

Imlac and the astronomer, will enjoy the world as persons who know they do not possess it.

THOMAS R. PRESTON

*University of Tennessee at Chattanooga*

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> All quotations from *Rasselas* are from the R. W. Chapman edition (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927).

<sup>2</sup> All quotations from the sermon on Ecclesiastes are from "Sermon xii" in *The Works of Samuel Johnson, L.L.D.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1825), ix.

<sup>3</sup> See Johnson's translation of Father Lobo's *Voyage to Abyssinia* (London, 1735), p. 208.

#### The Structure of *Wuthering Heights* Continued

To the Editor:

Pleased as I am to meet with an insight largely in accord with my own views, I feel that Robert E. Burkhart [Forum, Jan. 1972] is only too modest to limit the application of his schema to my essay. His ideas have a value and suggestiveness quite apart from mine and ought to be pursued more extensively than they are here. I believe he might wish to add two peripheral and defective, but symmetrical, love relationships to his schema—that between Frances and Hindley in the first generation and that putative one between Cathy and Lockwood in the second—both involving the insertion of a fairly weak and ordinary outsider into the novel's genealogical web of Earnshaw and Linton. And I would propose extending the schema to include the relationship between Heathcliff and Isabella. Beyond these suggestions, however, I shall not consider the extension and wider application of Mr. Burkhart's structure but merely mention how his remarks reflect upon my own essay.

I agree that his schema supports my contentions that no single character in the novel possesses a point of view endorsed by Emily Brontë and that, relative to Heathcliff and Catherine, the other characters of the novel seldom receive their rightful share of consideration and weight from its readers. I agree that all the characters must be considered before the distinctive conceptual balancing and jousting of *Wuthering Heights* can be appreciated. But I do see one aspect of Mr. Burkhart's schema as possibly an implicit challenge to my presentation: the symmetrical structure that he rightly sees and describes might well be taken to indicate that *Wuthering Heights* possesses a lucid, harmonious meaning, whereas I argued that the novel's several patterns (among those that I noted were the severe genealogical symmetry, the marriage triangles, and the arc from Hareton Earnshaw 1500 to Hareton Earnshaw 1802) were enigmatic and teasing rather than satisfactorily significant. In other words, I argued

that it is impossible to translate the clean geometrical shapes embedded in the novel into clear meanings answerable to the novel as a whole.

I think that the pattern that Mr. Burkhart nicely discerns is another such beguilement, which leads to only partial meaning and away from the chaotic "wuthering" at the heart of the book. I could be wrong. But I shall leave it to Mr. Burkhart, or someone else more perceptive or less prejudiced than I, to pursue his suggestive schema to its full extent of significance.

DAVID SONSTROEM

*University of Connecticut*

#### Huckleberries and Humans

To the Editor:

In re James L. Colwell's "Huckleberries and Humans" (*PMLA*, Jan. 1971), there may be particular significance in Mark Twain's shifting from *Eschol* to *Mulberry* as a first name for Colonel Sellers. *Escol*, *Eschol*, and *Eshcol* are three variant ways of transliterating the Biblical Hebrew word for a "bunch of grapes," in general, and specifically for that huge bunch of grapes carried back, along with samples of the fig and the pomegranate, to the Children of Israel in the desert by the scouting party they sent ahead into the land of Canaan. See Numbers xiii.23, 24, where the incident is cited to explain the name of the wadi spelled *Eshcol* in the English of the King James version.

Possibly Mark Twain or Charles Dudley Warner remembered that vivid picture accompanying that name from Sunday School days, when, as in *Tom Sawyer*, Bible verses were exercises for memorization. Perhaps it may better be inferred that Mark Twain mentioned his problem about the name to his Hartford pastor friend, Rev. Joseph Twichell, who would be the person in his acquaintance most likely to recall the Biblical associations and the meaning of the troublesome name. Whether Twichell heard the name as *Escol* or *Eschol*, it would have registered the same, since he would have known that in Hebrew S and SH are both represented by the same letter Shin, C and CH by the same letter Kaph (only in modern times are their different sounds distinguished by adding a differentiating single dot to the letter). Twichell may also have suggested the transition from grapes to mulberry via the fig of that passage in Numbers xiii, because he would have been well aware of the association in the Greek Testament between *sykon*, fig, and *sykomoros*, fig mulberry.

LEO MILLER

*New York City*