influenced the doctrine of Romanticism.

Kant's idealist philosophy and Romanticism share some similarities with regard to the modern philosophy and art, but there are also differences that should be considered. In Andrew Bowie's view, German idealist philosophy and Romantic principles emerged in "the attempt to overcome the problems Kant encountered in grounding knowledge in subjectivity", but the difference is that "Idealism pursues the 'metaphysical' project of grounding in a systematic manner, whereas early Romanticism renounces this foundational project and seeks to come to terms with the finite nature of human reason" (2001: 125). Hegel also discusses the "end of art" because art is suppressed by sciences; hence it loses its capacity to reveal the truth. However, Romantic minds such as Novalis and Schlegel consider that the meaning of art is inexhaustible; therefore, art reveals the essence of modernity.

According to David H. Richer, even though Hegel is a follower of Kant's conceptions on idealism, Hegel

rejects Kant's aesthetic with its basis in natural beauty and its insistence on the purposeless of the beautiful object. For Hegel, Nature is beautiful only by analogy with art, and art is supremely useful to man, not as mere pleasure but for 'its ability to represent in *sensuous form* the highest ideas, bringing them nearer to ... the senses and to feeling. (1989: 343)

As Robert H. Holub says, Hegel also rejects Fichte's subjective idealism, according to which subject is "absolute, logically prior to the world or non-subject, and the active agent in asserting a material world opposed to it" (1992: 90). In Fichte's view, the consciousness of the object is actually the consciousness of the subject's production, "of a presentation of the object, which is not recognized as such" (Fichte, 1906: 44). Everything the subject sees outside of himself is, in fact, he himself.

Although Hegel rejects this type of idealism, in Romanticism, Fichte's subjective idealism becomes a very strong conception, where the romantic persona is inadaptable to reality and through his creative power and imaginative flight produces the non-real world, therefore, asserting the material world and its inferior status. Through this attempt of the Romantic persona to escape the real world, and less to rebel against it, the Faustian claim is even more strengthened, in the sense that the real world which supposes human condition is limited, and, therefore, inferior.

Although against Fichte's view on the subject, Hegel's philosophy of art is very important for the literary theory of Romanticism. In his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), Hegel asserts the art as sensuous semblance of the Idea that grows and develops through the history of its forms and through the history of the spirit itself. Hegel creates the "dialectal historical sequence for art", which contains three phases: the "symbolic" phase of Oriental and Egyptian art; the "classical" one, which has achieved the perfect balance between reason and feeling, so-called by Hegel "the concrete spiritual"; and the "romantic" phase of art, which destroyed the balance between rational and emotion, since what is important now is the spiritual level.

Even though the idealist conceptions of Schelling, Fichte and Hegel are different from Kant's philosophy, they are considered the major principles that influenced the Romantic literary theory. In *The Critique of Judgement* (1790), Kant advanced his ideas on knowledge and perception, where he promotes imagination in art and subjectivity with concern to the judgements of the world. Regarding the comprehension of the beauty of a work, as David H. Richter affirms, it "exists nowhere but in the eye of the beholder. Yet because of their special qualities, aesthetic judgements seem to have an objective character and to reflect universal rather than individual concerns" (1989: 244). In *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), Kant develops the theory of perception which had a major impact upon the Romantic thinkers and German idealist philosophers, and also on the twentieth century philosophers. With regard to this theory concerning the perception, Kant advances the idea that the human knowledge of the external world is not based only on experience, but on both experience and priori knowledge. Kant explores and promotes the role of the mind with concern to the human understanding of the world and the way the audience

perceives a work of art. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan sum up Kant's philosophy on perception as following:

Knowledge is shaped by inner mental categories that operate prior to any sense experience. They determine how we know the world. Knowledge that was made up of sensory experience alone would have no unity or coherence. Such ideational unity could be provided only by logical operations that the mind could produce. One implication of this argument was to shift attention toward the work of the observer in constructing knowledge both of the world and of art. (2004: 129)

Another very important idea that influenced Romanticism is Kant's theory of the creation of beauty, which claims imagination to be the main mental faculty, which is not cognitive and rational, but rather creative and intuitive. It breaks the rules of the rational and from the given material creates a new product, "another nature", "another aesthetic idea". The reader in his or her own turn also has to escape the rules imposed by reason and use imagination as a creative principle, and thus becomes a producer of aesthetical ideas. These ideas did not influence only the Romantic doctrine, but also the Aesthetic trend of the nineteenth century and "art for art's sake" tenet.

Germany played a major role in the Romantic theoretical input, being the source of the most significant ideas in philosophy and literary theory. Richard Harland argues that the literary theory of Romanticism was created

by poets like Goethe and Schiller, by journal-critics like Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel (especially in their journal, the *Athenaeum*), and by academic philosophers like Kant, Schelling, Schopenhauer and Hegel. The last group was especially significant, in that the advent of German Idealist philosophy impacted very directly upon Romantic literary theory. (1999: 61)

According to Harland, in Germany the "intellectual scene exhibits an unusual degree of interaction between academics and creative writers throughout this period, often involving close circles of friendship and personal acquaintance" (1999: 61), which was not much encountered in the rest of Europe.

2.2 The Romantic Spirit in English Literature

The great German philosophers and poets also had a great impact on many British Romantic artists and British Romanticism of the nineteenth century. However, even earlier, in Britain, by the mid-eighteenth century, the Neoclassical doctrine started being attacked through the rise of Romanticism in both literary practice and literary criticism, which praised the imaginative flight and subjectivity of the author, and rejected the rational. In Romanticism, the poet is not a craftsman who produces art with the help of or by following the rules of the classics, but a man apart who possesses a special sensibility and a stronger imaginative power than any other ordinary man. Therefore, against the classical view of literature, which used to be only the representation of nature, Romantic artists and philosophers created the expressive theory of literature and authorship, where the literary work is the expression of the author, his own interior, subjectivity and self.

Among the precursors of British Romanticism were Thomas Gray and other representatives of the “Graveyard School of Poetry”, Thomas Warton with *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser* (1754), Thomas Young with *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759), and Richard Hurd with *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (1762).

Some of the most important expounders of Romantic ideas and the most important authors of literary works were William Blake, William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley, John Keats, and Lord Byron. All of them were influenced by German philosophers and poets. For example, Coleridge, influenced by Kant, Hegel and Schelling, adopted entirely the German perspective with regard to imagination as a creative and unifying principle in the poetic practice, where pleasure received from poetry emerges, not only from the whole of art, as in the other genres, but also from its each component part. Moreover, Schelling’s theory of imagination as unconsciously producing the real world and consciously creating the ideal one, i.e. the world of art, and his distinction between primary and secondary

imagination, made Coleridge create his own view and theory of poetic imagination in *Biographia Literaria* (1817).

Also, Schopenhauer and his philosophy on human existence that is actually the movement between boredom and want, and Nietzsche's affirmation that to be in a state of longing is to be alive are highly connected with the works of writers such as Byron and Shelley, who reflected through some of their characters, namely *Manfred*, *Cain*, and *Childe Harold* (Byron), and respectively, through the lyrical voice in *Ode to the West Wind* (Shelley), a burning desire of the human soul for rebelliousness or escapism that is not ever achieved, but only a source of alienation and frustration, revealing the tragic existence in modern literature. Thus, the English Romantic authors created a different type of character, or "lyrical I", which is a solitary and alienated being, that rejects and/or is rejected by society. This type of character is often above human condition, like Byron's *Manfred*, who is the possessor of remarkable intellectual skills and imaginative flight which make him able to exceed common human existence and reality. These are only some of the many other thematic concerns involved in the Romantic character that is mostly caught in the so-called "dualism of existence", expressing either "Romantic rebelliousness" or "Romantic escapism".

Some critical voices claim Romanticism to be a cultural movement, but also a social and a political manifestation, because, even though initially spread out from Germany, it co-existed with the political French revolution and with the industrial revolution in England, where the authors through their works of art rose reactionary political attitudes and numerous social theories with regard to the political and social situation of that time. For example, M. H. Abrams asserts that the romantic writers are actually "political and social poets" who "to a degree without parallel, even among major Victorian poets, these writers [romantics] were obsessed with the realities of their era", and it is "a peculiar injustice that Romanticism is described as a mode of escapism, an evasion of the shocking changes, violence, and ugliness, attending the emergence of the modern industrial and political world" (cited in Golban, Petru. *A Romantic Concern: The Individual between Escapism and Rebelliousness in Shelly and Byron*. Volume 2, 2016: 28-30).

However, the Romantic Movement is considered by many other critics a cultural and artistic manifestation, a literary doctrine and a literary practice with its strong philosophical input coming from Germany, and which was able to become a strong literary tradition concerning all major genres, especially poetry, but also fiction, drama, essay, letters, memoirs, aesthetic guidelines, and, very important, literary criticism.

Romanticism, being at first a reaction against Classical tenet, developed a new category of interests, and, regarding literary criticism, developed new opinions on literature, such as the poem's subject matter, its language, the poem's origins, the purpose of poetry, the author's sensibility and emotions. In Britain, the main exponents of literary criticism and theory of Romanticism were William Wordsworth with his Preface to the volume *Lyrical Ballads* (1800), Samuel Taylor Coleridge with his *Biographia Literaria* (1817), and Percy Bysshe Shelley with *A Defence of Poetry* (1821).

Since Romantic Movement is opposed to the Neoclassical one, its characteristics will clearly occur in opposition with those of the previous period. In this respect, the main features of Romanticism would be the Romantic Revival, or, in other words, the revival of the national cultural heritage, the interest in the Anglo-Saxons and medieval historical past, the popular and folk literary tradition and the creation of such works as ballads, gothic tales, and historical novel; the importance given to inspiration, feeling, imagination, the latter being considered the most important human faculty; the freedom of artistic expression; the importance given to the relationship between the author and the text, where the latter has become the expression of the author's sensibility, emotion, states of mind; the emphasis on the individual experience, which is subjective and psychological, and which has led to the Rise of Individualism; the concern with the non-real, supernatural, demonic, fantastic, and mysterious elements of nature and human inner world; the concern with nature and countryside, where nature plays the role of a spiritual healer, a major source of feelings and inspiration, a mirror of human life, its status being even ranked to divinity. All these characteristics, among others, are contrary to various Neoclassical features such as the revival of ancient classical models, the emphasis on reason,

rationalism, normative prescriptions and rules, the relationship between the text and the reader, the concern with moral topics, and so on.

Each of the Romantic characteristics reveals new thematic concerns which are very complex. For example, regarding the Rise of Individualism, as mentioned before in this research, the British Romantic writers created a particular type of character, which displays a different and a special nature from the ordinary man, being a solitary and alienated individual, at odds with human society and above human condition, usually possessing incredible intellectual skills. Due to these features of the Romantic persona, the character mostly finds himself rebelling against society or escaping it through the dualism of existence.

Another important romantic concern in Romanticism is the one with nature. Some might say that this concern started due to the threat of industrialization, which was at its beginnings, but there were not raised any ecological issues that require environmental protection. In fact, the matter with the nature in Romanticism was more complex and special, because nature was the one considered to give genuine feelings, and the relationship between human beings and nature expressed in romantic literary works targets aspects as pantheism, dualism of existence, escapism and authorship.

Individualism and nature, textualized in both religious and aesthetic ways, are interrelated, and together they embed the reconnection of physical nature and the spiritual one, of natural world and natural goodness of the individual against reason, rationalism, progressive history, social organization and learning, opinion and conversation, which try to prevent the inner drives. According to the romantic critics and writers, the inner drives, feeling and sentiment are the actual source of goodness, truth, and morality. Reason lacks the capacity to unite the inner with the external. Only the inner voice is the key to the natural order, as Murphy and Roberts consider, and, through the reconnection of the inner self with nature, the individual is capable of building himself, and of becoming “attuned to nature and the cosmos brings with it a deeper and fuller experience of the self, at one with the current of life in nature” (Murphy and Roberts, 2005: 43).

Against reason and rationalism, the romantics advance the unpredictable psychological and emotional states that usually come from the poet's relationship with nature. Against the norms of Neoclassicism, the romantics are reliant on the imaginative power and on the freedom of artistic expression which are mostly concretized within natural environment. Against the neoclassical concern with general human issues, the romantics relied on individualism which depends a lot on the subject's intercourse with nature. Against the neoclassical interest in the real, social and the issues of everyday life, the romantic poets created a dualism of existence and search for escapism. The characters or the lyrical I usually escape the real world by looking for natural surroundings as mountains or forests.

The romantics relied on Platonism and Neoplatonism, they were interested in illusion and supernatural, they exalted imagination, feelings, individual experience, and were focused on nature and expressed through it different forms of religions and spiritual realities, which led to the dualism of existence that is actually a personal search for the spiritual that appears as a self-indulging mental experience which relies on psychological and emotional states and on imaginative power, but it is also based on the identification with nature and on the exploration of its creatures and circumstances. Therefore, all the romantic concerns, especially the ones with nature and individual experience, made possible the creation of the Romantic hero as a different, special type of character.

2.3 Byron, the Byronic Hero and Its Hypostases

A very important role in the creation of the Romantic character was played by George Gordon Lord Byron, who through his contribution marked the rise and the consolidation of the Romantic Hero, in general, and of a special type of the Romantic hero the Byronic Hero – in particular. Byron's work also asserted the English Romanticism on a general European level. Due to the traditional criticism, however, English Romanticism, when compared to the German and French one, is wrongly diminished, being referred to as the Romantic Revival rather than being considered a literary movement, the traditional critics claiming that it lacks a definite and unified literary tenet, which is not true.

The recent criticism argues that English Romanticism is an important and definite literary movement due to the complexity of the Romantic literary concerns (such as the emphasis on imagination and feeling, the freedom of artistic expression, the individual experience, with the expressive theory of authorship, the dualism of existence with its materialized form – escapism, rebelliousness – another expression of the individual existence of the romantic persona, the nature seen as divine, the countryside) expressed in a great number of literary works. In this respect, the Byronic contribution is essential to the affirmation of English Romanticism on a general European background due to the fact that the English writer entirely expressed the Romantic literary standards, determining through his work the synchronization between Romantic literature in general and the English one. Therefore, Byron's literary activity not only played the role of a powerful instrument in the defence of English Romanticism but also contributed to the rise and consolidation of the Romantic Hero through his protagonists with their certain hypostases materialized in his textual representation.

The Rise of Individualism, as a romantic characteristic, made also possible the rise and the consolidation of the Romantic Hero, where the Byronic Hero is connected and dependent on the rise and consolidation of the former.

Byron's protagonists express various features of the English Romantic Hero, they being taken as a particular literary tradition within the Romantic Movement as well.

Byron created some characters that became protagonists in his literary works, such as *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, *Manfred*, *Cain*, *Don Juan*, and other works, whose distinct features allowed them to be characterized as hypostases of the same hero, and also due to their similar features, be gathered under the general name of Byronic Hero.

The Byronic hero often possesses common features with the poet, both of them being the most contradictory of men. In this respect, like the hero, the poet is a handsome young man of impressive aristocratic origin, rejecting and being rejected by his own class and society, a Solitary preoccupied with the separation from any social environment, looking for loneliness, knowledge and worlds of escapism created through his own imaginative flight; however, he is incapable of keeping himself completely away from the everyday life's temptations. Byron was a rebel and a radical by the English standards of his time. Even though he was a passive and a skeptical concerning the advantages of either reform or revolution, he was an active revolutionary in Italy and Greece, where he financially helped the Greeks, trained and led them in their revolution against the Turks, and becoming their martyr-hero. However, he was actually disgusted by the Greek's loss of ancient greatness. Byron was romantically sarcastic and critical towards society and human condition, calling it "herd" in his literary work *Childe Harold Pilgrimage*. Although his criticism is closer to the eighteenth century Neoclassical tenet and to neoclassicists like Johnson and Pope, his poetry is closer to those elements of the eighteenth century that were opposed to the Neoclassical principles, as sentimentalism, the poetry of the Graveyard School, the revival of the old popular ballads. Even though he was considered a radical concerning religion and a reformer of Christianity, he secretly sympathized with Catholicism. He was also acclaimed as being a womanizer, but he was actually passive in his relations to women, and at a quite early age he even became disgusted with erotic experience.

2.3.1 The Romantic Persona and the Dualism of Existence, Escapism and Rebelliousness

Since the Romantic poets were not interested in writing about topics concerned with the social life, and since they exalted individualism and imagination against the Neoclassical concern with society and rationalism, the individual experience becomes a concern of major importance in Romanticism. As other English writers, Byron also created dream-worlds, thus following the romantic trend of projecting “an imaginative world which is clearly distinct from the actual world” and that “evokes a mysterious universe, in which events are inexplicable, unwilled by man; if the world is ultimately coherent, its ordering is divine and not human”. (Butler, 1981: 124). These worlds created through the imaginative flight express actually escapism as a materialized form of dualism of existence. The romantic dualism of existence consists of a number of binary oppositions such as the real world versus the non-real one, or mind – body, spirit – corporeality, psychology – physiology, soul – body, good – evil, freedom – system, subject – object, culture – nature, history – nature, individual – society, reality – dream, reality – illusion, in other words, reality – non-reality dualism.

The dualism of existence represents actually a consequence of the importance given by Romantics to the individual experience. The romantic persona is thematically established in a relationship with reality, the actual world, corporeality, or, in Coleridge’s terms, physiology, as well as society, daily life, routine, dominance of reason, morality, religion as depicted as an institution, general mentality, rules, norms, ethical values, etc. The romantic persona knows that this reality is in fact a harsh one that prevents the personal accomplishment and the individual experience itself. Being aware of these facts, the romantic hero is individualist, superior, rejects and is rejected by society, is alienated, lonely and solitary, and suffers because of the real world’s cruelty, and looks for separation from it.

The relationship between the romantic persona and the real world leads to romantic rebelliousness or romantic escapism, which are two main perspectives of the thematic representation of the individual experience. The romantic rebelliousness is

the reaction against reality and the romantic persona's attempt to change it. The romantic escapism is the attempt to avoid reality and to find "another world" to be an alternative one, a form of non-reality, a sort of spiritual world, a special type of background where the human condition with its implied manifestations with regard to society and material world is rejected. This non-real world where escapism is attempted to be attained is in fact an imaginary world, a divine, spiritual and fantastic place, a kind of existence within the realm of dream, art, myth, individual or historical past, countryside, or nature. However, even if imaginary, escapism is more common than rebelliousness and this perspective of the thematic representation of individual existence can be found in most romantic works. Moreover, even though it is much desired, escapism is not entirely attained. It might be achieved just for a moment and it cannot be maintained or strengthened except as a short literary perspective within the thematic development of the text. This happens because the romantic persona is still part of the real world and due to his condition, he cannot fully escape it. Hence, the romantic hero is placed between two worlds, one real and one non-real, transposing, thus, from one world to another, having access to non-reality, but still being a part from the real world, everything leading to dualism of existence.

If escapism is so much desired but not fully achieved, what would happen if it is entirely attained? Would it be of any help for the personal accomplishments? Would it provide any state of fulfilment or happiness? These questions seem to be asked and attempted to be answered in Lord Byron's *Manfred*, who wishes escapism, but this time a different form of escapism, namely he wants to escape escapism, here romanticism becoming a kind of anti-romanticism.

2.3.2 *Manfred* and Escaping Escapism

Manfred is represented from the beginning as superior, proud, misfit, a solitary figure who rejects society, living alone in a castle in Alps, and who seems to have entirely achieved escapism, but who is not fulfilled with it. In this way, in terms of dualism of existence and escapism, Byron seems to deviate from the romantic tradition. In his view escapism is indeed desired, but what would happen if it is entirely accomplished? The poet questions whether escapism is a real source of happiness or not. The answer is that the achieved escapism, contrary to the romantic thinking, cannot be a source of joy, since the romantic persona is bound to the real world. Even though Manfred has already exceed the human condition, he still remains *half-dust, half deity*, this being proved by his needs since what he wishes for reveals typically human desires: forgetfulness and forgiveness. The first type of dualism regards his own universe of existence in contrast to the human world. There is also a second type of dualism which consists of the world of spirits versus the world of humans, and, as a typical romantic persona, Manfred is placed between them. He is inferior to spirits, but superior to humans.

Manfred has typically human needs as oblivion and forgiveness, and what he tries to do is to escape escapism since either escapism or his acquired knowledge cannot offer them. Neither his superior status nor his fascinating learning could help him. Knowledge for him is pain and has no use:

Manfred: Sorrow is knowledge: they who know the most

Must mourn the deepest o'er the fatal truth,

The Tree of Knowledge is not that of Life.

Philosophy and science, and the springs

Of wonder, and the wisdom of the world,

I have essay'd, and in my mind there is

A power to make these subject to itself –

But they avail not...

(I.i. 10 - 17)

If through his superior condition he cannot be offered forgetfulness and forgiveness, if knowledge is useless and is only pain, if he was not able to achieve what he wanted through escapism, then what is left is to escape escapism. Manfred's escapism of escapism is against the romantic thinking, since the romantics consider that escapism is desired because it might be a source of joy. Byron through his character Manfred shows exactly the contrary: escapism is indeed desired, but it is not a source of happiness as long as the characters are still placed between the two worlds, the real one and the non-real one. This makes Manfred an anti-romantic character because he is indeed superior and through his learning he could achieve escapism entirely, but he still has typically human needs since all he wants is to forget and be forgiven. In order to achieve these human needs what he should do is to escape his newly-achieved condition, in other words to escape escapism.

In order to fulfil his desires, he firstly calls the Spirits in the hope that they can help him. Even though through his learning he has become superior to human condition, the Spirits still consider him inferior, calling him "mortal". However, the Spirits are of no help for Manfred because they are immortal and for them the past is as the present and the future, hence for them there is no sense of time. Being eternal and not sensing the time, they cannot forget, thus they cannot offer oblivion:

Spirit: We are immortal and do not forget;

We are eternal; and to us the past

Is, as the future, present. Art you answered?

(I.i.155-7)

In the next scene, Manfred finds himself alone upon a cliff on the Mountain of the Jungfrau. He realizes that everything he learnt which led to his superiority that made him able to conjure up the Spirits was of no help. The Spirits could not offer him

forgetfulness and forgiveness. His study was not of any help, either. If what made him superior could not offer him the control over time, and thus being unable to receive what he wants, Manfred understands that his superior condition is useless since it cannot lead him to any fulfillment with regard to his typically human needs:

Manfred: The Spirits I have raised abandoned me,
 The spells which I have studied baffled me;
 The remedy I reck'd of tortured me;
 I lean no more on superhuman aid,
 It hath no power upon the past, and for
 The future, till the past be gulf'd in darkness
 It is not of my search.

(I. ii. 1-7)

However, since we talk about Romanticism, which has its source of inspiration in German idealist philosophy, all perception is the product of the self. In this case, what is perceived, is perceived in a subjective point of view; therefore, everything is uncertain, malleable, opened to interpretation, with more waves of possibility.

According to Emily A. Bernhard Jackson, there are some allusions that *Manfred* might represent a confession made by Lord Byron with regard to his involvement with his half-sister Augusta Leigh. The play's allusions to this relationship were asserted not only by confidants or those from the family circle, but also by the reading public. A review in London's *The Day and New Times* says that "Manfred committed incest! Lord Byron has coloured Manfred into his own personal features" (quoted in Marchand, Byron, 699). The critical voices claim that Byron intended Manfred to be also the story of Lord Byron, in a sort of declaration, but in a form of playacting. However, we cannot know if this is really true. Some of Byron's impressions about a specific situation are indeed represented by Manfred, whereas some are only pure imagination. Thus, here confusion might be created since it is not

clear which parts represent Byron's thoughts and emotions and which are mere invention due to the fact that the work consists of too much fiction which makes it hard to identify if it is a real confession or not.

However, since Byron creates characters similar to him, both of them, the writer and the character, shed light upon each other. For a better comprehension of the work, one version should be accepted from the various possibilities, but these versions might exchange. For example, when Manfred calls up the spirits in the first act, there takes place Manfred's version since there is no such analogue in Byron's life. When Manfred pleads with Astarte in the third act, however, it may be understood as Byron in disguise giving knowledge to his affair with Leigh. Thus Manfred does not result in the exclusion of another version. Manfred is not an ambiguous character only due to the fact that it is not for sure which parts entirely represent Byron's impressions, but also because Byron has not even separated his protagonist from the villain or the hero, from the seducer or the seduced.

What is even more confusing about Manfred is that he delimitates himself not by describing what is true of him, but by describing what is not true for him. Instead of giving defining characteristics, he gives some negative attributes or even blanks:

Manfred: I have had my foes

And none have baffled, many fallen before me –

But this avail'd not

He describes even himself in terms of absence:

Manfred: I have no dread

And feel the curse to have no natural fear

Nor fluttering throb, that beats with hopes or wishes

(I.i.3 – 24 – 6)

Hence, for Manfred, knowledge consists of a lack of knowledge or simply of lack since he possesses “no dread ... no natural fear”.

When Manfred says that his powers both mental and martial “avail’d not”, there is no reason given to the reader. When he asserts his “immunity” to dread, love, and “natural fear”, again the reader is not told the reason why. Neither does Byron, nor Manfred clarify the mysterious monologue, leaving instead “all nameless hour” that profoundly altered Manfred. With these confusions, the text forces the reader to imagine and to create possibilities that will fill the blanks.

However, even though at the beginning the reader is forced to imagine and thus, to create meaning due to the blanks implied in the text, the further he advances, the more complicated the reader’s task becomes. A very clear example might be the protagonist’s status, who is caught between two worlds: the real one and the world of the spirits. Manfred’s view of himself is that he is superior to human condition due to his learning and that this is what made him superior even if he looks like other men: “though I wore the form,/ I have no sympathy with breathing flesh” (II. ii. 56-57). Therefore, to him, his constant quest for knowledge made him far above the other humans. However, the spirits have another opinion. They do not consider him above the mortals, naming him a “Child of clay” (I. i. 131, 133), “Son of the Earth” (I. ii. 33), “Child of the Earth” (II. iv. 34), “mortal” (II. iv. 58; III. Iv. 81, 104). No matter how knowledgeable or mighty he is, he remains a breathing man. To them, Manfred is more dust than deity even though there are moments of great admiration as:

A Spirit: He is convulsed – This is to be mortal

And seek the things beyond mortality.

Another Spirit: Yet, see, he mastereth himself, and makes

His torture tributary to his will.

Had he been one of us, he would have made

An awful spirit.

(II. iv. 158 – 63)

To the Spirits, Manfred is closer to the human condition since he is searching for things that are beyond mortality, just as any other ordinary man would do.

Through these descriptions of Manfred, the text draws attention to the subjective and shifting nature of understanding and knowledge in general. In each case, the knowledge concerned with Manfred's status may shift visibly, being only a matter of kind, a choice of the individual who will choose which Manfred is the true one, or simply will accept his ambiguous nature as half-dust, half deity. Therefore, the text proves that knowledge is so complex and multivalent, mostly subjective, that knowing the truth is something perhaps impossible.

Another example that supports the idea of knowledge as multiplicity, being true only for the perceiver, is the central mystery of the play: the status and the death of Astarte. Again, Manfred leaves unanswered some of the most important questions that help one to comprehend the work: Who is Astarte? How did she die? What role did Manfred play in her death?

Manfred, even though silent with regard to the answers to these questions, keeps the subject of Astarte's identity alive throughout the entire text by means of rhetorical manipulation. The reader's assumptions about her are manufactured since the text says nothing totally clear about it. Manfred's description about Astarte's death is even more ambiguous and confusing:

Manfred: I loved her, and destroy'd her!

Witch: With thy hand?

Manfred: Not with my hand, but with my heart –

Which broke her heart –

It gazed on mine, and withered, I have shed

Blood, but not hers – and yet her blood was shed –

I saw – and could not staunch it.

(II. ii. 117-21)

Here, there are no answers, only more questions. If not Manfred shed her blood, then what made her blood be shed and who shed it if not Manfred? Manfred's answers

are actually a disguise for absence of explanation, again using blanks in order to describe what is true.

However, everyone who reads the play knows that Astarte was Manfred's sister, although this is not said in the text, except from Manuel's disclosure to Herman in act III, scene II, where Manuel reveals to Herman that Manfred and Astarte were bound by blood. Until this penultimate scene of the play, Byron does his part extremely well by creating a sort of situations where secrets are revealed. The language used by his characters is a helper for these dark revelations. He uses particular dramatic and formal devices that heighten the audience's expectations. Also, the expressive phonology plays an important role in revealing secrets. The result is a stereotypical scene of disclosure, but no disclosure follows. Yet, readers feel sure, even if only for a moment, that they discovered something, but this is a mere illusion. They might discover something by means of their perception and imagination. There are many variants possible, and the reader is the one who chooses them. In this way, Byron undermines knowledge since the reader has the ability to choose, thus knowledge being destabilized from its position as universal and absolute. Therefore, according to German idealist philosophy and to Byron's own views, knowledge needs a perceiver to perceive it, being thus an illusion. This is why Byron does not give any clear detail about anything in the play, not even about Astarte or her story. The readers are the ones who help to the consolidation of the meaning, characters, characters' stories and status in the play through what they perceive and by means of imagination.

When Manfred finds himself alone upon the cliff of the Mountain of the Jungfrau, he attempts to commit suicide, but the Chamois Hunter saves him. Manfred is proud and he does not want to share his sufferings with others, but such a circumstance forced him to do so. He tries to define himself by what he does not have in common with his kind, being unwilling to admit that he is one of them. However, even if he is disgusted by his race, he envies the hunter for his simplicity because a human life is an easier life, where his needs, namely forgetfulness and forgiveness, might be achieved.

Even though Manfred's condition is hard to be identified, what is certain is the fact that he has exceeded his human condition through learning, which has made him superior to humans, but he is still kept between the worlds, being superior to humans, but inferior to the Spirits. What is also confusing is the fact that the Spirits consider him inferior, a mortal, but he is the one who had the power to conjure them up, their attribution being to fulfil Manfred's desires. In the second act, scene II, Manfred conjures up the Witch of Alps. In order to fulfil his desires, she wants him to obey, but he does not attribute power and glory to anyone, considering her and the other Spirits his slaves, since he is the one who conjured them up:

Witch: That is not in my province, but if you thou

Wilt swear obedience to my will, and do

My bidding, it may help thee to thy wishes.

Manfred: I will not swear - Obey? And whom? the Spirits

Whose presence I command – and be the slave

Of those who served me? Never

(II.ii. 155-160)

Here, the idea of slavery is implied. Since this idea is implied, one must be inferior to another. The question is who is inferior to whom? On one hand, since Manfred is the one who conjured up the witch proves that he should be her master. But on the other hand, as long as Manfred is kept between the two worlds, the one of humans and the one of Spirits, he turns out to be inferior to the Witch of Alps, who is a spirit as well. And this is how the problem of his confusing status arises again. Manfred deals with the dualism of existence. Even though he has escaped the human condition, being superior to it and having the power to conjure up the Spirits, he still cannot achieve his needs. Hence, what is left next? – to commit suicide or escape escapism. However, committing suicide was not a solution, since he was saved by the Chamois Hunter. Therefore, he will continue to look for help at the Hall of Arimanes.

When Manfred firstly enters the Hall of Arimanes (act II, scene IV), the Spirits call him “a mortal”, “Child of the Earth”, making, thus, obvious his inferior status to them. They want him to kneel in front of Arimanes and worship. However, until this moment, Manfred did not attribute power and glory to anyone, not even to God, but now his attitude is changed, inviting Arimanes to kneel in front of God with him. In this way, Manfred shows to Arimanes that there is another power above him – the Maker/God:

Manfred: Bid him bow down to that which is above him,

The overruling Infinite – the Maker

Who made him not for worship – let him kneel,

And we will kneel together.

(II.iv. 55-58)

The Spirits know that Manfred is a man of different kind, and has great power and knowledge, and together with Arimanes they agree to call up the phantom of Astarte. The moment when Astarte shows up is the climax of the play:

Manfred: Hear me, hear me –

Astarte! my beloved! speak to me;

I have so much endured – so much endure –

Look on me! the grave hath not changed thee more

Than I am changed for thee. Thou lovedst me

Too much, as I loved thee: we were not made

To torture thus each other, though it were

The deadliest sin to love as we have loved.

Say that thou loath'st me not – that I do bear

This punishment for both – that thou wilt be

One of the blessed – and that I shall die;
For hitherto all hateful things conspire
To blind me in existence – in a life
Which makes me shrink from immortality –
A future like the past. I cannot rest.
I know not what I ask, nor for what I seek:
I feel but what thou art, and what I am;
And I would hear yet once before I perish
The voice which was my music – Speak to me!
For I have call'd on thee in the still night,
Startled the slumbering birds from the hush'd boughs,
And woke the mountain wolves, and made the caves
Acquainted with thy vainly echo'd name,
Which answer'd me – many things answer'd me –
Spirits and men – but thou wert silent all.
Yet speak to me! I have outwatch'd the stars,
And gazed o'er heaven in vain in search of thee.
Speak to me! I have wander'd o'er the earth,
And never found thy likeness – Speak to me!
Look on the fiends around – they feel for me:
I fear them not, and fear for thee alone.
Speak to me! though it be in wrath; - but say –
I reckon not what – but let me hear thee once –

This once – once more!

This part represents the cry of Manfred's soul and all the sufferance that he endured since the loss of Astarte. He implores Astarte to speak to him, and in this way, he might find out if he received what he was looking for so much: forgiveness and forgetfulness.

Phantom of Astarte: Manfred!

Manfred: Say on, say on –

I live but in the sound – it is thy voice!

Phantom of Astarte: Manfred! To-morrow ends thine earthly ills. Farewell!

Manfred: Yet one word more – am I forgiven?

Phantom of Astarte: Farewell!

Manfred: Say, shall we meet again?

Phantom of Astarte: Farewell!

Manfred: One word for mercy! Say, thou lovest me.

Phantom of Astarte: Manfred! [The Spirit of Astarte departs.]

In these lines Manfred has the chance to speak to his beloved Astarte. Astarte makes clear that all his sufferings and all his pain that disturbed his slumbers and his existence all this time will end tomorrow. When Manfred asks if he is forgiven, Astarte replies with: *Farewell!* – which suggests the fact that he was offered forgiveness. When Manfred asks if she loved him, Astarte utters his name, which implies an affirmative answer as well.

After the meeting with Astarte, Manfred feels a relief that he has never felt before, which makes us understand that he has finally achieved Astarte's forgiveness:

Manfred [alone]: There is a calm upon me –

Inexplicable stillness! which till now

Did not belong to what I knew of life.

(III.i.11-13)

While he was searching for the fulfillment of his human needs, he conjured up spirits, evils, witches, and had to do with the forbidden things to the search of man, “the shades of death”, which is banned by the Holy Church. His deeds were revealed by people who heard of them. In this respect, the Abbot of St. Maurice comes to see Manfred and convince him to repent. However, Manfred refuses the path of penitence, accepting any deserved punishment, although the Abbot does not talk about any punishment, but repentance, in order to make Manfred reconcile himself with his soul and then with God in Heaven. Manfred still refuses the path considered by Church righteous. When Manfred leaves, the Abbot decides to try his chance once again. While Manfred is getting ready for his own death, the Abbot enters the tower where Manfred is waiting to die, trying again to convince him to repent. Manfred shows the Abbot an evil spirit that wants to take his soul, but Manfred manages to banish the spirit by defying and scorning it. When the spirit is gone, in his last moments, Manfred still refuses to follow the path of penitence. All he wishes is to die as he has lived: alone.

Manfred defies the Spirits throughout the entire play, and at the end he refuses the path of penitence, thus he refuses to pray and accept God. Through his attitude he reveals rebelliousness, rebelling against the Spirits who want to make him obey them, or even against the Abbot who wants to make him accept the Christian path. However, Manfred refuses to repent because he has already achieved his goal – after all the sufferance he endured, he is finally spiritually relieved because he was forgiven by Astarte. Moreover, he understands that she loved him, love being his final realization. Manfred calmly accepts death, thus transmitting the reader that love is the only true and eternal human value, which is beyond the two worlds, the one of humans, and, respectively, the one of Spirits, and even more important than escapism itself.

2.3.3 Manfred as Faust

There is no doubt that *Manfred* is a dramatic Faustian poem. Byron himself confesses that, even though he did not read Goethe's *Faust*, because he did not know the German language, Matthew Monk Lewis, in 1816, at Coligny, interpreted aloud a large part of the poem, which extremely impressed him. There are also *Steinbach* and *Jungfrau* that made the young poet write *Manfred*.

Goethe really admired Byron's work, considering that what Byron did was to take his *Faust* and make it his. Due to his admiration for the English poet, Goethe became interested in the analysis of the Byronic personality with regard to the imaginative flight of the poet and his native talent, in this way, Goethe asserting Byron as "the greatest talent of the century".

Nietzsche saw in *Manfred* the materialization of the idea of superhuman, considering that *Manfred* is even greater than Goethe's *Faust* due to the establishment of his moral code beyond the inherited standards of goodness and evil. However, Nicolae Iorga has another opinion, namely that *Manfred* would never arise, so incapable to live, in the English poet's mind without Goethe's *Faust*. Moreover, according to Lucian Blaga, interpreting Goethe, Byron is "the materialization of the demonic", and this is the reason for Goethe's attraction and admiration for Byron.

Similar to Goethe's hero, knowledge, as the concern of Manfred's monologue from the beginning of the play, inspires Manfred with a pessimistic feeling and dissatisfaction. Science or philosophy do not give satisfactory answers to the capital questions, giving even evasive answers. The energy of Manfred's spirit, which alienates him from the human, also transforms him from the titanic romantic character into the genius romantic character, superior in his isolation. His alienation might be the result of his incapacity to adapt to the human world, which will also imply his rebellious attitude and the polemic demon, or the consequence of his superiority. He achieved his titanic power through a speculative path, as a result of his own learning. The dramatic development of the play consists of Manfred's inner conflict generated

by his sentimental aberration, where his revolt is only apparently the fundamental drama, since Byron closes in it a strictly personal meaning. The same temptation of suicide as in Goethe's *Faust*, appears in *Manfred*, too, because of their incapacity of identification with the infinite; there are also the same practice of the witchcraft, the same exorcism of spirits and the same lucid consciousness which spring up in both plays.

If Faust, at the beginning, is a learnt ordinary man that wants to become superior to his kind, Manfred is already superior, since he is "half-dust, half-deity". Manfred is already an accomplished Faust, or a superhuman, presenting the "abnormality" of the romantic condition. As we have mentioned before in this research, Byron question whether escapism is indeed a source of joy, since it is so much desired, is proved throughout the play that in Manfred's case escapism could not provide happiness due to his typically human needs, namely oblivion and forgiveness. Therefore, Manfred's goal was to escape escapism, which actually parallels his anti-Faust condition, since in his superior status, his typically human needs could not be provided either by escapism or by his acquired knowledge.

Even though Manfred looks like an accomplished Faust, in terms of morality, they are very different. Faust cannot choose over a behaviour or another, and morality is all about making choices. In terms of decision, Faust cannot choose between good and evil, right and wrong, he cannot discern or discriminate. In this respect, the values are not clear-cut for Faust since for him good and evil blend and merge together. This is actually what makes Faust a divided-self, whereas Manfred sets up his moral code that is beyond the inherited standards from good and evil. Even though he brought Astarte to death due to the incest, Manfred endured and suffered a lot because of his lost lover. He also has heterodox deeds as conjuring up spirits and looking for what is forbidden to human kind, but when he was forgiven by Astarte and when he understood that she loved him, he felt relieved and calmly embraced death, which makes clear that he considers love the only true eternal value. The problem is that Byron does not delimitate Manfred from the villain or from the hero. Manfred is villain and hero at the same time and for him what really matters is the eternal value of love. However, for Faust there are no values, he cannot even interact with the world outside

himself, not even with Gretchen. Faust only seduced Gretchen and then abandoned her in her own misery. When he wanted to save her, it was only because of the uncomfortable feeling of guilt, and all he wanted was escape it. Morality presupposes care. In order to experience care there must be an interaction with the Other, and this also supposes inter-human relations which might be seen in a communal life. Faust, however, lives separated from any community, and thus, he cannot feel anxiety, worry, or care for anyone. But Manfred feels love for Astarte, a feeling that has never been truly experienced by Faust. Furthermore, Faust's attempt to become superior also implies his attempt to become a demi-god like. In this respect, he builds up his own community – “a land of freedom and liberty”, which proves to be a land of violence and domination, a land where Faust exercises terrible acts upon his own community, which makes him not immoral but amoral.

Manfred lives separated from the community, too, and this is not because of his immorality or amorality, as in Faust's case, but due to his awareness of the cruelty and inferiority of the human world, reality, society, which makes the romantic hero desire to avoid it and attempt to find an alternative world, a non-real one, a spiritual one, where the human condition with its typically material and social manifestations is not accepted, and this is called “romantic escapism”. Therefore, what Manfred does is to escape the cruel reality in order to be fulfilled, which, however, is not a solution since it is not a source of joy.

Even though Manfred exercised immoral acts, too, he is a romantic persona, and such a character, according to “Sturm und Drang” conception, should not be held morally accountable for his acts. Goethe wrote *Faust* when he already turned back to Classicism, a doctrine that gives great importance to moral values. However, in Goethe's *Faust*, romantic features appear, too, and Faust is also a genius as Manfred is; thus, he should not be morally accountable, either. The difference between the two protagonists is that Faust is unable to experience care, whereas Manfred endures so much sufferance due to the death of his lover that proves his feelings of care and true love as the only eternal value.

As mentioned above, both Faust and Manfred live divorced from the community due to different reasons. Faust is not able to form any kind of relationship with the Other, whereas Manfred is separated from society due to his escapism. Both of them might be considered solitary characters. If Manfred is a solitary due to his awareness of the cruel society, due to his superiority and rejection of human world, even though he is part of it, as an expression of the rise of individualism in the Romantic period, Faust is a solitary simply because he lacks identity and is amoral. Faust has no one to care for and no past story to share.

Faust accepts to sell his soul to the devil in exchange of power and perpetual desire, in order to be able to become a demi-god, and, respectively, not to get bored. Through his pact he rebels against God and wants to throw off the constraints of fate and time. In the end, he accepts his limits, becoming the master of his time, and reunites with God in heaven through repentance. But Manfred does not attribute any power to anyone, does not get any power through any pact, but through his own learning and resistance, defies all the evil spirits, even Arimanes through his refusal to kneel in front of him, in that moment attributing power only to God, “the overruling Infinite – the Maker”. Manfred refuses to repent, which is actually his rejection of God because what really matters for him is the eternal value of love, beyond everything.

In both *Faust* and *Manfred* appears the idea of slavery. When Faust creates his own community, he exercises acts of power, domination and violence over the people there, treating them as slaves. When Manfred conjures up spirits, he treats them as his inferiors, too. However, in Manfred’s case this situation is more confusing since we do not know who is really superior. Manfred is still half human, which makes him, to some extent, inferior to spirits, but the fact that he is the one who possesses the power to conjure them up, and he is the one who has to be actually served by them, makes him be their superior. His rebellious attitudes against spirits, the fact that he does not attribute any power to them and defies them, also reinforce this idea of slavery.

Until the moment of death, none of them has been fulfilled. Faust has chosen perpetual desire in order to get satisfaction every time, since worldly pleasure cannot provide satisfaction to last forever, but only moments of satisfaction. The real

fulfilment is achieved by Faust in heaven, where there will be no need for any desire, because there, according to Schopenhauer, is the only place where happiness should be in a state forever-lasting. Until this moment, Faust has had a disharmonious self, which has lacked real fulfilment, trying to indulge himself through his acts of violence. He will eventually be able to acquire happiness only in heaven through his acceptance of his limits and God. Manfred is unfulfilled, too. His confusing nature might be the first obstacle against fulfillment. He is placed between the world of humans and that of spirits, but with typically human needs. He has achieved escapism, but it has not provided him with any joy. With his achieved condition and all his achieved power through learning is difficult to fulfill his human needs, but through his final realization that love is the only value superior to both worlds of humans and spirits, and even to escapism, he calmly embraces death, which also suggests that he finally achieved a sort of fulfilment.

The following chart clearly displays the similarities and differences between Manfred and Faust:

Faust	Manfred
Common human being (at the beginning)	Superhuman: "half-dust, half-deity" Abnormal Anti-Faust
Dissatisfied with knowledge	Dissatisfied with knowledge
Gets power through the pact with the Devil	Gets power through his own learning and resistance
Wishes perpetual desire	Has typically human needs (to forget and be forgiven) that cannot be achieved through either knowledge or escapism

Idea of slavery: he exercises terrible acts of violence, power and domination over his own community	Idea of slavery: since he has got the power to conjure up the Spirits, he does not obey them, but defies them, considering them inferior to him
Witchcraft and other supernatural acts	Witchcraft and other supernatural acts
Amoral	Immoral
At first, rebellious, but then understands his limits, repents, and thus attributes power to God	Does not attribute power to anyone, defies all Spirits, does not repent, is a rebel throughout his entire existence
Accepts his limits and chooses to die: an altruistic attitude since he will not be able to give damage to anyone	When he is forgiven by Astarte, understands the value of love, feels finally relieved, and calmly embraces death.

2.3.4 *Cain* and the Limits of Rebelliousness

Cain, another hypostasis of the Byronic character, a tragic figure, a solitary, a misfit, the one who is wandering throughout the worlds, is a romantic rebel, but with regards to the literary expression of the concern with social, moral, or normative aspects of existence. Cain rejects both God and Lucifer; everybody is obeying, whereas Cain is defying everyone, even God, due to his dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction is the factor that has led to his rebellious attitude, which develops on intellectual grounds. He questions why must he be punished by death for his parents' sin, why must he suffer on the Land without Paradise, and endure toil every day due to other people's sins, and why is search for knowledge a crime to be so cruelly punished by death. But if the punishment for the access to knowledge is death, the ultimate question arises: *What is death?*

Lindsay Maxwell Jones (1968) argues in *A Critical Study on Byron's Cain* that even though it looks like a dramatic work that consists of a plenty of religious aspects, Byron is not actually concerned with these religious values, but human values. He is not concerned with advancing or refuting any traditional or religious concepts, but with revealing his insights into the common, human predicament. Many critics and ordinary readers of the regarded period attacked Byron's work, considering that the writer's intention is to display his own scepticism with regard to the Christian doctrine. There were few critics who tried to defend him, and to point out the real merits of the play itself.

The popular minds were thinking that one so educated as Lord Byron may have misled the less educated people, because such an eminent mind could easily influence the individuals that were not so bright in terms of education. Therefore, his sin was said to have been his refusal to recognize the responsibility that was by virtue of his privileged position. Thus, his work continued to be seen in a "dark" light, and many critics approached the play as being a personal statement of rebellious position. A very good example for such an approach of the play can be Andrew Rutherford's *Byron: A Critical Study*, in which an interest in *Cain* as a statement of criticism levelled against the Christian concept of the universe can be noticed:

In *Cain*, Byron's next 'metaphysical drama', he draws on Old Testament events and 18th century philosophy, but the effect of this explicit treatment of such issues is to bring us face-to-face with his poverty of religious ideas. He had no talent for this kind of thinking – his opinions were confused and contradictory, and his conversations with Dr. Kennedy show how he was from having worked out any real critique of Christianity. (1962: 91)

However, our aim is not to discuss *Cain* as theology, but as a literary work with regard to the Romantic doctrine and Faust myth.

One of the most emphasized principles in Romanticism is the Rise of Individualism. As mentioned before in this research, the dualism of existence is a consequence of the importance given by Romantics to individual experience. The romantic persona is thematically established in a relationship with reality, the actual world. The romantic persona knows that this reality is a harsh one that prevents the personal accomplishment and the individual experience itself. Being aware of these facts, the romantic hero is individualist, superior, rejects, and is rejected by society, being a solitary who suffers because of real world's cruelty. The relationship between the romantic persona and the real world leads to romantic rebelliousness or to romantic escapism; in *Cain's* case, the former is the main concern of the play. The romantic rebelliousness is the reaction against reality and the romantic persona's attempt to change it. Cain rebels against God and Lucifer by not being obedient as the rest of his family, and his rebelliousness is provided by his dissatisfaction.

His rebellious attitude is clearly displayed at the beginning of the play. In the first act, scene I, while everyone is praying and worshipping God, Cain stays silent:

Adam: Son Cain, my first born, wherefore art thou silent?

Cain: Why should I speak?

Adam: To pray

Cain: Have ye not pray'd?

Adam: We have, most fervently.

Cain: And loudly: I

Have heard you.

Adam: So will God, I trust.

Abel: Amen!

Adam: But thou, my eldest born, art silent still.

Cain: 'Tis better I should be so.

Adam: Wherefore so?

Cain: I have nought to ask.

Adam: Nor aught to thank for?

Cain: No.

Adam: Dost thou not live?

Cain: Must I not die?

(I, i, 22-38)

For Cain, there is nothing to ask or thank for. While every member of his family is praying, thanking and worshipping God, Cain stays silent. When Adam suggests him to pray, Cain defies him, saying there is nothing he wants to ask for. Then, Adam suggests him to pray in order to thank, but Cain, again, considers there is nothing to thank for, not even for his life, since he will eventually die. His defying attitude is not only displayed through his refusal to pray, but also through the answers given to Adam, which are extremely short and precise.

Later, in the same scene, the reason of Cain's rebellious attitude is exposed:

Cain [solus]: And this is

Life! – Toil! And wherefore should I toil? – because

My father could not keep his place in Eden.

What had I done in this? – I was unborn;

(I, i, 86-89)

Cain has already started to question the necessity of all this toil of life. Why does he have to endure the daily toil for his parents' sins, since he was not even born at that time. Later, in the same scene, Cain starts questioning even the goodness of God:

Cain: The tree was planted, and why not for him?

If not, why place him near it, where it grew,

The fairest in the centre? They have but

One answer to all questions. ' 'Twas his will,

And he is good.' How know I that? Because

He is all-powerful, must all-good, too, follow?

I judge but by the fruits – and they are bitter –

Which I must feed on for a fault not mine.

(I, i, 94-101)

Here, Cain looks skeptical about the goodness of God, since He let the tree be planted there, so close to his parents, growing the fairest in the centre, in other words, He let them be tempted. Cain's question is if He is all-powerful, does this mean that he is all-good, if he let the tree be planted there? And this is the reason why he has to suffer for a fault that is not his.

Cain is the rebel, because, firstly, he does dare to question what the other members of his family do not. He understands that he has no reason to suffer since he was not even born at that time, therefore, having no fault. He rebels against everyone, because his reality is not fair for him. Cain is superior to everyone, firstly, because he

is aware of the harsh situation they live with, and, secondly, because he dares to question it and to rebel against everyone, even God due to it.

Cain does not only reject God, he also rejects Lucifer. Cain refuses to bow to Lucifer, too:

Cain: I never

As yet bow'd unto my fother's God,

Although my brother Abel oft implores

That I would join woth him in sacrifice; -

Why should I bow to thee?

Lucifer: Hast thou ne'er bow'd to him?

Cain: Have I not said it? – need I say it?

Could not try mighty knowledge teach thee that?

Lucifer: He who bows not to him has bow'd to me.

Cain: But I will bend to neither.

Cain worships neither God nor Lucifer. He does not bow to anyone, nor he will. Even though Lucifer says that the one who does not bow to God, automatically has bowed to him, Cain still does not bend to either of them, despite Lucifer's words. Cain sees Lucifer like a god, but he does not worship him.

As we have mentioned before in this chapter, Cain's rebelliousness develops on intellectual grounds. He dares not to worship any spirit or God, but most importantly, he dares to search for the knowledge of death. In order to find an answer to his ultimate question "What is death?", he chooses to follow Lucifer into a cosmic flight through ethereal spaces, but this does not mean that he bows to him in any way.

In Cain's cosmic flight, and throughout the entire play, nature plays an extremely important role. This time, nature presupposes another aspect. Apart from helping illuminate the rise of individualism, nature supports the creation of a particular

romantic religious system of values. In fact, regarding the romantic view on religion, three main perspectives emerge: (a) reinterpretation of the Christian doctrine through returning to the origins of the belief, in order to react against the established institution, authority and dogma of church, as Byron did with his *Manfred* and *Cain*; (b) return to pagan Roman and Greek religious systems; (c) promoting the sublime of nature in a sort of pantheism.

Byron does not set any detail of the scene, or any concrete scene, but his characters describe their surroundings in considerable detail. These details given by characters are interrelated with nature and its role in the play. In his cosmic flight, Cain describes everything he sees in front of him, the multiplying masses of lights, the blue wilderness of interminable air, the darkness growing in the world of phantoms, in other words, the different worlds he sees; here, nature plays a very important role also with regard to the dualism of existence:

Cain: Oh, thou beautiful

And unimaginable ether! And

Ye multiplying masses of increased

And still increasing lights! What are ye? What

Is this blue wilderness of interminable

Air, where ye roll along, as I have seen

The leaves along the limpid streams of Eden?

Is your course measured for ye? Or do ye

Sweep on in your unbounded revelry

Through an aerial universe of endless

Expansion – at which my soul aches to think –

Intoxicate with eternity.

Cain describes what he sees in front of him, the eternal universe with its increasingly beautiful masses of lights. As the journey proceeds to Hades, Cain continues to describe the changing scene before him:

Cain: How the lights recede!

Where fly we?

Lucifer: To the world of phantoms, which

Are begins past, and shadows still to come.

Cain: But it grows dark, and dark – the stars are gone!

Lucifer: And yet thou seest.

Cain: 'Tis a fearful light!

No sun, no moon, no lights innumerable.

The very blue of the empurpled night

Fades to a dreary twilight, yet I see

Huge dusky masses; but unlike the worlds

We were approaching, which begirt with light

Seem'd full of life even when their atmosphere

Of light gave way, and show'd them taking shapes

Unequal, of deep valleys and vast mountains;

And some emitting sparks, and some displaying

Enormous liquid plains, and some begirt

With luminous belts, and floating moons, which took,

Like them, the features of fair earth: - instead

All here seems dark and dreadful.

(II, i, 173-190)

When they arrive in Hades, once again Cain describes the scene that lies before them. In this way, Byron is able to give the reader a very real sense of visual dimension of his drama. Byron reveals his work in a totally new light. Instead of the verbal statements used in a dramatic work, the visual spectacle described by Cain throughout his trip through the depths of the space becomes a means of dramatization, this visual spectacle including also a consequent shift in perspective and emphasis. Therefore, Byron is able to reveal the situation in a wholly new light.

After Byron's death, Goethe argued that Byron should have lived "to execute his vocation ... to dramatize the Old Testament" (quoted in *The Works of Lord Byron*, 1898: 199). *Cain* is not a mere recounting of the Biblical story, but a reinterpretation of the Christian doctrine, a reconceptualization of the predicament of Adam and Eve and their family. Byron had nothing to do with any poverty of religious idea, as some of his contemporary critics and writers claimed, but he reinterpreted the Christian doctrine, went back to its origins of the belief in order to react against the established institution of church. Here, nature becomes the means that supports the creation of this particular romantic religious system of values. Also, with regard to dualism of existence, Cain delimitates his own world from the other worlds and the other worlds themselves through describing and comparing their natural environment and the changes that arise due to the shift between the different worlds.

In *Cain*, we are able to see the first family making their way in the new world outside the walls surrounding the Garden of Eden. In the process of dramatizing this story, of course, changes have to appear, and their nature depends on the writer's insight, but they have to fit the basic story as well.

Again, with respect to nature, as the play opens, we learn from the stage directions that the action takes place in *The Land without Paradise*, this being just the first reference of the many others that were made throughout the entire play to the physical presence of the Garden of Eden. The cherubim guarded walls around the Paradise dominate the horizon of this play. Even in Cain's cosmic flight with Lucifer, the reader is reminded of their presence, since Cain is constantly referring to them

either as means of comparison to the scene that lays in front of his eyes. The presence of the Kingdom of God is evident throughout the whole play. However, Cain and other characters depict the land outside the Paradise as being very beautiful, too. For example, in the second act, Cain enumerates for Lucifer the things around him that he finds beautiful:

All the stars of heaven,
 The deep blue noon of night, lit by an orb
 Which looks like a spirit, or a spirit's world –
 The hues of twilight – the sun's gorgeous coming –
 His setting indescribable, which fills
 My eyes with pleasant tears as I behold
 Him sink, and feel my heart float softly with him
 Along that western paradise of clouds,
 The forest shade, the green bough, the bird's voice –
 The vesper bird's, which seem to sing of love,
 And mingles with the song of cherubim,
 As the day closes over Eden's walls.

(II, ii 255-66)

Adah, too, finds much beauty in their natural world when she attempts to understand Lucifer's nature:

...but thou seemst
 Like an ethereal night, where long white clouds
 Streak the deep purple, and unnumbered stars
 Spangle the wonderful mysterious vault

With things that look as if they would be suns;
 So beautiful, unnumber'd and endearing,
 Not dazzling, and yet drawing us to them,
 They fill my eyes with tears, and so dost thou.

(I, i, 506-13)

Throughout the play, there is further reference made to this natural setting with regard to the wildlife – the fruit, the animals, the trees, the rivers – thus, this land is depicted for us in many of its aspects.

Another important aspect of nature and natural environment occurs in the second act, in Cain's ethereal journey. When he describes the scenes before him, he gives the reader a realistic sense of the grandeur of this cosmic background. Back on Earth, Cain continues to describe the scene before him, but this time being more sentimental in the scene of the sleeping Enoch.

Finally, the climax of the play approaches, which takes place in the sacrificial alter scene. This scene has already been visually prepared for the reader. Here, the reader is also given a glimpse of Cain's aspect which is depicted by Abel who is worried about his brother's different appearance:

Thine eyes are flashing with unnatural light –
 Thy cheek is flush'd with an unnatural hue –
 Thy words are fraught with an unnatural sound –
 What may this mean?

(III, i, 185-88)

Once murder has been committed, Cain's monologue shows his confusion – the fact that he could not differentiate between the worlds, between the real one and the others he has visited with Lucifer. This crime is the effect of a prolonged dualism

of existence, which obviously is a mistake, but it can also be considered an extreme act of rebelliousness that Cain performs while he is confused:

Where am I? alone! Where's Abel? Where
 Cain? Can it be that I am he? My brother,
 Awake! – why liest thou so on the green earth?
 'Tis not the hour of slumber; - why so pale?
 What hast thou! - thou vert full of life this morn!
 ...His eyes are open! then he is not dead!
 Death is like sleep; and sleep shuts down our lids.
 His lips, too, are apart; why then he breathes;
 And yet I feel it not. – His heart! – his heart!
 Let me see, doth it beat? methinks – No! – no!
 This is a vision, else I am become
 The native of another and worse world.
 The earth swims round me: - what is this? –'tis wet;
 [Puts his hand to his brow, and then looks at it]
 And yet there are no dews! 'Tis blood – my blood –
 My brother's blood and my own! and shed by me!

(III, i, 322-46)

The reason of this catastrophe is not simply the jealousy that is narrated in the Biblical account, but it is more complex. It is for sure that Cain kills Abel in a moment of anger, but also due to the confusion provided by the prolonged dualism of existence. His anger is not necessary the result of his jealousy on Abel, but is provided by the world he is living in, one of doubt and suffering. Cain is at odds with the already

established system of values, trying to discover the origin and the meaning of life in order to confirm his own sense of values because to him the established order goes against all his senses and reason. For Cain there is the right to use the knowledge of good or evil, so in his view: *Knowledge is good, / And life is good; and how can both be evil?* (I, i, 37-38). Hence, Cain is deeply affected by the fact that man must die, life must cease, and all beauty and love, as consequence of death, are ended, too. Everything dying is the actual evil act in Cain's view, an act "denounced against us,/ Both them/ Who sinn'd and sinn'd not, as an ill" (I, i, 283-84). Cain has a very strong sense of justice, and this is the reason why he cannot agree with his family's values.

After the murder was committed, the action is not focused on the setting anymore, but on the consequence of Cain's deeds, who is banished from the Land without Paradise. Cain understands what the real values are, namely love, togetherness, mutual support, and family relationship, they also being the real, true source of joy. Therefore, Cain is eventually happy because his sister and wife supports him in spite of his terrible act. Even though he will be a wanderer of the world, he will be together with the ones whom he loves, love being actually the supreme source of happiness, in Byron's view, and the poem's greatest thematic reversal: *Why wilt thou always mourn for Paradise? / Can we not make another?* asks Adah, who through her questions reasserts the intrinsic nature of love as the most important human value, foreseeing the possibility of building a new Paradise.

Another important aspect of the play is Cain's social environment. If in the Bible there is no real sense of community, Byron has created a genuine one in *Cain*, living in their newly found world, out of the Garden of Eden, though close enough to it, a community based on family ties, and some values established and maintained by the word of God. However, Cain is separated from this communal life due to his dissatisfaction regarding the knowledge of death and the toil they have to endure every day due to his parents' sin. If almost every member of this family recognizes God's authority and behaves accordingly, Cain is the one who rebels against it, this being the cause of the separation between him and his family, at least in terms of thought. But the already established system of values by God is what structures their lives, orientates them in their daily affairs, and most importantly, gives them meaning and

purpose to their existence, namely, the worshipping of God, the glorification of His work, and the peopling of the Earth.

The creation of such a community implied many changes to the real story, for example the number of participants and their personality, the most affected being the main character, who for this play is a sensible and sensitive man, with an independent spirit, but, at the same time, a loving father and husband. Byron manages to display his view of Cain in a variety of ways.

In relation to the historical situation in which Cain is displayed, he is aware of the fact of Creation and the Fall from Grace, the denial of man's rightful heritage, the sufferings and toil of the man's daily routine, the delusory nature of knowledge, and most importantly, the inevitability of death. Cain's reaction to all these facts is what differentiates him from other characters, who react, too, but in a very different manner, which is of worshipping God, whereas Cain's reaction is rebellious, defying both God and Lucifer, and also the other members of the family.

But the poet has made the situation more complicated and complex for the protagonist by placing him in a social setting where he cannot act in isolation, but according to a situation in which he is accountable for his deeds. Cain turns out to be a compassionate character since he is a husband and a devoted father at the same time. Moreover, Cain shows tolerance and understanding to his family. Even though he cannot find any value in worshipping God, he is ready to take part in the sacrifice as a sign of respect to his brother and his wife. However, Cain's patience is tried in the third act when he commits the extremely rebellious act by murdering Abel out of confusion, for him, at that moment, being impossible to differentiate between the real world and the ones he was wandering with Lucifer. This fact also shows his type of character as being dynamic, whereas the other characters are flat.

In conclusion, Byron manages to give the reader an extremely deep philosophical and psychological insight of his Cain by showing him as an individual that is aware of his predicament, as the one critical to the already implemented system of values that seems so "arbitrary", as rebelling against this system which is an

injustice for him, and finally, as the one who is looking for the source of his own discontentment.

2.3.5 Cain and Faust

Byron's *Cain* may be seen as a reinterpretation of the Christian doctrine, going back to its origins of belief in order to react against the already established institution, authority and dogma of church. But *Cain* is not a literary work consisting only of some changes added to the reinterpretation of the Biblical account, but also includes some borrowings from Goethe's *Faust*, which are less direct than those in *Manfred*, but they suggest a better understanding of the German poet's masterpiece and of the literary myth of Faust in general.

Just like Faust, Cain rebels against community and God. Faust is unable to accept God because he himself wants to become a demi-god, a god-like figure. Therefore, he tries to throw off all the faith constraints in order not to suffer under any authority. Cain is also unable to accept God because he considers unfair the fact that he has to suffer and endure toil due to his parents' sin, being, thus, the subject of a system of laws that he cannot understand.

Both Faust and Cain are thirsty for knowledge. Faust is dissatisfied with the human learning. Even though he is superior to humans, possessing more knowledge than any other ordinary man, he is still discontented with his condition. Out of despair he accepts the pact with Mephistopheles, being convinced that it would not help him out. Therefore, in Goethe's *Faust*, the pact becomes a wager over Mephistopheles' ability to divert Faust's aspirations. Cain also accepts Lucifer's cosmic flight out of despair in order to find a valid answer to his question *What is death?* Cain proves himself to be superior to his community, too. Instead of simply accepting the already set system of values as the other members of the family do, he is questioning it, trying to find answers to his source of discontentment, and rebelling against this "injustice",

as he sees it. Although both Cain and Faust accept the pact with the evil spirits, none of them worships any, not to mention that they even rebel against and defy these devils.

Byron uses the philosophical ideas presented by Goethe in his *Faust*, such as the “man’s attitude to death”, “the enigma of evil in the world”, and his “idea that Evil is only a means to bring forth Good, that it is only an instrument for the accomplishment of God’s will” (Boyd, 1932: 167).

Considering the “man’s attitude to death” in *Cain*, the first thing to be mentioned is the fact that, at the beginning of the play, the characters did not know death since it had not ever occurred in the world. Adam, Eve, and the rest were not afraid of it, but still, they understood that it may have been something terrible, as Adah comments on it:

As I know it not, I dread it not, though

It seems an awful shadow – if I may

Judge what I have heard.

(I, i, 465-67)

Cain, being curious about death, accepts Lucifer’s offer to visit the other worlds, hoping that he will find the answer to his question about the knowledge of death. Lucifer shows Cain the spirits from Hades as relics of the past. However, Cain only sees how meaningless life and death are, so he does not want to come back from Hades and wait in his world for the death that will eventually take him back there. Even though Lucifer showed him the other worlds, Cain could not see what death actually is, which turned everything into non-sense for him. But Cain is the one who brings death into the world, and so, he enables the other characters to see its result.

Death also becomes an important matter in *Faust*. In the last scene of Part I, Gretchen dies because of the protagonist’s terrible deeds, and Faust witnesses the effects of death. He tries to save her due to an uncomfortable feeling of guilt, but his attempt is in vain. Faust cannot escape this feeling of guilt, its presence providing him with suffering. However, the suffering will not last long since Faust is an individual

with a divided self, unable to really care for the Other, a fact that has brought him to amorality.

Cain comprehends that life is meaningless due to the existence of death, which makes no sense to him as well. This idea is also presented in *Faust*. More exactly, all his efforts of gaining knowledge were in vain since “ignorance is our faith” (I, 364). As Faust returns to witchcraft, and accepts the pact with Mephistopheles to become superhuman, and to gain knowledge, so accepts Cain the ethereal trip offered by Lucifer in his attempt to find an answer to his question with regard to the knowledge of death. The difference is that Cain refuses to make any pact with any evil spirit. When Lucifer offers to show him *all*, he demands Cain’s worship. However, Cain refuses to bow down to him as his God.

After his dissatisfaction with knowledge, after rebelling against everyone due to the system of values that he cannot understand, Cain finally realizes that love and unity are the real values, and that rebelliousness brings nothing good in the end.

Another important matter in both of the literary works is the existence of evil in the world. Cain is concerned that God allows evil to exist despite being all-good, but Adam is the one who justifies His allowance: “This evil only was the path/ To good” (II, ii, 287-88). The same idea is also displayed in *Faust*, where evil bears good, they blend and merge together. Mephistopheles words emphasize this idea: “Part of a power that/ Alone works evil, but engenders good” (II, 1335-36).

Both Mephistopheles and Lucifer are the evil spirits who obfuscate the true nature of the world, misleading humanity from the true path of God. However, some critics like Heffner, Rehder and Twaddell consider Lucifer to be embodied in Cain, whereas Mephistopheles “is the representative of Faust’s own evil self” (1954: 81).

Not only Faust and Cain share similarities, but also Gretchen and Adah. Chew claims in his study on Byron’s drama that “both are their pious faith in sharp contrast to their lovers who alike express the extreme of skepticism; the innocence of both women forces them instinctively to shun with terror the spirit of evil” (1915: 127).

In the prison scene in *Faust*, Gretchen is terrified of Mephistopheles' presence, yet she repels him:

What evil thing has risen from the ground?

He, ah, not he! – Forbid him from my sight!

On holy ground he has no right,

He wants my soul to torture and confound,

He waits my death.

(I, 4601-604)

Adah is not afraid of Lucifer; she immediately recognizes him as the spirit of evil, and similarly repels him:

He is not God – nor God's; I have beheld

The cherubs and the seraphs; he looks not

Like them.

(I, i, 412-13)

Adah loves Cain with a selfless love, just like Gretchen loves Faust. Cain loves Adah and his children, but still he is willing to give up everything and stay in Hades. When Cain is expelled from the Land without Paradise, Adah follows him reinforcing the only true value of their world: love. On the other hand, Faust does not show real love to Gretchen. He is the one who brings her to death, and even if he tries to save her, his attempt occurs only out of the guilt that he feels and which provides him with discomfort.

Although both Cain and Faust are rebels, solitaires, superiors, thirsty for knowledge, Cain is different from Faust in terms of morality. Byron's protagonist is a solitary because he does not support the idea of worshipping God or other spirits, and he does not join the morning prayers like the other members of his family, as shown in the first scene of the first act. However, due to his love for his family, he accepts to

join the sacrifice with his brother, Abel. At the same time, Cain is a devoted father and husband, set in a communal background, who is able to feel love and care, but who rebel against authority and wants to gain knowledge not because he wishes to become the authority himself, but due to the already set system of values which is an injustice for him and which provides him with suffering.

Faust, on the contrary, is totally separated from society due to his incapacity of feeling care or love. His attempt to throw off the constraints of any other authority and to gain knowledge is due to his desire to become a demi-god. Even though in *Part II* he tries to build his own community, which is supposed to be a land of freedom, the damage he gives to his people proves against his amorality. His attempt to build this liberal land is not because of the care he feels for people, but due to his desire to become a demi-god.

In the end, both Faust and Cain understand that rebelliousness does not bring anything good. Faust understands his limits, repents, and attributes power to God. He accepts to die, in this way, not providing damage to anyone. Cain, after his supreme act of rebelliousness, when he kills his brother in a glimpse of confusion, understands that rebelliousness did not bring anything good, and that he could not find the answer he was looking for so much; what he understands is that the only value that really matters in the world is love, just as Manfred understands this during his conversation with Astarte.

The chart below shows the similarities and differences between Cain and Faust as discussed above:

Faust	Cain
Rebel, solitary, superior	Rebel, solitary, superior
Unable to accept God, trying to throw off the faith constraints in order not to suffer under any authority, and to be able to become a demi-god	Unable to accept God due to the already set system of values that is unfair to him

Thirsty for knowledge	Thirsty for knowledge
Disappointed with human learning, disappointed with his own condition as a human being	Disappointed with knowledge because he could not understand what death really is even after his ethereal journey with Lucifer
Accepts the pact with Mephistopheles to exceed his condition and to be able to gain more knowledge in order to become a demi-god	Accepts Lucifer's offer to find out the answer to the question "What is death?"
"Man's attitude to death": a philosophical concept becoming an important issue when Gretchen dies	"Man's attitude to death": a philosophical concept emphasized in <i>Cain</i>
Understands that life is meaningless, this idea being emphasized in the line "Ignorance is our fate"	Understands that life is meaningless due to the existence of death, which also makes no sense for him
Accepts the pact with Mephistopheles, namely to sell his soul to the evil spirits after 24 years of pleasure	Even though he accepts the cosmic flight with Lucifer, he does not accept any pact with him
Does not worship Mephistopheles or any other authority	Does not worship Lucifer or any other authority
"Existence of evil" as a path to goodness, where evil bears good, blending and merging together	"Existence of evil" as a path to goodness, where evil bears good, blending and merging together
Has Gretchen as an innocent woman, who loves him selflessly	Has Adah as an innocent woman, who loves him selflessly
Totally separated from community	Although solitary, set in a communal life

Divided self, unable to care for the Other	Devoted husband and father, able to feel love and care
Understands that rebelliousness could not bring anything good; accepts his limits, repents, attributes power to God, accepts death, and saves the others from his terrible acts	Understand that rebelliousness is useless; accepts to leave the Land without Paradise, the single thing that matters in the end being the only true and eternal value of love.

CONCLUSION

The one who put a lot of himself into the portrayal of Faust is Johann Wolfgang Goethe, a writer who made possible the transformation of this story from a historical one into a mythological one, and finally into a literary myth. Lord Byron, apart from contributing to the rise and consolidation of the Romantic hero by his creation of Manfred and Cain and of other protagonists as typical Byronic heroes, also reconstructed through various Romantic perspectives – such as dualism of existence, escapism, and rebelliousness – the Faustian myth.

Faust, a common human being at the beginning, dissatisfied with the impossibility of achieving more knowledge due to his human condition, attempts to get power and become a demi-god through a pact with the representative of evil, Mephistopheles, a pact by which he has to sell his soul to the Devil after 24 years of pleasure. The pleasure for Faust is not provided by women or wealth, but by a perpetual desire that will make him able to escape any state of boredom or longing. Faust wishes to have desires in order to fulfil the emptiness of his life. All his deeds done in an attempt to become a demi-god through gaining knowledge display an amoral individual who is incapable of living in a community due to his lack of care for the Other, and who continuously damages people.

Byron's Manfred, like the Byronic hero in general, is a tragic figure, inadaptable, solitary, proud, outcast, superior, rebel, an accomplished Faust, who is "half-dust, half-deity". Even though he is a Faustian type of character, Manfred is rather an anti-Faust due to his typical human desires, namely forgiveness and forgetfulness. His wish of escaping escapism, that is, of escaping his superior condition which brought him to achieving the "so-much" desired escapism, reflects a wish which is contrary to Faust's desire of exceeding his condition and of becoming a demi-god, since, for Manfred, neither escapism, nor knowledge provides happiness. This is what Faust understands as well in the end when he accepts his limits, accepts God, repents, and becomes the master of his destiny, where his choice to die reveals an altruistic attitude because by his absence he would be unable to provide damage to his people.

After Manfred meets the phantom of Astarte, receiving forgiveness and understanding that she still loves him, he feels peaceful, and calmly embraces death. The play's ending carries Manfred's final realization that love is the only true human value, or rather a supreme value, beyond the world of humans and that of spirits.

Cain is another Byronic character that becomes a Faustian figure through his attempts to discover the knowledge of death. The difference is that unlike *Manfred*, *Cain* reveals fewer direct references to *Faust*, but still relies on some philosophical ideas presented by Goethe, such as "man's attitude to death", "the enigma of evil in the world", and "his idea that Evil is only a means to bring forth Good, that it is only an instrument for the accomplishment of God's will" (Boyd, 1932: 167).

Cain is not a superhuman like Manfred, and he does not desire to become one as Faust does. However, he becomes a Faust due to his dissatisfaction with knowledge and acceptance of the cosmic flight offered by Lucifer. Unlike Faust, he does not make a pact, and defies Lucifer, other spirits, and even God, having a rebellious attitude towards them, just like Manfred. Neither Cain nor Manfred attribute any power to anyone, not even Faust until he understands his limits and accepts God.

With respect to knowledge, Cain and Faust are thirsty for it, but disappointed with it, since Faust cannot gain too much knowledge as a human being, and Cain could not find the answer to his question even though he followed Lucifer in the ethereal journey. Manfred, the one who overcame his human condition, is also disappointed with knowledge since it cannot fulfil his typical human needs. Despite all of man's aspirations for higher, deific knowledge, mortal beings are still ultimately fated to an ignorant existence:

What no man know, alone could make us wise;

And what we know, we well could do without.

(*Faust*, II, 1066-67)

That knowledge is not happiness, and science

But an exchange of ignorance for that

Which is another kind of ignorance.

(Manfred, II, iv, 61-63)

Ignorance of evil doth not save

From evil.

(Cain, II, 234-36)

Therefore, knowledge does not provide any joy, fulfill any need, or offer any answer to ultimate questions like “What is death?” Even though Faust rose above human condition, gaining superior knowledge, he was not happy until he accepted his limits. Manfred, an already accomplished Faust, could not reach happiness due to his typical human needs, to forget and be forgiven, which actually did not require any superior condition. Cain could not understand what death was, even if its effects were shown to him by Lucifer. The cosmic trip created more confusion rather than provided any answer, and led to an extremely rebellious act by Cain, namely the murder of his own brother, Abel.

Both Manfred and Cain, after all their endurance, understand that love is the only real value and the only source of happiness, through it being able to finally feel relieved. Faust also finds his peace when he accepts his limits, attributes power to God, and chooses death after a long trip that has included so many terrible acts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berkeley, George. *Principles of human knowledge and three dialogues*. London: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Berman, Marshall. *All that is solid melts into air: The experience of modernity*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Bernhard Jackson, Emily A. *The Development of Byron's Philosophy of Knowledge: Certain in Uncertainty*. Arkansas: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Boyd, James. *Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Butler, M. *Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries: English Literature and its Background 1760-1830*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Byron, George Gordon Lord. *Lord Byron - The Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *The vocation of man*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987.
- Fitzsimmons, Lorna. *International Faust Studies: adaptation, reception, translation*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008.
- Fitzsimmons, Lorna. *Lives of Faust: The Faust Theme in Literature and Music*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Frank, B. *Faustus on Trial: The Origin of Johann Spies' Historia in an Age of Witch-Hunting*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992.
- Francke, Kuno. *Lectures on the Classics from the Five Foot Shelf of Classics*. Vol. L1 (in 51 volumes), New York: Cosimo Classics, 2009.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Faust*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2015.
- Golban, Petru. *A Romantic Social Concern: The Individual between Escapism and Rebelliousness in Shelley and Byron*. Book of Presentations, Volume 2, 28-30, Bartin University, International Literature and Society Symposium, (2016): 329 – 337.
- Harland, Richard. *Literary Theory from Plato to Barthes: An Introductory History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

- Hawkes, D. *The Faust Myth: Religion and the Rise of Representation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Jones, Lindsay Maxwell. *A Critical Study of Byron's Cain*. Diss. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1968.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- R-M. S. Heffner, Helmut Rehder, W. F. Twaddell. *Goethe's Faust: Part One*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1954.
- Rasmussen, Joel, Judith Wolfe, and Johannes Zachhuber, eds. *The Oxford handbook of nineteenth-century Christian thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Reginster, Bernard. *Happiness as a faustian bargain*. *Daedalus* 133, no. 2, (Spring 2004): 52 – 59.
- Rivkin, Julie and Michael Ryan. *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Malden MA. and Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Roberts, David, and Peter Murphy. *Dialectic of Romanticism: A Critique of Modernism*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. *A Course on Dramatic Art and Literature*. London: Harrison and Sons: 1861.
- Shorter, Mary Dee Harris. *Faust and Byron: The influence of Goethe's Faust on certain writings of Lord Byron*. Diss. Texas: Texas Technological College, 1965.
- Van der Laan, J. M. *Faust's Divided Self and Moral Inertia*. Vol. 91, No. 4, Wisconsin: Monatshefte, University of Wisconsin Press, 1999, pp. 452 – 463.
- Van der Laan, J. M. *Seeking Meaning for Goethe's Faust*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2007.
- Wutrich, Timothy Richard. *Prometheus and Faust: The Promethean Revolt in Drama from Classical Antiquity to Goethe*. No. 62. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Ziolkowski, Theodore. *The Sins of Knowledge: Ancient Themes and Modern Variations*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000.