

THIRD AND FINAL PAPER

21L706
Professor Kibel

FILM AND LITERATURE

Papers are due on Tuesday, December 13th in hard copy and should consist of roughly 3,200 words or 16.5K characters of text, not counting the title page.. Include a word-count or character count on the title page. Do not number the title page but number the rest. As before, the following questions and topics are meant to be suggestive. If you wish to modify them or invent a topic of your own, you may do so, but the focus of discussion should be one (or more) of the texts read or viewed this term after (i.e., not including) Shakespeare's *Macbeth*.

Once again, please remember that you are writing an essay, not a book-report. We have read the book and do not require a rehearsal of its contents. What an essay supplies is some reminder of the contents in the context of an argument about those contents; the reminder is offered in the course of explaining how one should understand or interpret those contents.

If you are writing about a film and wish to review it, copies for viewing are available in the Film Office.

Suggested Topics:

I. The first topic suggestion is quite general: Write a pointed analysis or interpretation of any text that we have viewed or read from Coppolla's *The Godfather* onwards. I remind you at this point that getting a handle on the features of a text most open to interpretation and commentary, one might begin by questioning the most obvious or most obviously puzzling features. The most obvious features are often the most difficult to question; the most obviously puzzling are often the most difficult to answer. For example, why does *The Turn of the Screw* have three narrators (the nameless narrator who introduces the story as one narrated by another, Douglas, who comments on the story and its author before reading it aloud, and the governess, who narrates the bulk of it? Why do both *The Godfather* and *Birth* begin with a voice-over against a black screen? Your overall job is to write an analysis of what a text is up to. If, at the end of the day, you assemble your observations in support of a conclusion that is not particularly remarkable (e.g., *The Godfather* is [perhaps] about the need to do evil in an evil world), you will have done your job. Your assignment is only to produce a short paper on a well-ploughed subject, not to break fresh ground.

II. The following suggestions are more detailed elaborations of the first. The suggestions are meant to be thought-provoking. Since this subject is supposed to be dealing with the differences between media, the questions raised are often very difficult to answer, but it is usually necessary to think about them a bit if one is going to write an exposition of a text that adds up to something.

The Godfather is the apogee of the genre of gangster films (Edward G. Robinson, Paul Muni, Humphrey Bogart) in which a criminal by dint of ruthlessness rises from the ranks to replace the leader (usually by killing him) in a gang which itself preys ruthlessly upon the general public—everyday, small-time entrepreneurs and shop-owners who are forced to pay the gangster tribute if they are to stay in business. Does Michael's rise to power follow this pattern? The only violence committed in the film against a member of the general public that we see or hear about is violence directed against powerful agents (not everyday figures at all) in the entertainment business. What does this say about the sympathies that we are expected to feel or not to feel for the main characters? Compare the Godfather's mode of existence, so intensely ordinary, middle-class suburban, with that of Lutz, the movie producer, with his race-horses, his prize stud, his collection of art-works, his mansion. What message does the film convey by this

contrast?

The undertaker comes to Don Corleone for justice. The tenor of the Don's reply is that the undertaker has strayed from the true path ("You thought you saw a better way.") and he is welcomed back. The undertaker must not only pledge friendship now and respect the rituals of friendship in the future but will be required—possibly—at some future time to perform a nameless service. "Until then, take this justice as a gift." Is this a Faustian scene? Is the undertaker selling his soul to the devil? The religious analogy is insistent in the idea of "Godfatherhood", the responsibility of spiritual oversight as "fatherhood" is responsibility for guidance as an offspring learns to take its place in the material world. The image comes to a climax at the end of the film, when Michael, as godfather to Connie's child, must utter the newly-born's responses to the priest's baptismal questions for the ceremony to be effective, immediately before having the child's father murdered. (There is a special irony here: since the child is named for Michael, the responses make it sound as if Michael is speaking for himself.

Trace the rise of Michael to power. How has he been selected for leadership? Is he more clever or ruthless than Salazzo ("the Wolf"), who says "I don't like violence, Tom. I'm a business man. Blood is a big expense." At the outset of the film, Michael says, "That's my family, Kay; it's not me." Does he discover that it *is* him? or is there a wrenching of his character as he undertakes the role of leader? Pay attention to three moments: First, his initiation of action to protect his father, second, his wired jaw, which constrains speech, third the anger that he shows at the end of the film, when he slams his hand on the desk and shouts at Kay. We never see the first Don Corleone lose his temper. What does this scene mark by way of Michael's career? Why does Michael earlier throw over Kay and why does he come back to her? The last thing we see in the film is what Kay sees--a closing door. What role does Kay play in the final scene, and why do we close on her view?

Compare Michael and Sonny as Godfather-elects. In this connection, compare Sonny's having Pauli killed ("Leave the gun. Take the cannoli.") with Michael's having Carlos, his brother-in-law, killed. Why does Michael conduct an inquisition of Carlos before having him killed? Don Corleone tells Sonny: Don't let anyone outside the family know what you're thinking. What has Sonny given away? How well does Michael follow this rule? Find three scenes in which the movie expects its audience to draw upon their powers of inference, when some one or more characters on the screen are puzzled about what has happened. When Michael insists (through his wired jaw) that they must kill Salazzo and the crooked Captain McCluskey and Sonny mocks him for "getting personal", Michael says, "It's business, Sonny. It isn't personal." How does this phrase resonate through the action of the film? Michael makes this assertion after pledging himself emotionally to his father (as the prostrate Don Corleone sheds tears) at the hospital. Is it business, then, or is it personal?

Compare the ascension to power of Michael by assassination with Macbeth in any way that illuminates the concerns of both texts.

In the world of Balzac's Paris, power depends, paradoxically, upon the appearance of having power. That is why for those who want power, being mocked by the raised eyebrow of a servant can humiliate so deeply. (You might try explaining, in connection with this notion of the power of appearances, both the wit and the appropriateness of Rastignac's remark about his tailor: "I know two pairs of his trousers that have made marriages worth twenty thousand francs a year." [p. 99.]) Comment on the theme of humiliation in the book. Or comment on the appreciation of the truth about the power of appearances that underlies Eugène's remark about trousers. Who in the society that Balzac depicts would appreciate the wit of the remark? The readership of Balzac's book, of course, are not depicted in the book but they are expected to appreciate it; what kind of relationship between the readership of the book and the characters within it is insinuated by their ability to get the point of the joke here?

Mme de Beauséant says to Eugène that she will lend him her name, which she asks him not to disgrace, and then he appeals to his mother and daughters for the means to acquire "the weapons" (suitable clothing and transportation). He wonders a bit if this action does not put him on the same footing as those in society whom he despises. Does it? At all events, it sounds a bit like a knight-errant starting out on his career. The comparison becomes explicit when Delphine sets him up in his own apartment. (p. 207) "Success is everything in Paris; it's the key to power." What is meant by "career" and "success" in the context of this book?

The Marquis d'Ajuda-Pinto is about to marry Mlle de Rochefilde, but Eugène's cousin, Madame de Beauséant, only suspects this and is the last person in the world of fashion to know. When Eugène first visits her, the Marquis makes a slight movement when he hears the footman announce that a third party is about to make an appearance, and Madame de Beauséant guesses at the truth. "And so it must be recorded that Madame de Beauséant had observed her lover's involuntary movement--slight, but so simple as to be frightening". (p. 71.) Much of the book is concerned with the way in which Eugène learns to interpret such trifles--small gestures, subtle alterations of tones, a second meaning lurking beneath the apparent meaning of a phrase. Balzac takes it for granted that the reader will understand perfectly why a tiny gesture in these particular circumstances may provide evidence for the vicontesse's conclusion. In part, the book is a chronicle of a young man's education in the ways of fashionable society, penetrating appearances and learning how to conceal his own feelings. ("Never let anyone suspect your real feelings," says the vicontesse to him, "or you'll be lost." [p.82]). Take any instance of subtlety in verbal exchange or observation by Eugène and show how it works and what Balzac expects his reader to understand.

"He [Eugène] had seen the three attitudes of men toward the world: obedience, struggle, and revolt; the family, society, and Vautrin. He dared not choose among them." Explicate this passage from *Père Goriot*. Why dare Eugène not choose among them?

The first American translation of *Père Goriot* ended at the words "Seeing him thus, Christophe slipped away" (on p. 275 of your text) and then added the following: "The reader may believe that Eugène returned to the Maison Vauquer thoroughly cured of his fancy for Parisian high-life and female patronage, and that in due time he married Victorine and took up his abode in the provinces." Comment.

The mutual courtship of male and female in Balzac's high society is a zero-sum game: there's a winner and a loser. In the text, women are largely manipulated by men--they are weaker. This is a feature of Balzac's fiction--women who can love at all wind up as victims, because sooner or later their beloved exploits or betrays them. Women are constant in love, men love and then fall out of love--that is the Balzacian general rule. Eugene's story is one version of this. Discuss the role of women of fashion in *Père Goriot*--the ability to patronize young men such as Eugène, their susceptibility to being victimized by husbands and/or lovers.

Why can women be exploited? They crave *respectability*, while the respectable aristocracy craves money. All is appearance--but only in Paris; the countryside remains a possibility. The passage on p. 217 that declares this speaks of the "strength to dominate but how or to what end he did not know". A remarkable idea. How does it bear on Eugène's state of mind at the moment? How does it bear on his final choice--to declare war on society?

After their confrontation in the garden, Eugène thinks of Vautrin: "That man must have a brain of iron! he told me bluntly exactly what Madame de Beauséant told me in polite phrases. He told me more about virtue than I've ever learned from men or books." What are the teachings of Vautrin? How would you elucidate his character and the kind of temptation that he represents? Are his views, indeed, endorsed by Mme de Beauséant in the speech to which Eugène refers?

Vautrin: Virtue is indivisible--hence go all the way to crime. True? Goriot: they are committing all crimes in this one. True?

Discuss the ethical issues raised by "the problem of the mandarin" in *Père Goriot* in relation to the plot. The issues were first posed this way by Rousseau, the eighteenth-century political philosopher and apostle of self-government, whom Vautrin claims as a master. Rousseau, of course, was not an advocate of crime or murder, but was intense about the self-hypocrisy of civilized mankind with regard to these and other subjects. Self-hypocrisy--that is, the hypocrisy that one practices upon oneself--is not a term used by either Rousseau or Vautrin but it applies to the matter of *Père Goriot*, which is much concerned with tracing "the devious ways by which an ambitious man of the world gets the better of his conscience as he tries to skirt round evil, so as to achieve his aim while preserving appearances . . ." (pp. 129-30.) Balzac calls this the theme of his book. Is it the theme? Elucidate. How does it reflect the matter of *The Godfather*, a text in which one character advises another not to let others know what one is thinking? Is accepting the justice of Vautrin or the Godfather a way to self-honesty or the path to damnation?

Vautrin and Tom Ripley have much in common but there are also profound differences between them. Elucidate.

What, after all, *is* Ripley's game? What does he mean when he tells Reeves that the game is over or tells Jonathan that helping him was part of the game? Why does Ripley involve Jonathan in Reeves's murderous schemes (even paying half the costs)? And why does he help Jonathan by helping him kill three people on the train? He gives reasons; are they illuminating? Ripley says (to his mistress, who passes in town as his wife) that he is no assassin. Is he? After Jonathan has dispatched his first victim, Ripley asks him to frame a set of prints depicting insects, and we witness Jonathan's increasingly positive response. What is Ripley up to here and what is the point of Jonathan's response? How would you characterize the bond that develops between the two men? The last thing that Ripley sees, we see as well--Jonathan's dying face; and then we (not Ripley) see something more, namely Ripley's face, the last shot in the movie. What does the sequence signify?

Both Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw* and Jonathan Glazer's *Birth*, are stories of possession--not the heavy-breathing, grande guignol, body-distorting-and-gore kind like *The Exorcist*, but something more subtle and perhaps more insidious. In both, there are two distinct ways of understanding the underlying story (the "teleological" axis of our story-schematism). In one, there are no supernatural events; everything has a natural explanation, or, at least almost everything, so that one might believe that whatever remains unexplained might be explained by the addition of a detail or two might be easily invented by oneself. In the other, the supernatural is real. The first generation of James's readers opted for supernaturalism; the majority of reviewers of *Birth* appreciated the sense of supernaturalism but accepted the naturalistic explanation at the end. In the case of either or both, outline the difficulties in choosing between naturalism and supernaturalism and then argue for one or the other. Alternatively, you might want to set out the case in just one of these two texts and then argue that choosing between naturalism and supernaturalism makes no difference to the point of the story.

What is the character of evil in either of these stories of possession? Answering this question in the case of James requires an effort of imagination. What can the ghosts *do* to the children? Well, what can ghosts ever do but claim you as one of their own? Whatever the ghosts are, you become--which is dead and something else besides. How horrifying can that be? This is a matter best left to the reader's imagination, which will supply the sense of dread without supplying a determinate object. In the James story, the assumption is that when most children "talk dirty", as Miles did at school, they are merely being naughty because they do not--cannot--really know what the words refer to, but the governess believes she has discovered that Miles and probably Flora actually know what the words mean. The governess was

first trying to shield them from corrupting knowledge; now she has the job of reclaiming them. To be sure, we all learn what such words mean in due course; the horror here is supposed to lie in children incongruously knowing about these things before their time. We have come a long way since James's day, and it is not clear how horrible it is that young Sean can lick his long ice-cream spoon, then gaze at it extended outwards and upwards, and reply to Anna's question (intended to have a double-meaning unavailable to a child's ears): "I know what you are talking about." Is such a child depraved? and if so, what has depraved him? We may not easily grant the horror of such a scene, but we have a substitute. For reasons that escape me, we have invented an all-purpose ghost in the figure of the child-molester, whose victims haunt innumerable film and television screens, seeking out their own victims in order to pass along the spirit of depravity. (*Birth* has to resort to this figure, too, in the person of Clara, who suggests pederasty to Sean, in order to bring home to its audience the horror of possession.) For James and for his generation, it was enough to plant the suspicion in the governess's mind that the children had been fully exposed to whatever went on between Quint and Miss Jessel while they were still alive. Taking the possession as a reality, is evil defeated in these stories? If the child is possessed, what is it that dispossesses him? What does a comparison of the last scene (on the beach) in *Birth* and the last scene (with Miles in the governess's arms) tell you about the similarities and differences of the two films?

At the end of James's story, the price of Miles's dispossession is his death (that is, if the threat posed by the ghosts is real). At the end of *Sunset Boulevard*, the price of Joe Gillis's dispossession is his death. Is this the right ending for the film? In freeing himself from Norma Desmond, he utters the truth—exactly what the governess sought to extract from Miles, even though he knows it may lead again to suicide. Does Joe deserve what happens to him? Why does Gilles, before attempting to leave Norma, so thoroughly disabuse Betty about his worth as an object of affection, replying to her assurances that she "hasn't heard what he is saying" because "she never came to this house" and to her plea that he pack and come away with her immediately, by telling her that he has a good deal, "a long term contract with no options"? Why does he insist on revealing the truth to Norma, that she has no fans who write letters, no admirers, that she is "playing to an empty house"? Gillis's voice nearly has the last word, as Norma descends the staircase; the flashback narrative has ended, yet Gillis's voice goes on. But the last word in this movie so focused upon the opposition between speech and silence belongs to Norma. Gillis is gone. Comment.

In terms of our *story/narrative/presentation* distinction, one can shoe-horn *The Turn of the Screw*, *Birth*, and *Sunset Boulevard* into the category of "stories of dispossession" and discuss similarities and differences in the action and the assignments of actantial roles. E.g., one can interpret *Turn of the Screw* so that the Subject is the governess, the Helper is Mrs Grose, the Object is Miles and the opponent is the pair of ghosts, leaving Sender and Recipient something to quarrel about. The vertical axis, we recall, concerns the intelligibility of an action, what counts as success or failure in terms of outcome; the upper axis, we recall, concerns the larger implication of the story's action, the difference that success or failure makes in some larger scheme of things. Since ghost stories always carry a trace of ambiguity concerning the threat posed by the ghost, when this ambiguity is deeply marked, as it is in *Turn of the Screw* and *Birth*, it is fitting that the determination of how the Sender and Recipient categories should pose some puzzles when we try to "invest" it. What does a comparison of two of these films in the light of our schematism suggest about the similarities and differences between them?

The category *presentation*, as we have said, is sometimes considered as part of *narrative*, since *narrative* concerns practically everything about the manner in which the story is communicated once its details of investment have been established—such things as, e.g., whether or not events are presented in the temporal order of their occurrence, which events are directly presented and which are only implied, whether some are narrated by characters in the story during the course of its action or recalled by them or presented independently by an encompassing narrative-voice, whether the thoughts of the agents are presented directly (within quotation marks) or indirectly, by the narrative-voice, and so on. Many of these issues

are carried over from prose into film but the narrative-voice presents special problems. The factor akin to *narrative* in film criticism that does not utilize the terms of our schematism is *mis-en-scene*, meaning by the phrase everything that goes into the arrangement of each visual images in the succession of images that together constitute an individual scene—roughly equivalent to the encompassing narrative-voice constituted by the succession of sentences on a page. It may seem odd to speak of *mis-en-scene* as “voice” or the arrangement of materials within a photographic image as “narration” but the rough equivalence is built into the frequent view that an actual voice-over in film may be a convenience of exposition but is fundamentally “uncinematic”, because exposition is one function of *mis-en-scene*. In this connection, we may observe that the voice-over in *Sunset Boulevard* is different; it carries an enormous weight of commentary and judgment. If it had been confined to the opening scene, stripped of its personal character and made into a voice akin to that narrating the documentary-within-a-film of *Citizen Kane*, the force of the film would be immensely depleted. It is the closest thing in cinema to the narrative voice of a novel. Comment, perhaps by comparing Gillis’s afterlife voice with that of the narration of *Père Goriot*. [An oddity worth noting: On Wilder’s testimony was while discussing *Père Goriot* with his fellow-screenwriter Charles Brackett that the two of them got the idea for the screenplay of *Sunset Boulevard*. How about that?]

Citizen Kane has been both praised and excoriated as a cinematic bag of tricks, and much ink has been spilled trying (with varying degrees of success) to debunk the idea that they are original. What is undeniably true is that the work seems a kind of compendium of technical maneuvers, including inventive use of sound-montage (the notable linking of different to bridge a cut between on shot and another). Oddly, too, what some have called the most cinematic of movies extends into cinema the tricks of the stage. Perhaps by force of economic restraint, large sets within the film are often underpopulated by people and interior architecture, the difference being made up by inventive lighting. And so some criticize the film as a regression to German silent film, which utilized stage devices for expressionistic purposes, while others criticize it as nothing more than a collection of cinematic tricks, with a desperately thin and often-announced theme—that Kane was seeking love all his life but could not find it because he could not love in return. Comment.

Whatever one’s view of the issue just posed, *Kane* is remarkably like a summing-up of the cinema medium. The first twelve minutes, in particular, begin with a display of its expressionist power (note how the snow that should be in the paperweight fills the screen beyond it); we have progressively closer views of a castle, whose window seems to grow no larger as we approach it, space is abolished and so is sound, as opposed to the whisper of the human voice, the whole like a dream worthy of the opening of Bergman’s *Wild Strawberries*. This is followed by a display of the anti-expressionist powers of film, its capacity to record events and speech, preserving evidence of what happens—the fabricated documentary of Kane’s life, the footage of which virtually recapitulates the technical development of cinema from 1890 to 1941, the year in which the film was made. What is the effect of this initial foray into the medium? Does it establishes at the outset what one critic has called “the basic tension of *Kane* (and cinema itself): objective fact versus subjective vision.” If so, show how this “basic tension” runs throughout the body of the movie.

Trace the series of accounts—six in all, if you add in the opening newsreel—of witnesses to his life, each of which takes a particular view of him. What is the point of this temporal back-and-forth, non-consecutive arrangement of events in the movie? Do the accounts of Kane all add up or are there not merely differences but irreconcilable difference between some of them? Or is it that the glimpses that we get are insufficient, necessarily so, and the result is bound to be incomplete—like the endless building of Xanadu or Susan’s mammoth picture-puzzles that she never finishes. The film has been described as a detective-story, with the reporter, Thompson, looking for a meaning rather than for the perpetrator of a crime. How apt is the comparison? Is it a flaw or a success to have the camera (or rather the *mis-en-scene*) upstage Thompson so often. The fact that we do not see his face until the end of the film might be taken to mean

that he is simply nothing more than an investigative reporter, that this is not his story but the story is what he learns. But the camera peering over his shoulder sees not only what he sees but more; and it is not limited in what it shows to what the people interviewed might know but has an independent power to capture the detail of events. Most notably (and famously) the secret of Rosebud is revealed by the camera after Thompson has left the story—the camera allows us to catch a glimpse of Rosebud as it is snatched from view and thrown into a furnace. What does the revelation and the way it is presented mean in terms of the film's intention? Keep in mind that we have been told more than once, and in different ways, that Rosebud doesn't matter, that you cannot sum up a life by a word. Is Rosebud just a classic (or *the* classic) McGuffin? What does the camera's power to poke and probe, to reveal and to comment by means of displaying the material surface of things, imply about its capacity to penetrate appearance and capture the truth?

Discussing *Kane* is an enterprise that calls upon us to analyze the character and succession of its images more closely and with more attention to detail than in the case of most other films. I offer one example of what I mean: There is an image in the film that one might easily miss. The tycoon has overextended himself and is losing control of his empire. After he signs the papers of his surrender, he turns and walks into the back of the shot. Deep focus allows Welles to play a trick of perspective. Behind Kane on the wall is a window that seems to be of average size. But as he walks toward it, we see it is further away and much higher than we thought. Eventually he stands beneath its lower sill, shrunken and diminished. Then as he walks toward us, his stature grows again. Of course, all films are capable of this kind of *mis-en-scene* or visual-narrative commentary but *Kane* employs it more than most. Find three examples of this sort of narrative commentary and analyze them with an eye to their relevance to the meaning of the film.

The characters interviewed by Thompson, each in their way, are participants in the drama that the camera reveals as they begin to tell their story. They are not changed in a decisive way simply by witnessing events, and their words to Thompson (including the written words of Walter Parks Thatcher) are simply an incitement to the camera to reveal what has happened independently of their speech, sometimes, as we noted above, showing what the person being interviewed cannot have seen. (The famous judgement of the stage-hand in the flies, who holds his nose when Susan sings is an instance.) But *Gatsby* is narrated by a character who is changed by what he witnesses. We have no access to the thoughts of Gatsby, the protagonist of the novel, unless he relays them to Nick Carraway, a first-person narrator. A character observed extensively from within who observes the major figure of a story (in Nick's way) sometimes provides a narrated equivalent of what in ancient drama is the chorus. Such figures can be considered choral figures; they observe the events of the story, suffer with the major characters, are affected by what they see, and comment on its meaning of the action, but they are not the true protagonists. Film does not much run to choric figures (except, from time to time, for comic effect) but the dead Gillis, as opposed to the live one, might be considered a choric figure in *Sunset Boulevard*. Comment on the use of the choric device in *Gatsby* in any way that illuminates the character or intention of the text.

It has been often said: *Gatsby* is more than a Midwesterner come East. The story of his dream together with his "heightened sensitivity to the promises of life" are those of America itself, and his tremendous and misled hope is that of mankind itself. Pretty extreme, isn't it, to say this of a crook who fixed his dream on a rather weak-willed young woman from an upper-class family in Wisconsin? What in the text's language of description would justify such a remark?

Nick Carraway begins his tale with a remark of his father's, who is urging tolerance of those not born with advantages; at the same time, his father has suggested that "a sense of the fundamental decencies [of life] is parceled out unequally at birth." This last view Nick identifies as snobbish. Is it? Almost immediately, Nick speaks of Gatsby as representing "everything for which I have an unaffected scorn." What is the source of this judgment? Does the novel share this scorn and the view that it is snobbish to think that fundamental decencies are parceled out unevenly at birth? Gatsby is someone who tries to deny

his birth—to think that his parents aren't really his parents. The first four paragraphs of the novel set out the character of the narrator and his view of his subject—Gatsby. Relate them in any way to the concerns of the novel.

Nick has his own story. He ran away from entanglements in the Midwest and returns, fleeing from what he finds in the East. Why does he throw overboard Jordan Baker? She accuses him of dishonesty in their final meeting. He early said of himself, “I am one of the few honest people I have ever known”—a somewhat absurd phrase, when put in the first person. (Compare: “He was the most honest person I have ever known.”). How does Nick observe? How does he relate to people? Discuss Nick in the light of his fitness to be chronicler and final judge of Gatsby's worth and Gatsby's fate.

Compare and contrast Jay Gatsby and Eugène de Rastignac as young men on the make, people not born to importance in society (although Eugène has the kind of birth that once carried position along with it) who are stirred by a notable form of ambition to achieve it.

The last four paragraphs of *The Great Gatsby* are usually taken to be a key to the novel's meaning. Review its imagery—the green light, the boats losing headway, the fresh green breast of the new world, the dark fields of the republic—and relate them to your understanding of the force of the story.