Paradigms of Relationships in Faulkner, Woolf and Vian

Inst. Zainab Abdul-Karim Musir
University of Baghdad/College of Education Ibn-Rushd/ Iraq
zainab.abdulkarim@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Received: 26/11/2022 Accepted: 3/1/2023 Published: 15/6/2023

Doi: https://doi.org/10.36473/ujhss.v62i2.2090

Abstract:

The paradigms within human relationship are shaped by a multitude of factors which tug at the edges of the ability to form interpersonal bonds with the influence of experience. What constitutes experience, then, can be argued in several different manners. However, it is the interpretation of conventional, institutional education in the minds of the characters in Williams Faulkner’s Light in August, Virginia Woolf’s To the Lighthouse, and Boris Vian’s Mood Indigo that sets a course for the trajectory of their relationships with others and with themselves. The various frameworks of the characters’ respective educations allow them to express what has been fed to them and how to interpret, knowledge. Once they are able to identify what constitutes experience through learning, these concepts, religious tenets, the awareness of factual circumstances, fixed categories imposed on reality, and ostensible truth as defined by ideology, are applied to models of human relationship, often with disastrous or emotionally numbing results through sticking to a pre-defined notion of how to apply what one is taught to one’s personal life. The characters of Light in August utilize an organic absorption of conventional education and religion as a form of teaching, as well as relying on past experience and intuition to traverse through their relationships, while the intellectual pursuits of the Ramsays and their acquaintances (particularly the male figures) in To the Lighthouse lead them to define relationship using ideas instead of raw emotion and experience. In comparison, the beautiful and tragic youth of Mood Indigo transform conventional education into goods for material consumption, as notions of the intellectual become synonymous with an indulgence in objectifying traditional forms of knowledge in monetary, and even human, form. The point at which education and desires converge and possibly become inseparable, then, marks the intersection not only between the compromise of relationships co-existing with powerful, learned ideas, but also the parallels between how self-acquired education through experience can differ from institutionalized thought. Can the distinctions between these methods lead to more or less successful relationships, or do they arrive at the same conclusion; the disintegration of previously cherished relationships? Is it then possible for education and relationship to co-exist peacefully? If not, perhaps it is this collision in the world of fiction that catalyzes the characters’ perpetual uncertainty with regard to both ideas.
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الملخص:

تشكل النماذج داخل العلاقات الإنسانية من خلال العديد من العوامل التي تجذب القدرة على تكوين روابط شخصية مع تأثير التجربة. ما الذي يشكل الخبرة، إذاً، يمكن مناقشته بعدة طرق مختلفة. ومع ذلك، فإن تفسير التعليم المؤسسي التقليدي في أذهان الشخصيات في رواية وليام فولكنر "ضوء في أغسطس"، ورواية فيرجينيا وولف "موود انكو"، ورواية "إلى المنارة" للدكتور فايان هو الذي يحدد مسار علاقاتهم مع الآخرين ومع أنفسهم. تسمح الأطر المختلفة لتعليم الشخصيات ذات الصلة بتقديم بعض التخمينات حول كيفية التعكير عن أو صد ما تم تغذيته لهم مثل ما هو، وكيفية تفسيرهم مجرد أن يكونوا قادرين على تحديد ما يشكل الخبرة من خلال التعلم. يتم تطبيق هذه المفاهيم على نماذج العلاقة الإنسانية، غالبًا مع نتائج كارثية أو محدودة عاطفيًا من خلال التماسك بمفهوم محدد مسبقًا لكيفية تطبيق ما يتم تعليمه على حياة الفرد الشخصية. تستخدم شخصيات "ضوء في أغسطس" الاستيعاب العضوي للتعليم التقليدي، والذين كشف من أشكال التدريس، فضلاً عن الاعتماد على الخبرة السابقة والحدس لاجتياز علاقتهم، في حين أن المساعي الفكرية لعائلة رامسي ومعارفهم (خاصة الذكور الشخصيات) في رواية "إلى المنارة" قادهم إلى تحديد العلاقة باستخدام الأفكار بدلاً من العاطفة والتجربة الخارجي، والمقارنة، فإن الشباب الجميل والمساواي في رواية "موود انكو" يحمل التعليم التقليدي إلى سلسلة استهلاك المادي، حيث تصبح مفاهيم المثقف مرافقة للانغماس في تجسيد الأشكال التقليدية للمعرفة في شكل نقد، وحتى بشري. النقطة التي يقترب عنها التعليم والرغبات وربما تصبح غير قابلة للانفصال، إذاً، تشير إلى التقاطع ليس فقط بين حل وسط للعلاقات التي تتعني مع الأفكار التقليدية والمكتسبة. ولكن أيضاً أوجه الشبه بين كيف يمكن للتعليم المكتسب ذاتيًا من خلال التجربة أن يختلف عن التعليم المؤسسي. هل يمكن أن تؤدي هذه الفروق إلى علاقات ناجحة إلى حد ما، أم أنها تصل إلى نفس النتيجة، تفتقد العلاقات العميقة صفاء؟ هل من الممكن إذاً أن يتعني التعليم والعلاقات الإنسانية بسلام؟ إذا لم يكن الأمر كذلك، فيما يكون هذا الاصطدام في عالم الخيال الذي يحظى عدم القيف دائما لدى الشخصيات فيما يتعلق بكلتا الفكريتين.

الكلمات الفيائية: النماذج، العلاقات الإنسانية، التعليم التقليدي، الأفكار، فولكنر، وولف، فيان.
Introduction

The various concepts of education in *Light in August* are met with disparate reactions amongst the characters. There exists, in the rural post-depression South, a focus on Christianity and theology as the crux of education, as opposed to secular and monetary learning. Joe Christmas repels both definitions of instruction, preferring instead to carve the path of his education through bodily experience, leading him to treat the concept of learning as an organic entity. Even when leaving the orphanage, he is literally pulled from education: “One evening they came to the schoolroom and got him. It was two weeks before Christmas” (Faulkner, 1990, P.141). His rejection is not without the grounds of previous immersion: he has been exposed to both the lessons of religion and the possibilities that can arise from reading and writing. Joanna Burden, the middle-aged woman whom he begins a physical relationship with, attempts to persuade Joe to study and be educated in a secular and business-like manner. She wants him to manage all her business affairs—the correspondence and the periodical visits—with the negro schools. She recites in detail while he listens in mounting rage and amazement. He has complete charge, and she would be his secretary, assistant: they would travel to the schools together, visit in the negro schools together; listening, even with his anger, he knew that the plan was mad. (Faulkner, 1990, p.268)

Joe recognizes the impossibility of the situation—Joanna’s plan for them to draw closer by forming a business relationship does not play into Joe’s way of life. She recites the word ‘together’ repetitiously, as if their relations were as mechanical as a business transaction. Her plan shares sentiments with Chick in *Mood Indigo*, whose love for Alise wears away when she can no longer share his intellectual obsession with Jean Sol-Partre. Yet, Joanna attempts to use education as a tool in order to further her relationship with Joe and eventually have him marry her, while Chick’s pursuit of Partre leads him to neglect the subject of marriage even after much persuasion. Joe Christmas has no interest in her plans, and treats Joanna’s suggestions callously.

‘To school,’ his mouth said. ‘A nigger school. Me.’
‘Yes. Then you can go to Memphis. You can read law in Peebles’ office. He will teach you law. Then you can take charge of all the legal business. All this, all that he does, Peebles does.’
‘And then learn law in the office of a nigger lawyer,’ his mouth said. (Faulkner, 1990, p. 276)

Faulkner shows that Joe responds to her with ‘his mouth said’ instead of ‘he said’, which highlights his bodily instead of intellectual response. When Joanna realizes that the prospect of honor through learning will not convince him, she attempts to appeal to an idea that had sunk its roots into Christmas following his adoption by McEachern religion.
When Joe Christmas is taken ‘from the schoolhouse’ and into the house of McEachern, the new patriarchal figure of his adolescence tells him, ‘You will find food and shelter and the care of Christian people,’ the man said. ‘And the work within your strength that will keep you out of mischief. For I will have you learn soon that the two abominations are sloth and idle thinking, the two virtues are work and the fear of God.’ Still the child said nothing. He had neither ever worked nor feared God. He knew less about God than about work. (Faulkner, 1990, p.144)

McEachern explicitly uses the word ‘learn’, insinuating that he will be educating Joe Christmas in the ways of ‘Christian people’, and immediately outlines a few correct versus unacceptable modes of behavior. Joe, however, does not understand. His exposure to God and work had been minimal, but he would learn about both through living with his new family. Perhaps his tense relationship with McEachern, which eventually leads to Joe murdering the man (Faulkner, 1990, p. 205) following years of childhood abuse with the word of God as the guide for physical pain, influenced Christmas’ rejection of God as a method of education. It is also possible that the result was inevitable, as Joe Christmas’ nature was so violent and all the institutional efforts to civilize him were useless. For McEachern, Joe’s rejection of his moral standards equates him with Satan (Faulkner, 1990, p. 205). Faulkner notes the strength of Joe’s physical reaction to committing murder against the looming power that used religion as an excuse for rigid abuse,

The youth upon its back rode lightly, balanced lightly, leaning well forward, exulting perhaps at that moment as Faustus had, of having put behind now at once and for all the Shalt Not, of being free at last of honor and law. In the motion of the sweet sharp sweat of the horse, blew, sulphuric; the invisible wind flew past. He cried aloud, ‘I have done it! I have done it! I told them I would!’ (Faulkner, 1990, p.207)

The reference to Faustus is a conscious move on the part of the author, for there was no conceivable way for Joe to have read the play. His comparison to a literary figure is ironic, for it is the moment after his murderous act, with the crude ‘sweat of the horse’ and the ‘sulphuric’ wind. Additionally, McEachern had just compared Joe with Satan, but Faulkner chooses to juxtapose him with Faustus, and treats him as a figure freed from the ‘honor and law’ of traditional education. In this relation to the fantastic, Lily Briscoe’s assertion in To the Lighthouse that “teaching and preaching is beyond human power” (Woolf 45) insinuates that education on these terms cannot be reached in this plane. Her statement suggests an answer to why Faulkner uses opposing imagery: the impossibility of teaching and preaching to others who will never fully absorb the gravity of these lessons, due to their personal experiences and views of relationship. Liberated from his confining relationship with McEachern, Joe cries to no one in particular, confirming to himself the feeling of independence he can draw through self-education using experience and instinct.
When Joanna Burden attempts to employ religion as a way to keep Joe with her, his resentment of her rises, for she herself was not previously a pious figure, and he may have been reminded of the failure of religion in his past to mold him. He thinks, “She ought not to have started praying over me. She would have been all right if she hadn’t started praying over me. It was not her fault that she got too old to be any good any more. But she ought to have better sense than to pray over me” (Faulkner, 1990, p.106). Joe acknowledges their age differences and the lies of her pregnancy, but, for him, the last straw is when Joanna broaches into the territory of attempting to educate him. The role of religion in Mood Indigo, in particular, differs drastically from that of Light in August. Jesus is a tangible figure that can be paid to come to weddings and has no control over death (Vian, 2014, p.185), and the Religious is a person to represent an idea that only plays a ceremonial role in their world. Once Joe’s bitterness grows against religion, he always resorts to his own experience to find a solution, falling back into an organic approach.

They looked at one another. ‘Joe,’ she said. ‘For the last time. I don’t ask it. Remember that. Kneel with me.’ … But the shadow of it and of her arm and hand on the wall did not waver at all, the shadow of both monstrous, the cocked hammer monstrous, back-hooked and viciously poised like the arched head of a snake (Faulkner, 1990, p.282).

In his perspective, Joanna’s arms and hands become “cocked” and “monstrous”, personified as a ‘vicious’ snake. Thus, when he murders her, his excuse for not marrying her is “‘No. If I give in now, I will deny all the thirty years that I have lived to make me what I chose to be’” (Faulkner, 1990, p.265). To live to make him what he ‘chose to be’ is the core of Joe Christmas’ philosophy, where the relationship he has with himself outweighs all else, and to change his definition of education is to betray himself. He must absorb his own perceptions and form a personal school of thought, internalizing his choices at the expense of his relationships with others.

The idea of an internal, self-wrought philosophy that guides the course of relationship is displayed with more depth in To the Lighthouse. While Christmas’ insistence on his absorbed knowledge leads to an explosion of emotion, the psychological intensity of Woolf’s characters, particularly the male figures influenced by highly institutionalized European education, is accompanied by a silencing of emotion. Ironically, they do not completely repel relationships with others in order to grow more familiar with themselves, but instead judge those around them using their own standards of intellectualism. This obsession with ideas as opposed to reaching out and attempting to understand the humans around them in Mr. Ramsay and Charles Tansley’s theoretical and self-important musings showcases a striking difference between their understandings of others and that of the less traditionally educated Mrs. Ramsay. The men’s lack of self-awareness in delving so deeply into the world of the idealistic leads to misconceptions about their relationships, in so much that many implied connections do not have reciprocal attributes.
For instance, Charles Tansley is viewed disdainfully by many, including Mrs. Ramsay, who notes,

He worked hard—seven hours a day; his subject was now the influence of something upon somebody—they were walking on and Mrs. Ramsay did not quite catch the meaning, only the words, here and there dissertation fellowship readership lectureship. She could not follow the ugly academic jargon… He was an awful prig—oh yes, an insufferable bore. (Faulkner, 1990, p.12)

For Mrs. Ramsay, the rabid intellectualism that accompanies Tansley is actually incredibly boring and priggish, so much so that she cannot follow the trail of his education. Yet, while he embodies the inaccessibility of academia, he is, at the same time, neither devoid of emotion nor hypocrisy. When Tansley goes on a walk with Mrs. Ramsay, he notes that “for the first time in his life Charles Tansley felt an extraordinary pride; felt the wind and the cyclamen and the violets for he was walking with a beautiful woman. He had hold of her bag” (Woolf, 1989, p.14), proving that, for all his bookish snobbery and misogyny from viewing women as silly and superficial (Woolf, 1989, p.85), he is not immune to the tantalizing idea of relationship. Years later, it is revealed that “He had gotten his fellowship. He had married; he lived at Golder’s Green” (Woolf 196), two sentences that almost serve as a dry afterthought to an existence already perceived as arid and emotionless. Thus, the lack of reciprocity through less expressivity is a result of his character being veiled by the restrictions of his high-class education. Tansley is not without self-doubt in social situations; he thinks that he “would put them both right in a second about books, but it was all so mixed up with, Am I saying the right thing? Am I making a good impression?” (Woolf, 1989, p.108), bringing forth the intersection between the hesitation surrounding his attempts to form relationships with others in an inoffensive manner and the books and learning that supposedly define him.

This intersection is intricately examined in Mr. Ramsay, a patriarchal figurehead of intellectualism, a proponent of education, and an educator of both the people who read his books and the family that depends on him. He is viewed by those such as Lily Briscoe and William Bankes as someone who is both “venerable and laughable at the same time” (Woolf, 1989, p.45), for the admirable depth of his education is accompanied by a self-doubt, one that tortures him when he realizes that he cannot reach the pinnacle of his scholarly pursuits. Mr. Ramsay utilizes an intricate metaphor to describe his metaphysical yearning and internalized intellectual obsession:

For if thought is like the keyboard of a piano, divided into so many notes, or like the alphabet is ranged in twenty-six letters all in order, then his splendid mind had no sort of difficulty in running over those letters one by one, firmly and accurately, until it had reached, say, the letter Q. He reached Q. Very few people in the whole of England ever reach Q. … But after Q?
What comes next? After Q there are a number of letters the last of which is scarcely visible to mortal eyes, but glimmers red in the distance. Z is only reached once by one man in a generation. Still, if he could reach R it would be something. Here at least was Q. He dug his heels in at Q. Q he was sure of. Q he could demonstrate. If Q then is Q-R- Here he knocked his pipe out, with two or three resonant taps on the handle of the urn, and proceeded. “Then R…” He braced himself. He clenched himself. (Woolf, 1989, p.34)

Mr. Ramsay calls his mind ‘splendid’, a self-congratulatory effort that paradoxically allows him to postulate theories about his own inability to fully acquire what he wishes to attain. His great need to reach R clouds his psyche with self-doubt, so that by the end, he braces and clenches himself in a manner that almost parallels the organic nature of Joe Christmas. As Mr. Ramsay approaches the edge of his conscious mental ability, he is suddenly no longer defined by his internal philosophy, one that he cultivates alone with an air of superiority. He is dependent on the sympathy and opinions of others, for, “in that flash of darkness he heard people saying- he was a failure- that R was beyond him. He would never reach R. On to R, once more, R-” (Woolf, 1989, p.34). The irony of his dependency highlights the importance of relationship as it cuts through the thick fibers of academic isolation and Mr. Ramsay, in the end, relies on his wife to assure him of his human attributes, of his ability to feel and be connected to others. It is sympathy he wants, to be assured of his genius, first of all, and then to be taken within the circle of life, warmed and soothed, to have his sense restored to him, his barrenness made fertile, and all the rooms of the house made full of life… He must be assured that he too lived in the heart of life. (Woolf, 1989, p.37)

The need for assurance is an unconscious relinquishment of the reins of relationship to his wife, whom he had always preferred to view as “not clever, not book-learned at all” (Woolf, 1989, p. 121). Instead, she infuses within him more vivid, organic imagery which she, devoid of intense intellectualism, can cultivate, in a manner similar to Joe Christmas (for they both shared an education through experience and a lack of learning in their respective institutions of higher knowledge), fertility and life.

Mrs. Ramsay does not concern herself with the intellectual breadth her husband and his friends often cite. She wonders, A square root? What was that? Her sons knew. She leant on them; on cubes and square roots; that was what they were talking about now; on Voltaire and Madame de Stael; on the character of Napoleon; on the French system of land tenure; on Lord Rosebery; on Creevey’s Memoirs: she let it uphold her and sustain her, this admirable fabric of the masculine intelligence, which ran up and down, crossed this way and that, like iron girders spanning the swaying fabric, upholding the world, she that she could trust herself to it utterly, even shut her eyes, or flicker them for a moment, as a child staring up from its pillow winks at the myriad layers of the leaves of a tree. (Woolf, 1989, p.106)
The image of Mrs. Ramsay leaning on the ‘cubes and square roots’ of ‘masculine intelligence’ is wrought with irony, for those facts merely lull her into complacency, while the men who discuss them are wholly reliant upon her for validation that their educational endeavors are not without fruition in the realm of human relationship. Their realization, however, is more beneficial to them before her death, just as Chick’s denial of Alise’s love leads to both of their demises in Mood Indigo, for intellectual pursuits can never be fully independent from the need for a foundational relationship. Mrs. Ramsay also claims that “it didn’t matter, any of it, she thought. A great man, a great book, fame- who could tell? She knew nothing about it.” (Woolf, 1989, p.118), as if whatever she did not know about, did not seem to matter. Perhaps it is because of her understanding that “it was painful to be reminded of the inadequacy of human relationships, that the most perfect was flawed” (Woolf, 1989, p.40) which allows her to be more forgiving of her husband.

Mrs. Ramsay’s assertions bring forth the extent to which Mr. Ramsay’s alphabet metaphor relates to human experience and relationship. He is never able to arrive at “Z”, to reach perfection in the consequences of his education, because “Z” represents not only the peak of philosophy, but absolute precision and understanding in human relationships as well. To the Lighthouse is fraught with failed attempts to fully grasp the thought process behind relationships with others, to interpret the intricacies of veiled meaning, and to not only test the limits of R, but to go beyond it, and explore the connection between the depth of a yearning for relationship with conventional British education.

Although a comparison between human bonds and the process of learning can be drawn through Mr. Ramsay’s contradictory logic of arrogance and self-doubt in his dreams of “Z”, the impossibility of ever reaching it also poses another question: is there potential for both love and education to co-exist? Vian attempts to address this issue in Mood Indigo, as he presents two young men, Colin and Chick, who view education as a material possession, an idea that can be brought into the human plane and made into a form that they can enjoy a relationship with. Intelligence can be consumed, felt, and acquired as long as one has the money and status to act out these wishes. Instead of the repulsive organic nature of Christmas’ revulsion of certain ideas and relationships, this bodily need for objects associated with Colin and Chick’s concepts of education is an indulgence in material desire.

For Colin, a young man who lives comfortably off of his natural wealth, his education is defined not only by the schooling a man of his status can enjoy, but also of jazz. His world is infused with references to it, with Louis Armstrong Avenue (Vian, 2014, p.10), his piano cocktail, constant records playing his favorite artists, musicians with the ability to make him feel that “there was something ethereal in the playing of Johnny Hodges, something inexplicable and completely sensual. Sensuality in its purest state, disconnected from the body” (Vian, 2014, p.95). Not only do these desires have an ability to be grasped in the form of records (similar to how books operate for Mr. Ramsay and Charles Tansley), but they exist on another, almost intangible level with music, similar to a spiritual conception of God in Light in August and the invisible philosophical thoughts and yearnings for sympathy in To Lighthouse. Eventually, Colin wishes to fall in love,
saying ‘I would like to be in love,’ said Colin. ‘Thou wouldst like to be in love. He would like idem (to be in love). We, you, would like, would like to be. They too would like to fall in love…’ (Vian, 2014, p.30), expressing his educational history with historical and linguistic references to past concepts of the idea. When he meets Chloe, he asks if she is arranged by Duke Ellington (Vian, 2014, p.35), suggesting that Chloe is a personification of his love for jazz. Before he says so, he mentions that “his mouth felt as if it was being scratched by burnt fritters” (Vian, 2014, p.35), bringing back the organic imagery once more as Colin is immersed in doubt from embarrassing himself.

Even Chloe, seems to embody the music that is her namesake consciously. She is able to feel the song, as if she were a part of its entity; additionally, when she is ill, she asks him to play her songs he likes, but Colin mentions that they will only tire her (Vian, 2014, p.94). His devotion to her begins similarly to his love of jazz, but, as she grows more and more ill, his dedication to her health estranges Colin from his material education and forces him to face the relationship he has actually cultivated. Colin’s philosophy is aptly illustrated by his response to the professor’s question of what he does for a living: “‘I learn things,’ said Colin. ‘And I love Chloe’” (Vian, 2014, p.144). He sets up the two very distinct functions of his daily life: his love of education, and Chloe. When he is forced to understand that Chloe cannot be acquired like a record or a book because she is a real, living person, Colin goes out and searches for a job to pay for the flowers that keep her alive. Before this point, Colin had assured Chloe that working was stupid, and they instead focused on the physical, such as the beauty of her hair (Vian, 2014, p.74). Thus, Colin’s breakage from his material intelligence kills the one which he had previously associated with it— his wife.

A similarly tragic result falls upon Colin’s best friend Chick, who exemplifies the commercialization of education and intellectualism to an even higher degree with his obsession with Jean-Sol Partre. His fascination is constantly fixated with organic imagery, as he finds “a copy of Partre’s Choice Precedent to Throwing-up, on an un-perforated toilet roll” (Vian, 2014, p.39) and collects Partre’s pants, fingerprints, and other material memorabilia that is not actually associated with the encyclopedias Partre writes. Ironically, philosophy is supposedly a bad profession in this world, unlike that of Woolf, where it is possible to “feed eight children on philosophy” (Woolf, 1989, p.22), and being a member of “an institute or something of the sort” (Vian, 2014, p.20) is “lamentable” compared with being a cook like Nicolas.

Chick meets a girl named Alise at a Partre lecture, and they fall in love. Alise becomes, for Chick, the female mate personification of his love for Partre, just as Chloe rises from the notes of Duke Ellington’s compositions. When he expresses his doubts about marrying her, comparing the disparities in their social backgrounds to a Partre book, she remarks, “‘I love you more than Partre’” (48). However, Chick is never able to do the same. He is drawn to the power that Partre holds over him in both an intellectual and physical manner, as the philosopher’s presence is compared to an elephant (80), until what had symbolized education in
Partre becomes a collection of teethmarks, pants, fingerprints—increasingly organic items acquired from, ironically, a bookseller.

Colin lends Chick twenty-five thousand doublezoons to marry Alise, but Chick only spends the money, without regard for Alise’s feelings, on Partre items, until the light goes out of his eyes (150), and he has a hold on neither his education nor his relationships. His complete disregard for even an attempt at compromising the two ideas exemplifies the danger of an obsession that can outweigh love, which Mr. Ramsay does not suffer on account of his wife’s emotional acuity and which Joe Christmas has no familiarity with in his lack of emotional attachments. When Chick’s relationship disintegrates, his material indulgence in consumption masked as education fully reveals itself. Chick sighed. Alise had left him that morning. He had been forced to tell her to go. He had one doublezoon and a piece of cheese left, and her dresses in the wardrobe got in his way when he tried to hang up Partre’s old suits, which the bookseller miraculously had been able to procure for him. He couldn’t remember what day it was that he had kissed her for the last time. He couldn’t waste time kissing her any more. He had to get his record player repaired so that he could learn by heart the text of Partre’s lectures. (Vian, 2014, p.164)

The image of one doublezoon and a piece of cheese juxtaposes the material and the organic in his life, leaving no room for human relationship. He physically squeezes Alise out of his apartment in the form of clothing in the closet—another instance of originally associating a possession with a human being. In Chick’s mind, “she had been happy to wait, happy simply to be with him, but you can’t let a woman do that, stay with you just because she loves you. He loved her, too. He couldn’t allow her to waste his time if she wasn’t interested in Partre any more” (165), proving that what he defines as education cannot co-exist with love. His mental illness and Chloe’s physical ailments push against the concept of happiness by fusing the two ideas, and, when failure is imminent, their partners resort to drastic action. Colin gets a job, contrary to all that he has learned as proper. Alise commits suicide and burns down a bookstore, attempting to destroy Partre so that she and Chick can be together, not realizing their relationship cannot be separated from Partre, for it is from him that she had been brought into Chick’s life.

**Conclusion**

As the distinctions between relationship and education are exemplified in various manners in Faulkner, Woolf, and Vian, the lasting parallels and characteristics of their approaches to what constitutes education drive the characters to their ends through displaying the inability of compromising education with relationship. The conflict between these two concepts haunts Joe Christmas as he rejects institutions of learning, living instead through his own experience and cutting off ties with imposed systems of knowledge by murdering those who persuade him to change his perception of education. Conversely, the academic, intellectually erudite Mr.
Ramsay and Charles Tanley delve so deeply into their institutional educations that they become insecure in their inability to reach the pinnacle of thought, relying instead on their relationships, both real and imagined, with female figures such as Mrs. Ramsay to assuage their cerebral limits. Eventually, the two ideas begin to meld together, whether it be conscious or unconscious, so that the goals of education can somehow parallel that of a relationship. *Mood Indigo* represents this idea with Colin and Chick finding girlfriends and wives who personify their intellectual interests, so that their educations become objectified into the material with jazz and Partre, and they cannot view Chloe and Alise as more human than records and articles. The eventual disintegration of this relationship symbolizes the inability of the pursuit of a defined education to be compliant with a fully realized relationship. In attempting to unite the notion of relationship with the quest for their own versions of “Z” in education, whether it be a reliance on the absorption of experience, the philosophy within and about novels and history, or the objectification of material intellect, the striking parallels between the works of fiction demonstrate the clash between perceptions of education in forming relationship.
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