For Allan, Chris

YOUR OLD MEN SHALL DREAM DREAMS

> A human being would certainly not grow to be seventy or eighty years old if this longevity had no meaning for the species. The afternoon of life must also have significance of its own and cannot be merely a pitiful appendage of life's morning.[1]

These words of Carl Jung invite us to consider the creative process in relation to the image of the wise old man and not only as we usually do in relation to the child. So often we identify the creative with characteristics associated with youth -- originality, spontaneity, play, narcissism -- and ignore the work of art, the discipline, the ordering, the recognition of limits. All our tribute is given Dionysos or Eros; we forget the sacrifice due Apollo and death. Even when we recognize the conjunction of creativity and death, we may well have in mind the "romantic" premature death of a Keats or a Novalis. "He whom the gods love dies young," we say. But death, too, is viewed differently from the perspective of the morning of life than from its afternoon. Perhaps there are insights about the creative process, about what sustains it and brings it to maturity and not only about what gives it birth, to be gained from the contemplation of the late works of those writers who do grow to be seventy or eighty years old.

This would be especially true of late works consciously understood by their creators as part of their own preparation for death and as in some sense works of self-completion, works in which old man and youth are rejoined. Thus last works which are obviously completions of projects begun much earlier are of particular interest. Though I intend

here to focus on Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus and Thomas Mann's Felix Krull, the most obvious example of such a last work is probably Goethe's Faust of which Mann wrote:

> A life so abundant and manifold that there was ever present danger of its being squandered, here asserts, by the power of memory, its essential unity. Faust is the representative achievement, the symbol of Goethe's whole life. He himself said of it:
>
> Man's life a poem similar to this;
> It has, of course, beginning, has an end too--
> But yet a whole life it does not come to.
>
> It is touching to see how his mind, in the later, elder, time, reaches back to give to the fragmentary and illimitable work the unity that in his deepest heart he craved. "He is," he said, "the most fortunate man who can bring the end of his life round to its beginning again."[2]

In his study of Leonardo da Vinci, Sigmund Freud suggests such a reunion of senex and puer as integral to the creativity of the mature. He believes that when the aging artist's creativity was waning, it was through regression to his infantile experience, with "the help of his oldest erotic energies," that he found renewal. The mysterious smile of the Mona Lisa inspired Leonardo because it awakened in him the earliest memories of his mother.

Mann seems to invoke this presentation of Leonardo as prototype of the artist renewed by contact with youth in several of his own "studies" of the artist. Mona Lisa's smile may well lie behind the enigmatic smile of Tadzio which stirs Mann's aging artist, Gustave Aschenbach, in Death in Venice, written shortly after Freud's study. Is not Felix Krull's becoming Louis de Venosta (L. d. V.), sketchpad in hand, a not too subtle indication of Mann's recognition, when he has become the aging artist, of his bond with Freud's Leonardo--a bond

mediated through his youthful protagonist Felix, who is also thus "the fortunate man" whom Goethe described?

Such connections seem legitimate because Mann has made explicit acknowledgement of his indebtedness to Freud, his conviction that Freud, particularly in his late works (the works from the time of Leonardo and Totem and Taboo onward), points the way to "a relation to the powers of the lower world, the unconscious... productive of a riper art."[3] In these metapsychological works in which Freud self-confessedly returns to his long-neglected philosophical interests, to "the early passion of his youth," he offers us a psychology particularly appropriate to the second half of life, as his earlier more therapeutically-oriented works pertain primarily to the concerns of the young: work and love. In the later writings Freud recognizes the coming to terms with death as the central task of life and posits the discovery of the mythopoeic dimensions of our lives as an essential part of this preparation.

The beautiful essay written by Mann in celebration of Freud's eightieth birthday indicates that the reconnection with the past which inspires the mature artist is not just a recovery of personal infancy and youth but "a penetration into the childhood of mankind, into the primitive and mythical." For, "while in the life of the human race, the mythical is an early and primitive stage, in the life of the individual it is a late and mature one." Mann speaks of the "curious heightening of his artist temper," the "new refreshment of his perceiving and shaping power," that comes when an artist acquires "the habit of regarding life as mythical and typical." He relates this to

the transition in his own career (which he identifies with the beginning of the Joseph cycle) from "the bourgeois and individual to the mythical and typical."[4]

Freud, so Mann tells us, helps us to understand what it means for myth to "become subjective," to pass over into "the active ego, becoming conscious there proudly and darkly, but joyously of its recurrence and typicality."[5] For Freud maturity means becoming conscious of our participation in mythic patterns and thus discovering a kind of freedom in relation to them. This is the significance of his putting the working-through of the transference at the center of the psychoanalytical process. For when we come to understand the degree to which all our experiencing is the reliving of ancient patterns and to recognize how much we shape our present on the basis of imaginal (not literal) versions of our past, we can become aware of the symbolic, mythological dimension as symbolic and thus make the move from repetition to recognition, from myth to mythopoesis.

The move to mythopoesis is also a move beyond the monomyth of the hero; the heroic illusion persists only as long as one is still caught in the identification of the ego with the myth. That identification represents what Jung calls "inflation:" taking the myth literally, not yet recognizing myth as myth. As we transcend the confusion of the literal and the symbolic, we become conscious of the multidimensionality of what happens between us and the others intimately implicated in our lives and learn to celebrate our capacity to transfer onto those we love our deepest longings - knowing exactly what we are up to. Mann calls what is

gained "a smiling knowledge of the eternal," a release from bondage to the identification of the real with the unique and unitemporal. Freud suggests that the capacity to distinguish between the literal and the symbolic is integrally related to our conversion to finitude, our acceptance of Ananke and death. Trying to repress myth, like Oedipus trying to evade the oracle, is what gets us into trouble, but participating in the myth knowingly is utterly different from unknowing compulsion. Thus the cultivation of mythic consciousness becomes the primary challenge of old age.

We might expect then that in the artistic works of old men we might find evidence of this more subjective, more conscious relation to myth. It is not so much the presence of mythical themes that distinguishes youth from maturity as a different relation to myth. There is more freedom for creative response to the inherited patterns rather than simple determination by them, more awareness that we are implicated in a plurality of myths and not wholly defined by any one, and that our participation in mythic patterns is not just a matter of seemingly accidental and superficial parallels but of the basic structures of our being. Mann's conviction that the move to this deeper appreciation of the mythical characterizes the mature artist suggests that when Sophocles returns to Oedipus after a twenty year lapse, when he himself returns to _Felix Krull_ after an interval almost twice as long, we might look for a different approach to the same material -- both the return to the beginning which Goethe commends and the transformation which _Faust II_ exemplifies.

Thus we should not be surprised if the Oedipus of Oedipus at Colonus, the Krull of Parts II and III, are more aware and more accepting of their participation in mythic patterns than was true of them in their earlier appearances. The mythopoetic logis of the psyche which Freud articulated in his later years suggests some other themes we might look for in literary works written by those engaged in coming to terms with age and death. Whereas in youth the heroic stance in appropriate, in later years the overcoming of egoic illusions, the recognition that life is poesis and pathos, doing and suffering inextricably intertwined, is crucial. Thus the focus shifts from the quest of the hero to the battle between the Titans, Eros and Death. And with the yielding of the heroic there comes an end to the exaltation of the tragic; in its place there appears the recognition (long ago voiced by Socrates at the end of the Symposium) that the tragic and comic visions do not exclude one another. The more mature relation to myth means not only the transcendence of the heroic but also the end of the hypermasculinity so often correlative with it. In Analysis Terminable and Interminable Freud suggests that the overcoming of misogyny, the subversion of our repudiation of our feminity (be we men or women) is the most difficult task of analysis. The full acceptance of self includes the discovery of our psychological bisexuality, in mythological terms of our hermaphroditism. The new perspective also implies release form the hero's mother complex, from his seeking everywhere for a reanimation of his literal mother and from his obsessive longing for rebirth, his nostalgia for innocence. It is now understood that the realm of the mothers means death as well as rebirth,

that mother means tomb and not only womb. In his essay on "The Three Caskets" Freud speaks of

> the three forms taken on by the figure of the mother as life proceeds: the mother herself, the beloved who is chosen after her pattern, and finally the Mother Earth who receives him again. But it is in vain that the old man yearns after the love of woman as once he had it from his mother; the third of the Fates, alone, the silent goddess of death will take him into her arms.[8]

He shows how Cordelia's death means that King Lear must now renounce love, choose death and make friends with the necessity of dying. Paradoxically, the radical acceptance of death entails the realization that it does not mean the end, does not mean resolution or completion. There are no tidy ends; in Freud's terms, analysis is interminable.

Send Us Back Then To Ancient Tebes

Even at the time of Interpretation of Dreams Oedipus meant to Freud not only parricide and incest but the long and painful process of self-discovery. This myth represented the pull each of us experiences toward being our own father, toward denying our separation from our mother, and the recognition that we cannot get away with either. "Resolution" of the Oedipus complex entails the move toward a different kind of seeing, toward transliteral, sacred understanding. Freud understands the significance of the fact that in Oedipus Rex only the blind see; Literal blindness, blindness to the literal, makes possible imaginal, metaphorical perception. But some twenty years later Freud, now painfully cancer-ridden, recognized even more profoundly that the story of Oedipus does not end in Jocasta's bed but in Demeter's grove outside of Athens. As throughout his years of wandering Oedipus' eyes

were his daughter, Antigone, so now Sig-mund's mouth is his daughter, "my Anna/Antigone." There is more to being Oedipus than at first appears. Freud had discovered early: I am Oedipus; you, too, are Oedipus. As his longing and guilt are ours, so, Freud seems now to suggest, could be his death, wonderful if ever mortal's was."

When Sophocles returns to Oedipus some twenty years after the composition of Oedipus Rex, he portrays Oedipus as dying at Colonus, his own birthplace. Thus he conveys that this, his last play (which he probably did not live to see performed), represents a homecoming. Although this is not sheer invention on Sophocles' part (there were ancient Attic traditions in its support), our familiarity with Sophocles' version may blind us to how much more freely Sophocles has reworked received versions of the myth in the Coloneus than in the earlier play. There are widely varying accounts of what happens to Oedipus after his downfall. The most popular seems to have said nothing of banishment at all: Oedipus was simply shut up in an inner room of the palace at Thebes. According to Homer he dies in battle at Thebes as befits a hero. Another ancient tradition has him exiled and after years of aimless wandering dying in the wild wastelands near the place where he slew Laius. In Euripides' The Phoenician Women Oedipus, long a prisoner in Thebes, does not leave the city until after he has witnessed the horrifying fulfillment of his curse: his sons have slain one another and only after witnessing that has Jocasta in her grief killed herself. In Apollodorus as in Sophocles, Oedipus dies at Colonus, but whereas according to Sophocles,[6] "the underworld opened in love the

unlit door of earth," according to Apollodorus he is hounded to death by the Furies.

It is clear that Sophocles felt free consciously to rework the story in the light of his own vision of a death appropriate to an Oedipus who has lived long enough to understand the meaning of his own story. The more conscious relation to myth is thus also reflected in the protagonist's own self-understanding. The Oedipus of the Coloneus is aware that he is living a myth, is a living myth. As the chorus tells him, "Old man, your name has gone over all the earth" (305); Your story "is told everywhere and never dies: I only want to hear it truly told." (517,8). Oedipus himself has come to recognize how all of his life has been lived in accordance with the oracle. Trying to evade living out the mythic pattern only intensified its power over him:

> The bloody deaths, the incest, the calamities
> You speak so glibly of: I suffered them,
> By fate, against my will. (962-4)

But he trusts that the rest of Apollo's prophecy is also to be fulfilled, and soon:

> For when he gave me oracles of evil,
> He also spoke of this: A resting place,
> After long years, in the last country, where
> I should find home among the sacred Furies:
> That there I might round out my bitter life,
> Conferring benefit on those who received me. (87-92)

The blind Oedipus who has come to Colonus has now himself become the possessor of that clairvoyant insight which earlier (because he could not bear to see) had been carried by Tiresias. Oedipus has now

become Tiresias in another sense as well. Though Tiresias remains the only mortal to have experienced life both as male and female, Oedipus in a less literal sense has during his years of exile lived as a woman. His blindness is a kind of castration; he has had to come to terms with a dependent status conventionally associated with the feminine, has had to surrender the heroic masculine notion of being able to make the world conform to his wishes. He has also learned how little gender determines our psychological orientation and how multiple are the confusions of object-love and identification-love in any primary relationship. He recognizes that Antigone who is not only his daughter but also his sister is also at times his son. She and Ismene "are not girls but men in faithfulness" (1368), while their brothers" sit by the fire like home-loving girls." (342).

Oedipus in this final scene of his life re-enacts the mythic pattern which is so indelibly associated with his name. He is still Oedipus -- and yet, because he understands now what he is about, the meaning is utterly different. His readiness to enter the forbidden grove of Demeter is a repetition of his earlier readiness to enter the fobidden womb of Jocasta. But now (as Slochower has noted[7]) there is this crucial difference: "This return to the mother takes place, not on a literal, but on a symbolic level." Oedipus has learned now that literal incest is beside the point.

The importance of the recognition that the return to the mother is to be enacted symbolically is a major theme in the writings of Carl Jung. This theme is boldly articulated in Symbols of Transformation, the work which both he and Freud understood as a consciously

parricidal attempt to free himself from domination by Freud and establish his own unmediated relation to the unconscious. Jung found Freud's understanding of incest too literal and too biological; he was persuaded that incest longing, properly understood, is always symbolical. It represents the longing for spiritual rebirth, for renewal at the source of life. The forbidding of literal incest, the taboo, forces the move toward symbolization and spiritual transformation. The point of regression is introversion, the relation not to the parents but to the collective psyche. The prohibition (or in Oedipus' case, the punishment of its violation) forces further regression to the mother as nourisher not as sexual object. Thus it is his blindness which represents the introversion that brings Oedipus to the Demetrian grove.

The pull toward the mother and the taboo which says, not the literal mother, not literal sex, moves us toward spiritual transformation. Jung's interpretation suggests the necessity of the kind of symbolic incest which Oedipus commits at Colonus. "The fear of incest must be conquered," the hero is the one who yields to the incest wish.[8]

> Therapy must support the regression and continue to do so until the "pre-natal" stage is reached... The regression leads back only apparently to the mother; in reality she is the gateway into the unconscious, into the "realm of the Mother."[9]

(It seems pertinent that in the preface to this book Jung should acknowledge his identification with Theseus. He is to Theseus as Freud is to Oedipus. Theseus' daring of labyrinth is the equivalent in his life of Oedipus' entry into the grove, but at a much earlier point in his life. At Colonus it is Theseus who is the only one present to

witness Oedipus' descent and to whom Oedipus' secret is passed on: an image clearly consonant with Jung's understanding of his relation to Freud.)

At Colonus Oedipus' return to the mother is symbolic, and cognizant of the mother in her role as the silent goddess of death. Having in the violent act of self-blinding had a preliminary experience of death as Thanatos defines it, Oedipus is now ready for death as it is understood in Demeter's realm. Here death means reunion with Persephone ("Veiled Persephone lead me on" 1548); death is now blessing not curse, initiation not termination. This death is a kind of introduction into the Eleusinian mysteries of which Sophocles said elsewhere: "Thrice happy are those of mortals, who having seen these rites depart for Hades; for to them alone is it granted to have found life there; to the rest all there is evil."[10]

At Colonus everything is turned around. What had been a source of difficulty has become a blessing to be celebrated. The grove is a place of many reversals and transformations. The gods have not forgiven Oedipus nor has he been brought to accept his sinfulness.[11] But he has suffered long enough to have come to accept his life as it has been without trying any longer to argue a distinction between "so it was" and "so I willed it."[12] The years of wandering serve as the equivalent of participation in the preparatory outwardly visible phases of the Eleusinian initiation. The burial place of one whose presence during the years of exile had been perceived as

curse will be a source of blessing. The Furies who haunt violators of the mother so mercilessly now appear as the Eumenides, "the gentle all-seeing ones." Blind Oedipus long led by Antigone now becomes the guide.

These resolutions do not depend on Oedipus' story now being explained; the mystery which has surrounded his life is not dissolved:

> Now the finish
> Comes, and we know only
> In all that we have seen and done
> Bewildering mystery. (1675-8)

The lines describing Oedipus' end are utterly beautiful:

> But in what manner
> Oedipus perished, no one of mortal men
> Could tell but Theseus. It was not lightning,
> Bearing its fire from God, that took him off;
> No hurricane was blowing.
> But some attendant from the train of Heaven
> Came for him: or else the underworld
> Opened in love the unlit door of earth.
> For he was taken without lamentation,
> Illness or suffering: indeed his end
> Was wonderful if ever mortal's was. (1655-65)

Yet this wonderful end does not betoken the end of human tragedy. Sophocles does not offer us a world which after Oedipus' death is restored to harmony. The last lines of the play communicate a vision of the interminable quality of the troubledness of human existence. The curse Oedipus visited upon his sons is still to be fulfilled; Antigone and Ismene, grief-shattered, confront a "wide and desolate world," with no way clear before them.

Nevertheless in his last tragedy Sophocles offers us his vision of a wonder-full, creature death - a death in which a "bitter life" is transformed into something that "confers benefit."

Holé Heho, Ahé

As Sophocles returned in his last tragedy to a figure whose story he had begun to relate some twenty years earlier, so Thomas Mann returned at the end of his life to continuing the narration of the adventures of a character who had made his first appearance more than forty years earlier. Mann began "Felix Krull" in 1910 and already guessed then, "It will probably be my strangest work."[13] He put it aside, so he thought temporarily, to work on "Death in Venice," and then published the completed fragment in 1912, having discovered that he was not ready to take it further after all. He came to regard it as a youthful expression, "belonging to an outmoded bourgeois-artist period" in his history as a writer. This phase of Mann's life is perhaps comparable to the one in Freud's during which he wrote his case histories. After World War I both Freud and Mann had moved to a view of life so deeply attuned to the shaping power of mythic forces on individual existence that the earlier focus on individual quest no longer seemed an appropriate vehicle. "Felix" seemed to belong to that outgrown period.

Yet in late 1945 after finishing the Joseph cycle, Mann found himself picking up the fragment again, as though there were after all something to be finished here. He had an intuition that the completion of "Felix Krull" might in some way be meant to be his last work. Again another project became more immediately compelling and Mann soon found himself completely immersed in the writing of Dr. Faustus. But then in 1950 he returned to "Felix", still uncertainly ("perhaps it will only be mischief"), and on this occasion found it was indeed time to

take up the old tale once again. It was finished in 1945 and was, after all, his last work.

The return to "Krull" is continuation -- and transformation. As Mann wrote Carl Kerenyi:

> I was not aware, God knows, of undertaking a Hermetic novel when I began with this forty years ago. I had no other intention than yet another impersonation and parody of art and the artist. It was only in the course of the subsequent continuation that certain associations, undoubtedly induced by the proximity of the Joseph, found their way in, and the name of the god arose.[14]

It is an important part of Krull's acceptance of himself as a confidence man that his trickery brings joy not harm. The recognition of the identity between blessor and violator lies at the heart of Felix Krull in its final version and is central to Mann's identification with Felix as archetypal artist: creator and thief in one. (Perhaps Oedipus at Colonus is also a hermetic work in Mann's sense. Certainly Oedipus invokes Hermes as well as Persephone to guide him to his death, and the reversals whereby the violator becomes the bringer of blessings have a decidedly hermetic flavor.)

Mann has in the later parts come to see Krull in mythic terms not consciously included in his earlier conception. He writes of his delight that once again as so often before he and Kerenyi should have been engaged quite innocently in such parallel projects; he on his "hermetic novel" and Kerenyi on the trickster figure in mythology. Of course, a mythological element is visible in Mann's fiction long before Joseph. The difference between earlier works, like the beginning of

"Krull" and "Death in Venice," and the final parts of Krull is not that myth is present in the latter and absent from the first but rather in how myth is present. Aschenbach is destroyed through being possessed by the mythic, taken over by one mythic pattern and not having any creative freedom in relation to it. Whereas Felix, "favored by fortune," is like Mann's Joseph aware of the many mythic roles in which he participates. Therefore he can celebrate the mythic as source of rebirth rather than destruction. He takes delight in his many impersonations, sees them as providing the means for "renewal of my worn-out self."[15] He believes that it is the attitude which underlies one's performances that gives one's activities their meaning: "For my part I am in agreement with folk wisdom which holds that when two people do the same it is no longer the same (p. 112). It is his ability to see his life as an artistic creation, in symbolic terms, that underlies his self-enjoyment. His spurning of Strathbogie's adoption offer expresses his rejection of "a reality simply handed me." (p. 215) He can take as much delight in passing as less than he is when he is a waiter as in passing for a marquis. He gives voice to his most deeply held conviction when he says, "to be allowed to live symbolically spells true freedom" (p. 101). As befits one thus attuned to the mythic aspect, he knows how impossible it would be to disentangle the "good luck" in his life from his own contribution.

Felix adopts an artistic, mythopoetic attitude toward life without, however, being conciously informed about the particular classical mythological roles which he is re-enacting. He is quick

to appreciate the pertinence of the Hellenic motif when another suggests it, as when Diane Philibert calls him a Hermes figure, but in large measure the explicit parallels are conveyed to the reader indirectly. They are not part of Felix's conscious self-understanding. Thus when Louis asks him, "'Are you strong on mythology?'", Felix answers, "' Not very, marquis. There is, for instance, the god Hermes. But aside from him I know very little'" (P. 230).

Yet Felix, as we come to recognize, participates in many myths. Though he might not be able to name his classical counterparts, we see him not only as Hermes but also as Adonis, Actaeon, Eros, Proteus. Felix's own way of explaining this polymorphism is to say, "He who really loves the world shapes himself to please it" (p. 61).

The Hermes identification is, nevertheless, the central one; not only because Felix as confidence man is Hermes as trickster nor because Felix as waiter is Hermes as servant, but because of Hermes' primal connection with Aphrodite and thus with the image of the hermaphrodite. Much is made in the novel of Krull's slender and delicate beauty and of his being one with whom both men and women fall in love. His own eroticism has a definitely feminine aspect, particularly in its pronouncedly passive orientation. He speaks of "eccentrics who were seeking neither a woman nor a man but some extraordinary being in between. And I was this extraordinary being" (p. 104). And he himself feels the pull toward what he calls a "double creature:" the brother/sister pair on the balcony of the Frankfurt hotel, Andromache the very masculinized female acrobat who arouses his worship.

But Felix's "penchant for twofold enthusiasms" (p. 281), is particularly evident in his attraction to mother/daughter combinations, beginning with his own mother and his sister, Olympia, in the Rhine valley town of his childhood years and ending with Senhora Kuckuck and her daughter, Zouzou, in Lisbon. Though the story of Felix's encounter with the latter pair is comically and joyfully told and has none of the awesome power of Sophocles' drama, here too the climax takes place in "Demeter's grove," that is, in the garden of the Senhora's house. Here, too, Krull is brought to recognize that it is in vain that he turns to the female who most directly arouses his sensual interest, the virginal daughter. For suddenly there stands her mother.

> And yet I ask you to believe that I was less cast down by this maternal apparition than one might have thought. However unexpected her appearance, it seemed fitting and necessary, as though she had been summoned, and in my natural confusion there was an element of joy. (p. 376.)

Both Felix and the Senhora recognize that she has come to lead him "back to the right path." It is time for him to encounter "the graciousness of maturity." He had turned to the mortal daughter when he should have turned toward the archetypal mother. As his coming to Lisbon represented his discovery of an "older geological strata in the earth's history" so the Senhora appears to initiate him into primordial, mythical mysteries. He had recognized from the beginning that she was not one to be trifled with. The preceding scene during which Felix becomes aware of the connection between the Senhora's surging bosom and the violence of the bullfight below had made fully manifest the bond between the Mother and death. Now as the novel ends, Felix is aware of "a whirlwind of primordial forces" bearing him "into the realm of ecstasy." Again he sees "the surging of

that queenly bosom." The Senhora is clearly the Great Mother and, as Jung says, the hero is the one courageous enough to commit incest.

Perhaps an entirely just appreciation of Mann's own last "confessions" would demand our looking at both Dr. Faustus and Felix Krull -- together they represent a profound honoring of the tragic and comic perspectives on human sufferings. But, that of the two, Krull should be the very last seems highly appropriate. Mann in his own old age deliberately chooses Felix, an archetypal puer aeternus, to represent artistic creativity, yet without romanticizing the playful and narcissistic aspects of the creative. Felix is well aware that his career is "based on imagination and self-discipline," and that the "great joy," the experience of love given and received is what redeems his trickeries. Because of Felix's youth his turn to Dona Maria is inevitably ambiguous. Is he still caught in a too-literal pull toward the mother or is he, indeed, aware that in turning to the Senhora he is moving into the transformative realm of the Mothers? That ambiguity is, I believe, intentional. Mann does not want to dissolve the mystery of the discovery of the mythical within the actual. And after all, we are by no means at the end of Felix's adventures.

The novel ends -- and yet what we have are still only fragments of Felix's confessions. They could theoretically continue interminably. We know that much else is to follow; that at some point in the future, for example, Felix will find himself in prison. Accepting these fragments as all we have is accepting the finitude of life -- and recognizing that our fragments nevertheless serve as symbols of wholeness.

Consent to mortality and celebration of the mythical are profoundly intertwined in both Oedipus at Colonus and Felix Krull. Through this conjunction, Mann and Sophocles in their last works communicate their "smiling knowledge of the eternal."

Christine Downing

San Diego State University

NOTES

1. C.G. Jung, "The Stages of life," in Joseph Campbell, editor, The Portable Jung, New York: Viking, 1971, p. 17.

2. Thomas Mann, "Goethe's Faust," Essays of Three Decades, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971, p. 19.

3. Thomas Mann, "Freud and the Future," Essays, New York: Vintage, 1957, p. 323.

4. Ibid., p. 317.

5. Ibid., p. 318.

6. Sohpocles, "Oedipus at Colonus," in David Grene and Richard Lattimore, editors, The Complete Greek Tragedies, Volume II, p. 150. (hereafter line references in test.)

7. Harry Slochower, Mythopoesis, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1970, p. 90.

8. C.G. Jung, Symbols Of Transformation, New York: Pantheon, 1956, p. 294.

9. Ibid., p. 329.

10. Quoted in George E. Mylonas, Elesis: The Eleusinian Mysteries, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, p. 284.

11. Cf. H.D. Kitto, Greek Tragedy, New York: Doubleday, 1954, p. 419. Nietzsche's definition of redemption.

12.

13. Hans Burgin and Hans-Otto Mayer, Thomas Mann: A Chronicle of His Life, Alabama: University of Alabama, 1969.

14. Alexander Gelley, translator, Mythology and Humanism: The Correspondence of Thomas Mann and Karl Kerenyi, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975, p. 210.

15. Thomas Mann, Confessions of Felix Krull, New York: Vintage, 1969, p. 252. Hereafter page references in text.