ABSTRACT

A survey of English verse parodies since the Renaissance, undertaken in teaching an online poetry course, allows us to see the form less as irreverent burlesque than as a reworking, openly or indirectly, of another poem and its subject. Although parodies act as touchstones for poems which a reading community judges excellent, they can critique or mock a text. Modernist poets, subversively extending the form of parody itself, also use it entirely to rebuild the subject of the original so as to serve a contemporary audience. Jon Stallworthy’s “My Last Mistress” and Alicia Ostriker’s “Holocaust” exemplify this type. They write what I term the reconstructive parody.
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RESUMEN

Un estudio sobre las parodias inglesas escritas en verso desde el Renacimiento, tal como hemos acometido en la enseñanza de un curso de poesía en línea, hace que no las apreciemos tanto como una forma irreverente burlesca sino más bien como una reeleración —abierta o indirectamente— de otro poema y del tema que trata. Aunque las parodias aparecen como piedras de toque de poemas, que una determinada comunidad de lectores considera excelentes, las parodias pueden ejercer una crítica o burlarse de un texto. Al ampliar la forma de la parodia e introducir un tono subversivo, los poetas modernistas también la utilizaron para reconstruir el tema del original y para que sirviera a los lectores de su época. “My Last Mistress” de Jon Stallworthy y “Holocaust” de Alicia Ostriker ejemplifican este tipo de parodias. Estos dos poetas escriben lo que yo denomino parodia reconstructiva.
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We judge poetry by the poems we know, and paper-book anthologies impose limits on how many poems we know. Professors have learned about poems as students of older professors now for over one hundred years. The types of poems first taught remain the types taught today. Understanding Poetry, recently re-edited
by Walter Kalaidjian, explains, in an exemplary way, that our profession believes
poetry to be serious, original, and bracingly demanding on the reader. It gives us a
new “vital knowledge we can find nowhere else”; it has a “revisionary” role in self-
knowledge; and it tells us that we must work hard to understand poems. Marianne
Moore’s “Poetry,” which begins “I too, dislike it...,” is the first poem in Kalaidjian’s
anthology, which not only offers no example of a parody but does not include the
term in its glossary. Over the past decade, Literature Online (LION) has overcome
the size limits imposed by all paper anthologies. This Web archive, which includes
about 350,000 works, publishes many more types of poems than any paper-book
anthology can admit, and parodies are among these. For that reason, its use inevita-
bly raises questions about how the teaching profession defines poetry.

In 1994 I made a digital conversion, for the Web, of Representative Poetry, the
instructional anthology first published in 1912 by the University of Toronto
Press and co-edited by William Alexander and his associate, William Clawson.
Alexander received a doctorate in Greek literature but abandoned classical litera-
ture for English studies because he loved the poetry of Robert Browning. Repre-
sentative Poetry went through three major re-editions up to 1962-63, assisted by
Alexander’s successors, colleagues like F.E.L. Priestley, David Hoeniger, Northrop
Frye, and Marshall McLuhan. Representative Poetry Online now has over 500 poets,
more than twice the number in all previous print editions. Many of these poets are
excluded from today’s usual teaching anthologies. Since 1994 I came to recognize
how narrowly the original Representative Poetry defined good poetry as I was pep-
pered weekly by comments from online readers of RPO. They made RPO our Li-
brary’s most popular Web site worldwide. That the Poetry Foundation of Chicago
has just licensed RPO reflects this popularity.

Five years ago, as editor of RPO, I began teaching an experimental fully-
online undergraduate credit course in English poetry and learned two things from
doing so: how superbly chatrooms engage students in discussing poetry, and how
effectively a very big poetry database like Literature Online challenges conventio-
 nal ideas of poetry. My online course anthology for this undergraduate course, titled
Reading Poetry Chosen by Poets, offers well-known poems by about sixty poets, and
their parodies, from the Renaissance to the present. A partial list appears in the
appendix to this essay. Poems occupy what can be imagined as pyramidal clusters:
the arch of each cluster is a keystone poem, famous in its time; and beneath it are

---

1 An earlier version of this essay was delivered on December 30, 2004, in Session 658, on
Computing, Theorizing, Communicating, at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Associa-
tion of America.


3 Literature Online (Proquest Information and Learning Company, 1996-). <http://
lion.chadwyck.com/marketing/index.jsp>.

4 Representative Poetry Online, ed. Ian Lancashire (Toronto: University of Toronto Library,
1994-). <http://rpo.library.utoronto.ca>.
poems written by other poets about that keystone, poems sometimes called touchstones because they mark another work as excellent. Parodies, that is, poems about poems, can be send-ups, but comedy and satire are not essential features of the form, in my opinion, despite widely-accepted definitions by such careful scholars as M.H. Abrams. The defining feature of parody, rather than burlesque, is that it recasts distinctive, recognizable elements of another poem. The neutral sense of the root of Greek parôidia, that is, parôidos ("singing indirectly, obscurely hinting"), characterizes parody as oriented to something else. In ancient Greek drama, it is a parallel "song sung counter to or alongside another song," a poem that "targets a pre-existing text, rather than persons or events in the real world." In this non-normative sense, a parody is a poem that thinks, obliquely or subversively, about another poem or its subject matter. Linda Hutcheon identified the subversive, self-reflexive quality of contemporary parody twenty years ago, a feature that made it unusually attractive to postmodernism. This recognized, or helped precipitate, a change in the parody form that I will discuss.

I did not need to choose which poems to anthologize. A poem got into my teaching anthology in one of two ways: it either stimulated another poet to write a poem in response to it (it was a keystone) or it discussed another poem (it was a touchstone). The search functions in Literature Online helped to find these pairs or clusters, which (as far as I know) no one had previously collected. Reading Poetry Chosen by Poets thus differs from Kalaidjian’s exemplary Understanding Poetry not because I give equal weight to poems that are sometimes neither serious, nor original, nor bracingly —demanding— I do, although parodies can be very serious, beautifully written poems —but because I allowed decisions by poets about their subject matter to govern the selection. For example, I only taught Sir Philip Sidney’s “With how sad steps, O Moon,” John Donne’s “Good Friday, 1613,” William

---

5 Carolyn Wells, the first major American anthologist of parodies, says: “Parody... is a tribute to popularity, and consequently to merit of one sort or another, and in the hands of the initiate may be considered a touch-stone that proves true worth” (A Parody Anthology [1904; New York: Dover, 1967]: xxvi). A keystone rests at the top of an arch and secures all the stones beneath it.

6 “A parody imitates the serious manner and characteristic features of a particular literary work, or the distinctive style of a particular author, or the typical stylistic and other features of a serious literary genre, and deflates the original by applying the imitation to a lowly or comically inappropriate subject" (W.H. Abrams, A Glossary of Literary Terms, 7th edition [Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1999]: under “Burlesque”).

7 Note that poems attacking or praising other poets lack this feature.


10 Over three years, I searched for lines from many anthologized poems as well as looked for poems that mentioned another poet.
Wordsworth’s “The Solitary Reaper,” and John Keats’ “Ode to a Nightingale” because they were the subject of Philip Larkin’s “Sad Steps,” Elizabeth Spires’ “Good Friday. Driving Westward,” Lorna Goodison’s “To Mr. William Wordsworth, Distributor of Stamps for Westmoreland,” and Edna St. Vincent Millay’s “Over the Hollow Land.”

The higher literature has marginalized parody since 1800. Literary professions, following critical taste, have promoted the view that serious poems enable readers to change their lives. Poems that address, at times disrespectfully or at least critically, universally loved poems, it may be thought, take unwelcome liberties. Some major nineteenth-century poets therefore urged that they be repressed. In 1806 Wordsworth called parody “a mode of false criticism.” When Walter Hamilton, the first great parody anthologist, asked Robert Browning in 1886 for permission to quote his poems along with their parodies, the poet replied “that as he disapproved of every kind of Parody he refused permission to quote any of his poems, adding in somewhat ungracious language, that his publishers would be instructed to see that his wishes were complied with.”

The editors of Toronto’s Representative Poetry in 1912 must have agreed with Browning. That textbook offered no parodies and by 1923 had made Browning its most generously represented poet. Readers who feel offended by parodies have grounds for resentment. Hartley Coleridge expresses dislike for Wordsworth in “He lived amidst th’ untrodden ways,” Arthur Clement Hilton feels contempt for Swinburne in “Octopus,” Benjamin Franklin King mocks Arabella Eugenia Smith’s sentimental “If I should Die Tonight,” and Phoebe Cary dresses down Oliver Goldsmith, Wordsworth, and Longfellow. Although the public loved the keystones that parodies supported, the person-of-letters who edited good poetry for appreciation and study shunned parodies. Because Victorian readers used them to memorialize and critique their much-loved keystones in a “consummately moral” way that exposed weaknesses, literary authority could only allow parodies to reach the public in a marked form, the parody anthology. Mark Jones describes this as a social strategy of containment.

Some parodies are easy to read and to enjoy. Gelett Burgess, Lewis Carroll, Phoebe Cary, Gavin Ewart, Andrew Lang, Don Marquis, and Phyllis McGinley did not pen life-changing poems, possibly aware that unremitting intensity can be wearing, and that serious poems often contradict one another in ways that impede a reader’s application of them as tutorials about how to live. Yet parodies, far from

---

13 Terry Caesar, in “‘I Quite Forget What —Say a Daffodilly’: Victorian Parody” (English Literary History 31.4 (Winter 1984): 795-818), says that “Prize competitions calling for parodies on subjects and/or specific styles were begun by magazines at least as early as 1879” (796).
14 Caesar 806.
being superficial, by their very nature ask readers to remember an original poem well enough to supply its text in silent counterpoint to the parody as it unfolds. These touchstones make unusual demands on a reader’s memory. While it is true that many a parody, as Donald Hall says, “ties idiosyncrasies of style to inappropriate subject matter,” they act as touchstones to tag, to popularize, and to annotate great poems. James Clerk Maxwell, the 19th-century physicist who imagined Maxwell’s demon, saw something peculiar in the furtive kiss described in Robert Burns’ “Comin thro’ the Rye.” Maxwell imitates Burns’ dialect but transmutes the kiss of wet, bedraggled Jenny into a meeting of what Victorian physics termed rigid bodies. In the process he celebrates Burns’ original and makes a point about casual encounters.

Parodies celebrate and gloss their originals, the keystones; and difference leads easily to comedy. A century and a half ago, most readers expected parodies to amuse. Writing them was a British national pastime, to judge from *Punch*, competitions, and Walter Hamilton’s six-volume anthology (1884-89). They sometimes reproduce the syntactic and metrical structures of pre-existing poems while deflating their sublime topic, as Hall and Abrams say. A frequently parodied poem, Charles Kingsley’s “The Three Fishers,” begins:

Three fishers went sailing away to the West,
Away to the west as the sun went down;
Each thought of the woman who loved him the best,
And the children stood watching them out of the town.
For men must work, and women must weep,
And there’s little to earn and many to keep,
Though the harbour bar be moaning.

Duns Scotus closely follows this in *College Rhymes* (Oxford, 1865):

Three freshmen went loafing out into the High,
Out into the High, as the sun went down;
Each thought on his waistcoat and gorgeous tie;
And the nursemaids stood watching them all the way down.
For men won’t work, and their mothers must weep,
For nothing they earn, and their ticks run deep,
Though the College Dons be moaning.

15 W.D. Snodgrass, *De/Compositions: 101 Good Poems Gone Wrong* (Saint Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf, 2001): xv. Snodgrass rewrites keystone poems to increase their readability, but his students wisely then compare the de/compositions with their originals and, in time, learn how much has been lost. For example, the final couplet in Shakespeare’s sonnet 73 (“This thou perceivest, which makes thy love more strong/ To love that well which thou must leave ere long”) becomes “And yet your love for me grows even stronger/ Knowing I’ve got to go before much longer” (52-53).
This not only respects how Kingsley’s poem depicts the sadness of the seagoer’s family at their separations, it enhances the warmth of his original with a moral reminder that other men cause their families grief by not working at all.

Isaac Disraeli in *The Curiosities of Literature* tells an anecdote to show that parodists like Duns Scotus were not always thought the enemies of serious poets:

A Lady of *bas bleu* celebrity... had two friends, whom she equally admired —an elegant poet, and his parodist. She had contrived to prevent their meeting as long as her stratagems lasted, till at length she apologised to the serious bard for inviting him when his mock *umbra* was to be present. Astonished, she perceived that both men of genius felt a mutual esteem for each other’s opposite talent; the ridiculed had perceived no malignity in the playfulness of the parody, and even seemed to consider it a compliment, aware that parodists do not waste their talent on obscure productions; while the ridiculer himself was very sensible that he was the inferior poet.16

Nineteenth-century parodists were useful. They taught readers which poems had unusual merit, and then amplified them. Their readership must have been educated because magazines did not print the original to which a parody responded. Parodies continued to thrive because poetry was widely read. Despite being excluded from approved literature textbooks, they remained popular throughout the twentieth century. Poets such as J.C. Squire, Rudyard Kipling, Max Beerbohm, T.W.H. Crosland, Percy French, Gavin Ewart, Kenneth Koch, and Wendy Cope practised the form successfully. Anthologists Carolyn Wells, Louis Untermeyer, and Dwight Macdonald published lasting anthologies. Within academe, renegade William Zaranka of the University of Denver brought out *The Brand-X Anthology of Poetry: A Parody Anthology* in 1981. He termed this the “Burnt Norton Edition,” I guess, because its contents would presumably have been burnt by the editors of Norton anthologies before reaching proofs.

Despite a lack of encouragement from twentieth-century critic-teachers, modernist poets have not only written many superb parodies but have transformed the form itself. Because many poets earn their living by teaching literature in colleges, it has been natural for them to write about poems that occupied their minds professionally. Sometimes modern poets have affectionate fun with the keystones they admire, as Wendy Cope does in “Waste Land Limericks” and Kenneth Koch in his well-loved “Variations on a Theme by William Carlos Williams.” Even the utterly whimsical “How I Brought the Good News from Aix to Ghent, or Vice Versa” by Walter Carruthers Sellar and Robert Julian Yeatman serves by reminding everyone of the gallop of Browning’s infectious metre. Other modern poets use the parody as a weapon. Poets like Lorna Goodison, Mimi Khalvati, Mona Van Duyn, and Annie Finch effectively employ the form, with wonderfully civilized indigna-

tion, in feminist causes. Anthony Hecht’s “The Dover Bitch: A Criticism of Life” more cruelly eviscerates Matthew Arnold’s keystone poem, “Dover Beach,” sometimes regarded as the most popular poem in English. Hecht’s speaker, an irregular lover of the lady whom Arnold’s speaker has taken to Dover, shows that loss of religious faith is not as damaging to one’s self-esteem as the insensitivity of a male who, having invited a woman to a hotel room overlooking the English Channel and the lights of France, spends a long time talking about romantic love as a way of filling their spiritual void, and then does nothing practical about it. Other modernist parodies express neither affection for, nor indignation at, a keystone but tacitly admit its power by reconstructing it, from the ground up, for a different world. Denise Levertov’s “Caedmon,” Richard Howard’s “An Old Dancer,” Tom Clark’s Keats cycle, and Peter Meinke’s “E-mail from Tokyo” are such works. They rebuild the subject of the original for a different era. Jon Stallworthy’s “My Last Mistress” and Alicia Ostriker’s “Holocaust” will serve here to illustrate how the burlesque-tarred parody is changing in the hands of the modernist poets.

Robert Browning’s “My Last Duchess” would seem immune to parody, so sympathetic a portrait does it paint of Ferrara’s joy-spotted wife, so damning a one of the lethally proud duke, but in “My Last Mistress” Jon Stallworthy, poet and editor of the Norton Anthology of English Literature, the leading English literature anthology of the past forty years, reworks this keystone original for neither praise nor blame. He rebuilds it. Stallworthy’s first lines

That’s my last mistress on the easel. I call her “The Fallen Picador” — and why? (1-2)

recall the opening of “My Last Duchess” to anyone who has read English poetry:

That’s my last Duchess painted on the wall, Looking as if she were alive. I call That piece a wonder, now (1-3)

Browning’s heroine, who is based on Lucrezia, youthful wife of Alfonso II (1533-98), becomes in “My Last Mistress” the painter, Françoise Gilot, mistress of Pablo Picasso from 1943 to 1953, and mother of his two children Claude and Paloma. When Françoise left him, Picasso persuaded her to do him one last favour: to open the bullfight at Vallauris near Cannes, being held in his honour, by riding a dancing horse before the bull that was Picasso’s symbol.

17 The Muse Strikes Back: A Poetic Response by Women to Men, ed. Katherine McAlpine & Gail White (Brownsville, Oregon: Story Line, 1997), offers many such take-offs.
19 Quoted from Representative Poetry Online.
She lived ten years with the minotaur
and deserved to leave with the honours of war,
so when Vallauris last July declared
me president of the corrida, I shared
the honours with her. Seeing that the bull
was my symbol, the horse her symbol,
what end could be more fitting than that they
should face each other in a ritual way—
life imitating art, a masterpiece
of living theatre? When I took my place
in the president’s box and raised my hand,
she was the first out, scattering sand
and with the hooves of her passaging horse
determining my picture’s lines of force.
She circled the arena, reined in, bowed
to me as president, and read aloud
the proclamation in my honour. Then
rode from the ring, leaving the bulls and men
to face their deaths. (3-21)

The duchess who suffered a death after Ferrara took umbrage at her innoc-ent-enough behaviour, remains behind only in a portrait. Françoise is here alive, still (Picasso admits) “determining my picture’s lines of force.” As Ferrara unveils his portrait of the duchess for the ambassador of an unnamed count whose daugh-ter the duke hopes to wed, so Picasso too shows his “lines of force” at work in his own portrait of Françoise, which he titles “The Fallen Picador.”

There were no horses killed
that day, but ever since my dreams are filled
with goring. The result you see. Had she
remained, unchanged, the girl who posed for me
in the light of Liberation, hers
would be a face the world remembers,
a daughter of the sun, instead of this
nightmare metamorphosis
of woman into horse: familiar head
and satín flank, the bull’s head garlanded
with entrails. (21-31)

Fused to the horse’s body, whose flank the bull has gored and gutted, Françoise suffers a public humiliation. It is like that of the duchess, except that whereas she suffers and is vindicated by her portrait, Françoise, who is hideously transformed in her portrait, humbles Picasso by living on and writing a tell-all book on their affair, a book from which Stallworthy draws. His touchstone and Browning’s keystone end alike. Ferrara shows the count’s ambassador a brass sculp-ture (supposed to have been made by Claus of Innsbruck), depicting Neptune taming a sea-horse; and Picasso places a golden bull’s head necklace around the neck of someone whom we imagine to be his next mistress.
But enough of her. 
Here’s something that I fancy you’ll prefer—
a necklace. Let me help. Look how your skin
irradiates my metal from within. 
It fits that hollow better than its mould,
my bull’s horned head Charagnier cast in gold. (31-36)

Stallworthy again draws on Françoise’s book to mould Picasso after Ferrara. 
She tells how Picasso “made jewelry in gold and silver by the lost-wax process, with
the help of a Vallauris dentist, Doctor Chatagnier.”21 In the poem, Picasso seems
just as unconscious of how the “horned head” of the bull, his own symbol, depicts
him as a cuckold —Françoise went on to marry Jonas Salk, the creator of a vaccine
against polio— as Ferrara is unaware that the curtaining of his last duchess’ portrait
reveals his own murderous jealousy.

Stallworthy’s parody affirms the value of Browning’s poem but, rather than
interpret it, independently advances a joint underlying feminist cause. The male
abuse in “My Last Mistress” is more problematic because Picasso is a great artist,
not an aristocratic thug who left nothing behind him. The outcome should be
worse but is not. The duchess died, but Françoise lives on after Picasso. Ferrara
woos another duchess, to all appearances successfully, but Picasso adorns his new
mistress with an image of unfaithfulness that bodes ill for her loyalty to him. The
modern story of Picasso and Françoise that Stallworthy parallels to Browning’s tale
of the Italian Renaissance also shows that life indeed imitates art (to use Picasso’s
words). As Ferrara is the tyrannical Neptune shown taming a sea-horse, so Picasso
is the cuckolded, horned bull symbolized by the necklace he gives his female lis-
tener. Stallworthy affords students a second dramatic situation by which they can
assess Browning’s subject after five hundred years have elapsed. Stallworthy does
not attempt criticism of Browning’s poem but unletters and recasts its story for the
reader’s own, much changed world. Such poems unify art across time. What we call
significant imitation, allusion, and appropriation or describe metaphorically as
palimpsest and “intertext” are diminished forms of the intense experience that the
reconstructive parody can achieve.

Alicia Ostriker, a professor of English and a renowned American poet, paro-
dies W.H. Auden’s “Musée des Beaux Arts” in her poem, “Holocaust.” She is not
the first. Irving Feldman savaged the self-assured opening of “Musée” (December
1938) a decade previously, in “Just another Smack.”22 To Auden’s opening lines,

About suffering they were never wrong,
The old Masters: how well they understood

21 Gilot & Lake 301.
22 Teach Me, Dear Sister (New York: Viking, 1983).
Its human position: how it takes place
While someone else is eating or opening a window or just walking dully along... 23

Feldman responds gratingly

Sir, respectfully, is it possible
ever to be right about "suffering?"
—suffering which, after all, is not
just lying around waiting to be mapped,
but has abundantly its awful life. (10-14)

and he quickly becomes less respectful. Feldman conveys Auden’s objectivity as an
“I’m all right, Jack,” indifference. The “smack” that Feldman administers “school-
master” Auden at poem’s end is as sharp a barb as any poet has endured in print:

And then wouldn’t you know it.
Out cruising, say, for a little action,
or maybe looking to change its luck,
Suffering just happens to happen by,
big as leviathan and calling you son,
and clouts enormously your shoulder blade,
and dispatches a knee swift to the groin
—or now you haven’t breath to shout
or to curse the day you were born—
and caves in your ear with a whisper
(the last words you’re going to hear,
doubled over now, dropping fast),
“Listen close. It’s me. Only I got away.
And my message is strictly for you
—Hey, old fella, you’ve been elected.” (43-57)

Ferocity like this makes other well-turned modernist parodies seem civi-
lized, from the witty repartee in youthful Annie Finch’s “Coy Mistress” (1997),
which puts paid to Andrew Marvell with the first line, “Sir, I am not a bird of prey,”
to the answer that Mona Van Duyn in “Leda” (1993) gives to W.B. Yeats’ closing
question in “Leda and the Swan,” “Did she put on his knowledge with his power / Before the indifferent beak could let her drop?”:

Not even for a moment...
She tried for a while to understand what it was
that had happened, and then decided to let it drop.
She married a smaller man with a beaky nose,
and melted away in the storm of everyday life

Feminist parodies are chillingly polite, but Feldman’s is outraged. He is thinking of the plight of six million Jews, gypsies, aliens, and castouts in Nazi Europe. “Crystal Night” took place in Berlin on November 9, 1938, a fortnight after the first Jews were deported to Poland, and just a month before Auden wrote “Musée des Beaux Arts.” It is easy for undergraduates for whom personal history does not go back even to the first Gulf war to read Auden’s “Musée” out of historical context. Feldman’s “Just another Smack” humiliates Auden as much as it engages with his masterpiece. A reconstructive parody may also be angry, but its objective is neither the keystone poem nor its poet.

Ostriker’s “Holocaust” avoids personal reference entirely, instead dwelling intensely, on Auden’s observation of how indifferent ordinary folk are to “the dreadful martyrdom” in their neighborhood. The little word “And” that begins “Holocaust” appends it to something that readers quickly recognize to be “Musée des Beaux Arts.” With this deft touch, she returns parody to its ancient function, which is not to belittle but to extend and reconstruct.

And about burning people—
They were never wrong, the old
Old masters,

How it never stopped, it is done all the time,
How you must admit there is an absolute
Seductiveness, a classic primal urge— (1-6)

The masters of which Ostriker speaks are older than Auden’s Renaissance men, and the immolations she describes in “Holocaust” both precede and follow the New Testament crucifixion he alludes to, but her masters still belong to a “classic” tradition. Auden turns to Renaissance paintings of events from the gospels and Greek myth, and Ostriker to how the Old Testament and medieval and modern history depict Jehovah, Holy Catholic and Protestant inquisitions in France, England, and New England, Rome, Truman’s wartime America, and the lynch mobs of the deep southern states.

Is not my word like as a fire?

Oh Jephthah’s daughter, ah Joan,
Oh Jews and Protestants, ah Sir Thomas More,
Oh Giordano Bruno, ah heretics, witches, fanatics—

24 Auden might have replied to Feldman that Europe in November 1938 proved as massively neglectful of Nazi purges as old masters such as Pieter Breughel suggested they would be.
Scent of magnolia sweet and fresh
In the Carolina woods, a splash of gasoline
And the sudden smell of burning flesh

Oh Jericho, ah Carthage,
Oh Hiroshima (7-15)

Ostriker introduces the church-sanctioned executions of two women and
two men with the words of God in Jeremiah 23.29, and the torching of three cities
in war with words from the second stanza of Billy Holiday’s arrangement of Lewis
Allen’s “Strange Fruit,” a song about black human bodies hanging on southern trees:

Pastoral scene of the gallant south,
The bulging eyes and the twisted mouth,
Scent of magnolias, sweet and fresh,
Then the sudden smell of burning flesh.

Holiday recorded “Strange Fruit” in 1939, the year Auden penned “Musée
des Beaux Arts.” Ostriker’s echoes of poetry, ancient Hebrew and modern pop,
complement Auden’s visual “beaux arts.”

That is not to say she entirely agrees with him. Society in “Musée” avoids
looking at sufferers. Breughel decenters Icarus’ fall and death by drowning, focusing
instead on the ship that “Had somewhere to get to and sailed calmly on,” and
locating the “human position” of suffering as lost among society’s leisure activities.
Ostriker sees that position differently. It is a “primal urge” shared excitedly by every-
one, from Auden’s children skating on a pond to his working ploughman.

Masses at once, masses

In the fiery patriotic mind,
Men stroking themselves
Eyes half shut, women aroused,

You as a child first feeling that excitement
At the cave mouth—
Sparks flying upward to emulate stars

You dancing to emulate the fierce commotion
Your mouth greasy after eating
Running with the dogs round the circle

The hiss, the crackle, the boom, the fragrance—
The sweet savor—

You draw close enough to set
Two hard fires ablaze in your two eyes
And they never go out— (16-30)
Auden’s dogs “go on with their doggy life” in an “untidy spot,” independently of working executioners and belaboured victim, and dully (in comparison), but Ostriker’s dogs run excitedly with their people around a fire. Auden’s children want to skate, and his aged want a different thing, the birth of a child, whereas Ostriker’s men, women, and children share the same “fiery patriotic mind,” a love of burning. The close of “Holocaust” discloses the last difference in Ostriker’s remastering of Auden’s “human position.”

Mean little fires,
Satan’s toys,
God’s flames.

A rapid, persistent
Chemical
Reaction. (31-36)

She addresses us as fire-obsessed from childhood, our eyes flickering with an unsublimated desire to incinerate someone, and refers this pervasive horror, not to the “beaux arts,” but to science. The poem’s epigraph gives an irresistibly reifying definition of fire: its etymology is from “holokaustos, burnt offering,” and its meaning begins “a rapid, persistent chemical reaction that releases heat and light.”

Nowhere does Ostriker mention the great extermination of Jews in Nazi Europe, what we now call the “holocaust,” although the ovens of death-camps will intrude on the minds of most readers of this poem. Neither does Ostriker abuse Auden’s view that people are *blaise* in the face of suffering. Both poets depict ordinary people as morally detached from the great crimes taking place in their midst. Auden’s folk eat, walk, consort with dogs and the torturer’s horse, and go about their business. Ostriker’s, succumbing to the same primal urge, are absorbed into the “masses.” The two poets reflect on how the fine arts and the sciences approach the same phenomenon. Their styles could not farther apart. Auden’s long lines convey the casual way people browse in a museum. Ostriker’s verses are short and explosive. As a result, the clustered keystone and its touchstone are greater than the sum of their parts.

Reconstructive modernist parodies avoid personal judgment on the touchstone poet and that poet’s writing and imaginatively recreate the phenomena that the keystone addresses. There are now enough parodies of this kind to serve the teaching of poetry well. Their clusters lead students to compare texts (still a most demanding kind of critical thinking), to see why we place some poems again and again in the curriculum, and to reflect on the ways that literary works appear to converse over time. There are many other parodies of this kind than the ones by Stallworthy and Ostriker. They include Marilyn Hacker’s sonnet, “Did you love well what very soon you left?” which in its close, “I drank our one year out in brine instead / of honey from the seasons of your tongue,” rivals its model, Shake-
Shakespeare’s “That time of year thou mayst in me behold.” To them can be added poems like “Good Friday. Driving Westward” by Elizabeth Spires, “IX. Sonnet for the Portuguese” by Rafael Campo, and “Caedmon” by Denise Levertov.27 The origins of this modernist innovation in poetic form are obscure, but Adrienne Rich’s “A Val- ediction: Forbidding Mourning” and Elizabeth Bishop’s “Casabianca” stand out as pioneering works.

The verse parody today is a protean form. It embraces authorly reproaches like “To Mr. William Wordsworth, Distributor of Stamps for Westmoreland,” in which Lorna Goodison identifies his “Solitary Reaper,”28 literary critiques such as David Hoover’s witty address to Joyce Kilmer on “Trees,” and modernist reconstructions by Stallworthy and Ostriker. The form, strictly understood as poems about poems, has a history going back at least to the Renaissance, where we find it in Sir Philip Sidney’s transformation of the hymn “Veni Creator” into the sonnet, “Come Sleep!” Poems that delight both popular and educated readers and that teach so well deserve to be rehabilitated by the editors of today’s mass-market anthologies.

APPENDIX
SELECTED PARODY CLUSTERS

SIR THOMAS WYATT (1503-42)

SIR PHILIP SIDNEY (1554-86)

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE (1564-93)
“The Passionate Shepherd to His Love” (RPO). Parody: “The Nymph's Reply” by Sir Walter Ralegh (ca. 1552-1618; RPO), and “Raleigh Was Right” by William Carlos Williams (1883-1963; LION).

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE (1564-1616)

JOHN DAVIES (1565?-1618)
THOMAS CAMPION (1567-1620)


JOHN DONNE (1572-1631)


GEORGE SANDYS (1578-1644)


ROBERT HERRICK (1591-1674)


JOHN MILTON (1608-74)


ANNE BRADSTREET (ca. 1612-72)


ANDREW MARVELL (1621-78)

HENRY VAUGHAN (1622-95)

APHRA BEHN (1640-89)

JOHN WILMOT, EARL OF ROCHESTER (1647-80)

JONATHAN SWIFT (1667-1745)
“The Lady’s Dressing Room” (RPO). Parody: “The Reasons That Induced Dr S to Write a Poem Call’d the Lady’s Dressing Room” by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762; RPO).

THOMAS GRAY (1716-71)
“Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard” (RPO). Parody: “An Evening Contemplation in a College” by John Duncombe (1729-86; LION) and “The Beadle’s Annual Address” by Thomas Hood (1799-1845; LION).

CHRISTOPHER SMART (1722-71)

JOHN NEWTON (1725-1807)

OLIVER GOLDSMITH (CA. 1730-74)
“Song from The Vicar of Wakefield” (RPO). Parody: “When Lovely Woman” by Phoebe Cary (1824-71; RPO).
William Blake (1757-1827)

(1) “And Did Those Feet in Ancient Time” (RPO). Parody: “Till We Have Built Jerusalem (Guyana, 1976)” (1997) by David Wojahn (1953-; LION) and “Dark Satanic Mills” by David Herbert Lawrence (1885-1930; LION).


Robert Burns (1759-96)

“Comin Thro’ the Rye” (RPO). Parody: “In Memory of Edward Wilson, Who Repented of What Was in His Mind to Write after Section” by James Clerk Maxwell (1831-79; RPO).

William Wordsworth (1770-1850)


Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834)

“Kubla Khan” (RPO). Parody: “Thoughts about the Person from Porlock” by Stevie Smith (1902-71; LION).

Robert Southey (1774-1843)

“The Old Man’s Complaints” (RPO). Parody: “You Are Old, Father William” by Lewis Carroll (1832-98; RPO).

George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824)

“So We’ll Go No More a Roving” (RPO). Parody: “We’ll Go No More A-Roving” by William Ernest Henley (1849-1903; LION) and “We’ll Go No More A-roving” (1991) by Gavin Ewart (1916-95; LION).

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822)


FELICIA DOROTHEA BROWNE HEMANS (1793-1835)

JOHN KEATS (1795-1821)
(1) “Ode to a Nightingale” (RPO). Parody: “Ode on a Jar of Pickles” by Bayard Taylor (1825-78), “VI Over the Hollow Land” by Edna St. Vincent Millay (1892-1950; LION), and “Fate Taint” (1994) by Tom Clark (1941-; LION).

RALPH WALDO EMERSON (1803-82)

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING (1806-61)
“How Do I Love Thee?” (RPO). Parody: “How Do I Love Thee?” by Wilfred Owen (1893-1918; LION) and “IX. Sonnet for the Portuguese” (What the Body Told (Durham: Duke UP, 1996)) by Rafael Campo (1964-).

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW (1807-82)

DAVID BATES (1809-70)
“Speak Gently” (RPO). Parody: “Speak Roughly to Your Little Boy” by Lewis Carroll (1832-98; RPO) and “Speak Gently” by T.D. Sullivan (1827-1914; LION).

EDWARD FITZGERALD (1809-83)
Omar Khayyám” (1996) by Edwin Morgan (1920-; LION), and “In a Persian Garden” (132 original stanzas, revised and increased to 150; 1994) by Frank Kuppner (1951-; LION).

**ALFRED LORD TENNYSON (1809-83)**


**ROBERT BROWNING (1812-89)**

(3) “How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix” (RPO). Parody: “How They Brought the News to a Gent” by W.J. Linton (1812-97; LION) and “How I Brought the Good News from Aix to Ghent, or Vice Versa” (*Horse Nonsense* [1933]) by Walter Carruthers Sellar (fl. 1935-55) and Robert Julian Yeatman (fl. 1935-55).

**MATTHEW ARNOLD (1822-88)**


**DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI (1828-82)**


**EMILY DICKINSON (1830-86)**


**ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE (1837-1909)**

“Dolores” (RPO). Parody: “Dolores Replies to Swinburne” by Gilbert Keith Chesterton (1874-1936; LION) and “Octopus” by Arthur Clement Hilton (1851-77; RPO).
GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS (1844-89)


ARABELLA EUGENIA SMITH (ca. 1844-1916)


EMMA LAZARUS (1849-87)


W.B. YEATS (1865-1939)


EDWIN ARlington ROBINSON (1869-1935)

“Richard Cory” (RPO). Parody: “Richard Cory” (Sounds of Silence (Columbia Records, 1966)) by Paul Simon (1942-).

ROBERT FROST (1874-1963)


EDWARD THOMAS (1878-1917)

William Carlos Williams (1883-1963)

D.H. Lawrence (1885-1930)

Joyce Kilmer (1886-1918)

T.S. Eliot (1888-1965)

Wilfred Owen (1893-Nov. 4, 1918)

Stevie Smith (1902-71)

W.H. Auden (1907-73)
William Stafford (1914-)

Dylan Thomas (1914-53)
(2) “Do Not Go Gentle into That Good Night.” Parody: “Go Gentle” (1975) by Linda Pastan (1932-; LION)

Philip Larkin (1922-85)

Denise Levertov (1923-97)

Ted Hughes (1930-98)